

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, January 24, 1967

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Les Reverends Pères Oblates praying for the passing of an Act to amend an Act to incorporate Les Reverends Pères Oblates in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. CLERK: The petition of Dorothy J. Ungar, praying for the passing of an Act for the relief of Dorothy J. Ungar.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

Notices of Motion

Presenting of Bills

Committee of the Whole House. The Honourable Provincial Treasurer.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer)(Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, may I have leave of the House to allow this item to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: May the Honourable Minister have leave? Orders of the Day.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day may I ask a question of the Honourable Minister of Health? Can he tell us when we can expect the Annual Report of the Manitoba Hospital Commission?

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health)(Flin Flon): Yes, Mr. Speaker, it should be down within the next few days.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day may I direct a question to the Honourable the First Minister or to the Minister who is charged with the responsibility of the Election Act - I'm not quite sure with the readjustment of responsibility who is the Minister in charge. The question would be, Mr. Speaker: Is the Electoral Divisions Commission now meeting to consider changes in the electoral boundaries? If so, when might we expect to receive a report from the Commission?

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General)(Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, my understanding of the Act in question is that that Commission does not sit or is not required to sit until such time as the final reports of the census are received from Ottawa. My information is, subject to correction, that those reports have not yet been received.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . Mr. Speaker, if I may, the Electoral Divisions Act says they must make a report in the year 1967. I was going to ask a supplementary question as to the receipt of the report of the last census, which I understand was taken last summer, so I would then ask the Honourable the Attorney-General, can he indicate when we might be receiving the report of the census-takers at the federal level, and if he cannot answer that will representations be made so that we can have this information in order that the conditions of our own Electoral Divisions Act may be adhered to?

MR. LYON: I have no accurate information, Mr. Speaker, as to the time when this information will be received. Information does come from the office of the Chief Electoral Officer to the effect that we can perhaps expect it sometime in late spring of this year. That's all the information I have and I must admit that was hearsay.

MR. DESJARDINS: Before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Labour, to know if he is ready to introduce legislation for proper protection in the installation of gas and gas equipment when it's installed, and also the proper inspection.

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour)(Osborne): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the honourable member I'd like him to know that I am waiting for advice from the Advisory Committee that is studying the legislation, and also the report of the investigation that is going on at the present time.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, this is not a good enough question. I'd like to know if he's ready to bring in proper legislation. I think it was proven that we need it.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Minister of Public Utilities)(Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I wish to lay on the table of the House a nil report by the Public Utilities Board with respect to the Greater Winnipeg Gas Distribution Act.

HON. WALTER WEIR (Minister of Highways)(Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, may I lay on the table the Annual Report of the Department of Highways for the year 1965-66.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed with the Orders of the Day I would like to inform the House that on my right in the gallery there are 25 Grade 11 students from the Garden City Collegiate under the direction of Mr. Groff. This collegiate is situated in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks. On behalf of the members of the Legislative Assembly I bid you all welcome.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate. Proposed motion of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, in speaking on the motion before us which is an Order for Return for certain information, I would like to make it clear that as far as I'm concerned I think the Opposition is quite right in requesting information of this type and in seeking out certain information in connection with these companies mentioned. I had the intention of doing likewise had this Order not been put forward, and my request would not only have been limited to Part I but also to Part II of the Act, although if I understood the Minister correctly in one of the discussions that we had, I think he said that there were no actions taken under Part II of the bill. That is the Development Fund Act.

Now, Section 30 of the bill has been mentioned on several occasions in this debate, and as I understand Section 30 the government, or the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council which is Cabinet, may oblige to give us this information if it is their desire to do so. As I see it, it is all in their power and at their discretion, and as far as I can see it they can also refuse to do so because it says "may". Now I'm certainly not a lawyer and my good friend here who spoke on the debate yesterday definitely indicated that he felt that the Act provided for us to get this information, and I certainly do not object to it. On the contrary I think we should have the information made available to this House, and just last spring when we voted the bill we also voted a certain amount of funds to go with it; \$50 million was authorized to be borrowed by the Fund and to be used, and certainly they had every right to proceed. As I see the bill under Part II, Section 43 in my opinion would state that we would be entitled to all the information without government discretion on this point to have the information on all actions under Part II of the bill. But I'm not so sure under Part I.

The other point that has been discussed quite freely, and this is in connection with subsidizing the borrowers of the Fund, and in my opinion the Manitoba Government is subsidizing all loans, large or small, to the extent that it has subscribed a certain amount of capital to share stock in the company, in the Fund, and on which no interest is collected, so that here we've set a certain amount of funds into this Development Fund and we are not collecting interest on it, therefore we're subsidizing the borrowers of this money to that extent. And if I understood correctly the Honourable Member for St. John's when speaking on this he also mentioned reserve funds. The way I see it, earnings accruing to the Fund after paying interest on moneys borrowed and operating expenses, the balance of this goes into reserves, and I haven't checked this, whether they may be lent to prospective borrowers or not, and certainly I will not make any point in this matter, but the money in the reserve funds are definitely there to be used. So, regardless who makes the loan, as far as I'm concerned the loan that is made by the Development Fund to borrowers are being subsidized.

The point was raised in debate whether Churchill Forest Industries project is a good one or a bad one, and I think we heard a lot from the First Minister last December. On the final day of the Throne Speech he was defending this to the hilt, that in his opinion it was a good one. I certainly have my reservations on this, and in comparing Manitoba's actions with other provinces as to the concessions being made, the First Minister did leave out very important items which in my estimation make a vast and a large difference. I cannot see it but that the province will subsidize the industry, the Churchill Forest Industry, for years to come and I certainly intend to debate this matter further when we deal with this under the proper department when the estimates of that department come forward.

Now the expression was made by members of other parties, or should I just say party, that had they been aware of the action of the government that would result, certainly they would have used it in the election campaign. Well I did so, and I used it quite extensively and I even had the truth squad sent after me. So I certainly intend to debate this at a future date to further extent.

(MR. FROESE cont'd).....

Now, the other matter that I want to deal with at this particular time is the result of what happened when this Order was brought in and came up for debate. Because when I adjourned the debate the other day it was to accommodate the government, not only once but twice; first, so that they could proceed with other business; secondly, so that they could present the estimates before 5:30 that evening, and this was brought about by the Leader of the Official Opposition in bringing forward a point of order.

Well, to go back, I think we ought to go back to the sessions of December. The last day when the House recessed there was a question arising as to the orders of procedure, and unanimous consent was required in order to speed up the procedure and advance certain bills by two or three stages, and unanimous consent was required for this purpose.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if what the honourable gentleman is outlining at the moment has anything at all to do with the motion under discussion. I wondered if we could clear away the motion and probably he could discuss the item that he's discussing now at some other time. I can't reconcile what he's discussing now with the motion that's before the House.

MR. FROESE: Well Mr. Speaker, I was prevented the day that I adjourned this debate from taking an active part in the debate at that particular time, and had I had the opportunity to debate it at that time it would have been quite in order because this

MR. SPEAKER: I would ask the honourable gentleman if he will keep to the principle of the motion and probably discuss it in that direction.

MR. FROESE: Well, the point I'm addressing myself to arose from the debate and that is not based on the motion before us. Am I allowed to proceed?

MR. SPEAKER:the honourable gentleman to be satisfied that I am trying to deal with the motion before us, the order paper as of this day, and he has discussed the motion and I wondered if he had anything more to say to the motion before I put the question.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL(Lakeside): Not to the motion itself, Mr. Speaker. I was going to debate the other point.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. CAMPBELL: Do I understand on the point of order that Mr. Speaker is taking the position that the honourable member is prevented from discussing the procedure that took place or remarks that were made by other speakers on this debate? Is that the ruling of Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: That of course is not the intention. I am merely, as I thought I had pointed out, asking the honourable member to deal with the contents of the motion before the House at this particular time. I feel that there will be some time in the future that he could speak on the matter that he was beginning to outline when I had to interrupt him.

MR. FROESE: That means that I'm being prevented from discussing the point of order that took place at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: It certainly was not my intention to deny the honourable member to discuss it at the proper time, but I wondered if the proper time was now when we're dealing with the motion on the order paper.

MR. FROESE: Well Mr. Speaker, I think it is the proper time because I was prevented from speaking at that particular time. I had to take the adjournment in order to accommodate the government.

MR. SPEAKER: I rule that we must stay within the bounds of the motion being discussed.

HON. J.B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare)(The Pas): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments on some of the remarks that have been made in this debate on this Order for Return, particularly, I suppose, because of the special interest of the people in the part of Manitoba that will be most vitally affected by the development that will be taking place in the near future.

First of all I'd like to comment on the pious expressions for public concern and public confusion, doubts and misunderstanding that was raised by the Leader of the Official Opposition, and at the same time he threw in the question of credibility of the government itself with respect to this whole transaction. There were suggestions of duplication, fear of too much development by the "too far too fast" wing of the Official Opposition, and I'm glad to see that they were not impressed by the arguments of stagnation put forward by other members of that party in recent months. There were new financial or credit theories that I think are novel for this half of the 20th century; there were questions raised about give-aways and about who's going to eat the pie-or in this case the pudding. It was all mixed up and spiced with a little doctrinaire socialism.

(MR. CARROLL cont'd).....

I think all of this debate might well have been amusing except for the implications, for the shading of fact and the effect that this may have on the future resource development in the Province of Manitoba - the creating of the myth of the give-away of our natural resources. It is a myth that's being perpetuated in this debate here in the House. There's no such thing as a give-away of resources. These resources are being rented out; the cutting rates are being sold at a reasonable price taking into account the size and the dimension of the territory that must be cut to bring this forest development into operation. The cutting rights are not exclusive to the company that will be developing that resource. The rights of the existing operators in that area are being preserved, and I think this is a new arrangement insofar as developments of this kind are concerned in Canada. The existing operators are being enabled to expand the size of their cutting operation to be able to double their present capacity so that certainly there will be many other companies and many other operators in this area receiving benefits within the territory itself. And if one reads the remarks very carefully, we get the impression that it isn't the forest resources he's talking about at all; it's 40,000 square miles of Manitoba which includes, I suppose, all of the rights -- or the implication is there that it's more than just the forest rights that are being alienated as the result of this particular agreement. And I would hope that we might examine and be much more careful in our discussion of this agreement in future because this does add to the doubt that people have with respect to the agreement we're discussing.

Suggestions are made that the company may not have the financial ability to proceed. The company and its directors and its principles are somehow or other inadequate to be able to meet their commitments with respect to this undertaking. And I would just like to quote from Page 281; the Leader of the Opposition is discussing our capitalization and he goes on to draw this conclusion: "Now surely a company with that capital structure is unable to proceed with a \$100 million dollar investment." The question of the credibility of the government is under attack. Indirectly the judgment of the Board of Directors from Manitoba Development Fund was also drawn into question, because surely these are the people who must judge the financial ability of this company to be able to proceed with this undertaking. Surely they're the ones who judge the people who are making these commitments themselves, and surely this is an attack on the Development Fund itself.

I wonder how one could draw these kind of inferences with the evidence that was presented to this House last year by the Minister of Industry and Commerce at that time, who quoted from the manager of the Royal Bank main office in the City of Winnipeg, who discussed and said that Monoca A.G. St. Moritz is a valued client and that all their relations with the Company had been most satisfactory. They go on a little further: "Monoca would not enter into any commitment that they would be unable to fulfill. Dr. Oscar Reicher is considered a confident, experienced businessman who enjoys an excellent reputation in the business community." They go on to quote, chapter and verse, the Swiss Bank Corporation, the Canadian Councillor in Berne, Switzerland, an official of the foreign trade service of the Department of Trade and Commerce: "Reliable financial sources report Monoca a reputable private Swiss company, specializing in arranging, financing and counselling services for large scale projects including wood pulp and paper industries." They talk about their capital structure and say that their financial ability is far beyond the capital which is registered in their original structure.

The Union Bank of Switzerland: "Doctor Reicher held in high esteem." They considered him to be a trustworthy experienced businessman. "The company has sufficient means at its disposal and can be trusted. Would not commit himself to any arrangements that they couldn't fulfill."

The First National Bank of Boston, who has special knowledge of the subsidiary company, Technopulp A.G. of Switzerland, bring in the name of Dr. Cassar, a well-known well-regarded businessman by American and foreign banks. The president of the Royal Bank of Canada. All of these people are brought in to vouch for the financial integrity as well as the business competence of the principals behind these companies, and yet in spite of all of this evidence, this preponderance of evidence supporting the fact that this company is able to make large financial commitments, can be trusted to proceed with them, has in fact established four large - very large - pulp and paper concerns within the last six years, we have people out saying, "Surely this company does not have the financial ability." These people who are the ... some cloud of suspicion which is held over their heads.

(MR. CARROLL cont'd).

I just ask, what kind of a reception is this for Churchill Forest Products, a company offering to come in here to help us to develop the resources of Manitoba? Officials of that company touring northern Manitoba, what were they greeted with on their arrival? "There's nothing to this thing, this talk about northern development in the forest industry; it's just politics; it's a myth. They've got no money." Sounds very strangely like the arguments we heard here the other day, the Leader of the Opposition. And for those who had some doubt about this argument, they said, "Well, it's a give-away of our natural resources. We're selling out our northern operators and besides that if they do come they're going to bring in outside labour. They're bringing in 500 labourers from the Province of Quebec, that's what they're going to do."

I think it's a terrible thing, Mr. Speaker, that we have this kind of an inquisition every time we have a company offering itself to help us to develop the resources of our land. I think we are entitled to reasonable doubt, to reasonable questions, but if we want to discourage the development of Manitoba then the Leader of the Opposition is going about it, in my opinion, in the right way.

Now for those who are in the "too far too fast" wing of the Official Opposition, who fear the pace of development within our province, who do not apparently subscribe to the view of the Leader and others in that party, who don't subscribe to this stagnation philosophy that is followed by others in the party, I think they're being somewhat misled by the over-all statistics of reasonable and satisfactory growth within the province itself, by the provincial averages, by the growth in productivity, by the satisfactory increases in farm production and increases in average wages and retail sales records and consumption statistics, and all of these things which tend to indicate a very satisfactory average growth within the province and position of economic health. But it doesn't matter how high the provincial average wage is for that person who has none, and this is the person about whom I am most concerned at this particular time.

I am concerned about the many thousands of fishermen in the province of Manitoba who today enjoy an average income of something between eight hundred and a thousand dollars a year. I am concerned about the farmer in the uneconomic far areas of our land who may not have sufficient land of their own, who may not have sufficient equipment, who may be plagued by weather and other hazards which make it impossible for him to enjoy a standard of living much beyond the poverty level, and in some cases perhaps at the poverty level. I am concerned about the trapper and all those who live in isolated parts of our province who do not enjoy the same share of equality in opportunity as other Manitobans do. I am concerned for the consequences of doing nothing to help to develop the resources so all of our people may enjoy more equally the rising standards of living in the rest of our province

In 1962 I had the very great pleasure of touring many of our remote Indian reservations and I was very much concerned about the conditions which faced me at that time: the tragedy of unemployment; the waste, the degradation, the feeling of hopelessness and despair for those who saw little opportunity within their remote areas for a better economic life. Many young men are not sufficiently aware of the need for an education; others who may have had the opportunity of a better education who took advantage of that opportunity but who did not feel comfortable outside the environment of the residential school in the white man's society. I am concerned about the many who were inadequately prepared for the move from his remote settlement to the white society, who fell victim to discrimination or who found acceptance only in the slums of our large cities, who were subject to exploitation by some of the less scrupulous of our white society. Surely these are the people that we were concerned about when we were bending our efforts to try to develop an industry in northern Manitoba. We wanted to develop, to utilize our resources for the benefit of our people. We wanted to provide job opportunities; we wanted to provide training programs; we wanted to provide business sales and service opportunities; we wanted to open up and develop our resources and we wanted to contribute to the over-all economic well-being of the province. This is the reason for the added thrust and the added determination for the development of our forest industries. This was the reason for the establishment of the Manitoba Development Fund a few years ago. This was the reason for the effort of the Department of Industry and Commerce, their consultants, their experts. And this is the reason why many of these people, including the former Minister of Industry and Commerce and the Premier who spent many late hours trying to wrestle with the problems associated with bringing in the development of this northern resource.

(MR. CARROLL cont'd).....

I would like to comment very briefly on the credit theory proposed by the Member for Lakeside which I think, as I mentioned earlier, is novel in this half of the 20th century. I would just like to ask him whether the farmer whose combine breaks down at harvest time would subscribe to this theory that he who finances the machinery should own it. I am wondering if the beginning farmer who requires very vast advances in capital to get started in this kind of an undertaking today would subscribe to this theory. I wonder if the young couple starting out in life today would subscribe to the theory that he who advances the capital - in spite of the fact that it be returned, presumably - should own that asset.

The country here was built by people who were willing to share and to invest their capital. Our banking institutions are part of this whole program. The unfortunate thing is that all people, all companies, all industries haven't been able to share equally in the use of these credit facilities, and this was the *raison d'etre* for the Manitoba Development Fund of a few years ago. We hear people talking about duplication and we have in the report here the facts with respect to the development that has taken place up to the end of the last fiscal year indicating that some 3,359 new jobs have been created directly as a result of this Development Fund. And I wonder how many jobs indirectly were created as a result of this development. It is conceivable there would be two, three or four times that number with their families associated, all depending and resulting from this duplication. And if this is what we mean by duplication then I, for one, am for it. If duplication means opportunities for the under-employed in northern Manitoba, for the unskilled, for the uneconomic farmer, for the fisherman who is being crowded off the lakes in our province, then I'm for this too. If duplication means greater opportunities for our timber operators in the north, access to new markets for their product enabling them to increase and expand, if it means the salvage of our unharvested forests, then I am for that too. It means more than this

MR. DESJARDINS: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. CARROLL: Yes, at the end of the speech, I'll be very glad.

If duplication means the development of our north, new roads, new tourist attractions, the prospects of new mineral developments, if it means access to our remote settlements, then I'm for that as well.

Let's look for a moment at what this new development means - Churchill Forest Products - in terms of direct employment, and I think this is where we should be focusing our attention and our concern. It means 1,000 new jobs directly associated with the first stage of development. One thousand new jobs, many for people living in poverty today and in isolated northern communities, in the fishing villages around our lakes and other places in our province. It means new roads; it means new truck transport and the repair facilities that goes with them. The Leader of the New Democratic Party will know what it means in terms of rail travel because there will be 170 carloads of pulpwood moving each week to the port of Churchill during the shipping season. It means 50 carloads of lumber per week 12 months a year when the lumber mill has been developed. It means 50 carloads of newsprint per day when the first stage of development is completed. It means all of the transport involved in the woods-gathering operation, over 40,000 square miles. It means truck transport; rail; it means water transport. It means all of these things associated with moving that product into the central location for development. If duplication means these kind of things I am sure every member of the House would be for it.

I was interested in the comments of the Member for Inkster: "If Monoca makes money it's a bad deal." Well, I don't subscribe to this theory because I think it's a good deal if the company makes money. It's a good deal because they'll be able to expand and double the size of their operation and more. It's a good deal because they'll be able to pay reasonable wages to the people that will be working in that plant. They will be sharing in the pudding that the Member from St. John's was talking about. It's a good deal because they'll be able to pay the Manitoba Development Fund not only a return on our investment but the interest in addition. They'll be paying the full cost of their operation with a little left over. We'll share in the pudding and others may be able to gain benefit from this kind of development as well. They can share their profit with other Manitobans, if in fact other Manitobans see fit to invest in this company when and if shares are offered because the company has indicated that if they are offering equity stock that Manitobans will be the first to be able to share in the development of this northern resource - that is, if people still have faith in this after some of the comments that have been made by other members of the House. They'll be able to share with us by paying taxes and

(MR. CARROLL cont'd)... they'll be able to share by helping to attract other related industries and others who may be attracted by this kind of development in our province.

The Member for Inkster compared the Churchill Forest Products deal with the Louisiana Land Transfer. That is a good one. The sale of property of Alaska, the Manhattan Island. Well I think one would call this a red herring - a red herring - because there is really no comparison between the kind of arrangement that was made with Churchill Forest Products and the kind of arrangements that he's referring to. These were irretrievable land transactions, gone forever the day that the deal was signed and made. Well that's the case with our arrangement with Churchill Forest Products. Do we sell any land? Not a bit. Not a bit. We rent the cutting rights on a sustained yield basis for a fixed term of years and we get back a better forest than we gave them to begin with, a forest that will be protected; a forest that you can get into because of the access roads; a forest that's worth a great deal more than our forest today. But then -- you know the interesting thing, the Member for Inkster tried to skate on side with the angels. He quoted John F. Kennedy, and he said the use of public resources for private property -- he was talking about that and there's a danger he says in preferring the short run profits to long term necessity. Well I think we have the best of both possible worlds here because we not only get the short run profit, we not only get to utilize the wasting assets but we get to utilize the under-developed people of our province who desperately need this kind of opportunity in that part of Manitoba, and we also have the long term advantages of this kind of development in our province. I think these arguments were more concerned with the short term political advantage - the doctrinaire socialist philosophy that was being expounded - than with the long term advantages to be gained under this agreement with Churchill Forest Industries.

You know, I heard not long ago about one of the presidents of a large Canadian pulp company saying anyone can make pulp and anyone can make paper but the secret is in selling it in competitive world markets, and this is what our friends continue to overlook in preaching their philosophy of public ownership. And we're not opposed to this philosophy under certain circumstances. What I am concerned about here, and what the House is concerned about, is in the kind of precedents that we establish day by day as the House proceeds, and year by year. I am concerned about the precedent being established in our province which may provide a very real deterrent to the future private development of our resources and industry here. I'm concerned about the impression being created by those who appear to be in favour of development but who in fact attach a stigma to those who come in to build and develop our province; who cast doubt and suspicion on the developer; who questions his financial integrity and resources. I think we should be welcoming these people with open arms because the best salesmen for our province are surely our successful businessmen; our satisfied customers and their employees.

You know, we've been trying to bring in this kind of development for years. We've put in extra effort in recent years. Oh, we've had hundreds of prospects and we've probably had a few dozen nibbles, but this was the first real bite and these people, who are they? The suggestion is they're some "fly-by-nighters" in here for a fast profit and get out. Nothing could be further from the truth. Their credentials I think are of the highest nature and have been documented in this House. This company is in here to help to develop one of the most important natural resource industries that we have. They're prepared and want to hire our local workmen. They've indicated their interest in using the local forest operators in the north. They've indicated a willingness, if need be, to include Manitoba shareholders among the investors in their company. I think this indicates the highest kind of co-operation on the part of this company and I say, Mr. Speaker, this company needs all the help and encouragement they can get by every member in this House and by the government as well, and I for one would like to suggest that we start our co-operation with them by showing a willingness to welcome them in the spirit and tradition that we have been famous for over the long years, to show our welcome to those who come to visit our province to come to share with us in the building of it and making it a better place for the people of Manitoba.

MR. DESJARDINS: If I may be permitted to ask a question of the Honourable Minister who just spoke. If you recall, Mr. Speaker, I was trying to get this question in when he was telling us what he was in favour of, and he said it give more jobs. I'm in favour of this. I'd like to ask the Honourable Minister if he's in favour of the way the government gave the contract for Kettle Rapids construction to Atco, who will do all their construction in Alberta, over Pearson who would employ local people when this was specified in the Is he in favour of that too? It has something to do with construction of the north but if my honourable friend

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd). . . . will not answer I'll see that he be given another chance because there'll be another Order for a Return in.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Honourable Minister a question? My question arises from the fact that my honourable friend asked me the question, as I understood it, would I be in favour of the person who financed the combine for a young farmer owning the combine. I want to ask my honourable friend, shouldn't he rephrase that question having regard to the circumstances. Didn't he really mean to ask me, would I be in favour of the person who finances the combine owning not only the combine but the farm and all the other machinery that the farmer holds? Isn't that what he meant to ask?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Burrows. Did you have a question in mind?

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): I'll defer in favour of my Leader.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, having been in the House for some considerable period of years it always intrigues me when I listen to what is commonly called "tear-jerkers" and if we've ever heard a tear-jerking address, this afternoon has been really an example of how one's emotions and heart and lack of understanding can lead one down the garden path, as was my honourable friend the Minister of Welfare this afternoon. And I can understand quite well at the conclusion of his remarks why it was that he was so well applauded by his fellow tear-jerkers.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my honourable friend for the compliment.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend the representative of that great constituency of The Pas may thank me for one or two other matters which I wish to draw to his attention on behalf of the denuded population, or deprived or under-developed population, of his constituency that he referred to in his remarks. I think that it is the first time in any debate that I have heard a constituent referred to as "under-developed" in Manitoba. Whether he means financially or physically of course he did not go on to indicate to us, but I suggest that this is just in his overall exuberance of trying to rend our hears asunder.

My honourable friend speaks of this great corporation that is going to be granted the exploitation rights of some 40,000 square miles of almost virgin forest in the area of The Pas. He indicates to us that all of us should join in this House with him and his colleagues in granting to a firm, totally unrelated to Manitoba or indeed to Canada, to have the privilege of providing work for the constituents of The Pas. Most admirable, I suggest Mr. Speaker, for a member of this House on behalf of his constituency to appeal for work for them. But where has my honourable friend been, Mr. Speaker, since he joined the government, first in minority back in 1958? Where has he been and where have his colleagues been in adopting the recommendation of the Legasse report insofar as the Indian and the Metis are concerned? He says to us this afternoon that Monoca from across the seas are the saviours of northern Manitoba; we should not question their financial ability or inability but we should join with them in providing jobs for Manitobans. So I say to him, where were you, my honourable friend, in attempting to encourage members opposite to adopt the recommendation of the Legasse report on the Indian and the Metis.

Mr. Speaker, just recently we had a report on the fishing industry in Manitoba. That particular recent report on the fishing industry was under the chairmanship of Mr. McIvor. He makes certain recommendations to alleviate the financial and economic burdens on the people of The Pas constituency and the north. The Throne Speech, I frankly confess, did make reference to this report as something that is going to be done, but I say, Mr. Speaker, to my honourable friend the representative of The Pas and northern Manitoba, the problem of the fishermen and the trapper is not new. That government has been in office, first in minority position and then in majority position, Mr. Speaker, for too long but at least for 8 years, and what has been done for the Indian, the Metis and the northern trapper? And I say it's poppy-cock and absolute poppycock for my friend the representative of that area to stand up in this House today and decry we in opposition because we criticize what in our opinion is a give-away of our natural resources to somebody outside the boundaries of Canada. I say to my honourable friend, if the government was genuinely concerned and sincere with the plight of those people, they've had the opportunity, they've had the financial resources to develop in northern Manitoba. Not only, Mr. Speaker, our natural resources but to take in to northern Manitoba industries and other developments to provide employment for the very people who my honourable friend said this afternoon were under-developed.

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd).....

I don't know whether I heard my friend correctly or not, but at the outset or near the outset of his remarks it appeared to me that when he was talking of the forest industry in around The Pas that he said something to the effect that we're going to bring in immigrants. "We're going to bring in 500 workers from Quebec," I believe my honourable friend said, and I am prepared to stand corrected if he did not say it.

MR. CARROLL: I was reporting on the rumours that were circulating and which greeted the representatives of Churchill Forest Products when they arrived in the north. These were some of the rumours that were circulating that they would be bringing in outside workers to fill jobs in northern Manitoba.

MR. PAULLEY: Then I ask my honourable friend, is it correct or is it not? Or does not my honourable friend the Minister of Welfare, the representative of The Pas, talk to the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce who has indicated to us that in order to alleviate the sufferings of the people of The Pas he's going to bring importees from Portugal, Spain and other European countries to help out? What is the policy of that outfit on the other side of the House, Mr. Speaker, I ask? Here is one crying to us this afternoon about the poor unemployed in The Pas and here's another member of the same Cabinet saying we're going to bring them in from outside the country. Well, I suggest if you're talking about pudding you can't have your pudding and eat it too, and I'd like to know from Jekyll and Hyde who is what and which is which. Thus far we haven't had any indication. --(Interjection)--Pardonnez-moi? You see, in his discourse my friend the Minister talks about the shading of fact, if anybody was under the apple tree. Well in the shade of reality, my honourable friend was during his remarks. He tries to becloud the issue that is before us and the proposition that we in the New Democratic Party have raised from time to time so far as our natural resource development, that if we have to spend public moneys in respect of the development let's spend it on behalf of Manitobans and not of others.

My friend talks about the myth of give-away resources. The myth is a figment in the imagination of my honourable friend. It is real if this is what the policy of the government is doing. My honourable friend says to us in this House this afternoon that to pursue our criticisms means in effect harming future resource development in Manitoba. What tripe! What tripe, Mr. Speaker, insofar as industrial or resource development in Manitoba, if we can give as they are giving away our natural resources and using Manitobans' moneys in order to give them away. They'll be knocking at our doorsteps so don't worry about it my friends. They'll be coming here. The only thing is, Mr. Speaker I suggest, if the policies continue, those who want to exploit Manitobans wealth will be tripping over each other at the doorsteps to get into the give-away gimmicks of the present Conservative administration in Manitoba. So my friend does not have to worry about getting

MR. CARROLL: There weren't very many lined up for this deal were there?

MR. PAULLEY: No, there weren't many lined up, Mr. Speaker, and they became lined up when my honourable friend and his colleagues threw out the real plum and delineated what the plum would be. Then they were there.

MR. CARROLL: What was the plum?

MR. PAULLEY: The agreement between Monoca.

MR. CARROLL: You mean they were the only ones that were offered this deal?

MR. PAULLEY: So I say, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend is away out on a limb. He talks of the Manitoba Development Fund being such a good thing for Manitoba. I join with him that it is, and last year over the objections of some we amended the provisions of the Development Fund so that Manitoba money could be used for Manitoba development direct in the public sector; so the public sector could use public funds for the development of industries and our resources. And I say to my honourable friends that this was a golden opportunity for the government to utilize these funds for the purpose of the development not only of Churchill Forest Industries but Simplot as well.

Reference has been made, Mr. Speaker, to Simplot and as far as development is concerned in Manitoba, my honourable friends the Liberal Party here in Manitoba, contrary to the opinions expressed now at Ottawa, are more or less opposed to American capital coming -- they want American capital and the federal boys are a little apprehensive about it. But here, lo and behold, the Conservative administration in Manitoba, with an investment at Simplot of approximately \$30 million by an American organization, are putting up some \$25 millions at the local level and three and five at the federal level. To induce American capital into Manitoba?

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd).....Mr. Speaker, there is no American capital by comparison coming into Manitoba. Instead of utilizing our Development Fund for a fertilizer plant we're saying to an organization, and in our name, we're saying to an organization in Boise, Idaho, "Come on in here. We'll give you \$28 million so that you can own a plant in Manitoba but the Manitoban taxpayer will put up the finances." Anti-American? No. "We love our Americans," says the government opposite - if necessary, to the degree of 28/30 of a fertilizer plant in Manitoba.

Then my honourable friend talks about development for the under-developed people of Manitoba. He talks of the new roads; he talks of the effect on the railroads of the transportation of cord wood and pulp and newsprint. He says that we're going to share in the profits as a result of the taxation that is going to be assessed against Churchill Forest Industries when they develop. I seriously ask my honourable friend the Minister of Welfare, the representative of these under-developed people he.....Has he read the agreement insofar as taxation is concerned? Would it have made any difference whether this development had been a cooperative undertaking by Manitobans on the effect on railway transportation to the same development? And employment? I ask my honourable friend the Minister of Welfare, what about the new roads? According to what I read in the agreement the taxpayers of Manitoba are going to build them anyway.

He talks about the stumpage rates in the general area there. The operators in the area are going to be given the same rates. This isn't so according to the agreement. He hasn't told us that the stumpage rates are going to be different in The Pas than they are in Pine Falls where there is employment being created at the present time and has continued over the years. He talks about discrimination, as far as we are concerned. He talks as a free enterpriser and yet sets up differentiations in rates and stumpage charges and conditions between one segment of Manitoba and the other. And this might not be too bad, Mr. Speaker, if it was development for the people of Manitoba, and by Manitobans, which the Minister and his colleagues reject. So I say, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend, I would suggest, should look a little deeper into the question of this development at The Pas and be sure of his facts before he stands before us in this House and tries to give us the soft touch to change our opinions. He talks to us of the fact of the fisherman, the trapper only having an income of \$800.00. I share, Mr. Speaker, with my honourable friend the concern for the fishermen and the trapper, but I say to my honourable friend that he and his government and his colleagues have had at least a year to do something about it and the situation today is no better than it was when they first took office. He talks about us having a short-term political approach to Churchill Forest Industries, and he says the proper approach is the long-term gain. In respect of the fishermen and the trappers, how long is a long-term gain to increase their income from \$800.00 to a decent income, and if we have to wait on the very rapid approach of the present administration they'll be having their \$800 income for many years to come, I fear. Having said that -- of course I know that the government will not last too much longer. I hope and pray at least that such is the situation for the benefit of the under-developed people... in the Minister's verbiage, will not have to wait too long.

I say, Mr. Speaker, we are perfectly justified in seeking the questions in respect of any corporation. We will not be deterred in our efforts by such orations as given this afternoon by the Minister of Welfare or any of his colleagues. And I want to here say that we do not attack the credibility or the integrity of the members of the Development Fund when we criticize their actions. We do not agree that it is fitting and proper for Manitoba taxpayers' funds to be loaned out at 6 1/4 percent when our people buying houses have to pay 7 1/4 and upward for their homes. And if my friend the Minister of Welfare means that because of this we as members in this House should not criticize the government or any government agency, then he has no conception at all of the rights of legislators, either in government or in opposition, in our democratic system of society. I want to say to my honourable friend once again, I have every concern for the citizens of the north, the fishermen, the trappers and all of the rest of the people in the north. I want them to have a fair deal. I say to them that this government has had an opportunity of eight years of bringing to them fair deals, fair living conditions and all of the amenities of life that the government has failed, and this deal is not the type of a deal that will help except at a cost to the taxpayer of Manitoba.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into the debate for a few minutes, and I feel that if the member for Radisson thought that the Minister of Welfare pulled a tear-jerker, then I say the member for Radisson outdid him. If we're going to fight about the Indian people, let's talk about him for awhile. Let's talk about these plums, these

(MR. BEARD cont'd)..... plums that were offered, these financiers from across the water; the same plum that was offered people that are developing plants now in the Province of Manitoba. Those that are in operation in Manitoba today were given the same offer. They turned it down. Maybe it wasn't a ripe enough plum, I don't know, but it was turned down. I've heard Opposition run the gauntlet from one end to the other. First of all there isn't enough resource in northern Manitoba to develop a good pulp and paper industry. Then we come to the point where the resources are being given away, all of a sudden, all of a sudden. So wonderful we have to stand up and protect this that is being given away. The rights of all Manitobans, the resource that belongs to not only Manitoba but Canada is being given away, and they're paying them to take it away. But thank the good Lord, Mr. Speaker, that at least we did find somebody that we could pay to take it away because it's been standing there these hundreds and thousands of years and nobody has got around to taking it away. And if we want to debate that, I would suggest that the honourable members go up there and take a look. The stumps are there to show them what happened to the trees while they were waiting for somebody to take them away. They never got around to it and this is probably one of the causes and one of the problems that the Indian people as a whole throughout all of northern Manitoba suffer through the lack of industry, through the lack of interest, of business to go up there and conduct industry or conduct business.

I wonder if the member would like to go to Brandon, tell them that they are against the chemical plant at Brandon; see how far he gets. Go to the constituencies of Churchill, Flin Flon and The Pas; tell them that they are against the proposition, that it's no good for them. I wonder if they would agree to it. I don't think so, because we're here to tell you today that they gave us a vote of confidence last Spring. They said these were good and these are the people that are directly affected, Mr. Speaker. One of the reasons why we think it's good and why I particularly think it's good, is the fact that the Indian people look to it as the way and means of earning a better living. They can visualize this as opening up job opportunities that they can take advantage of on a short term basis, on a long term basis. This allows in many cases for industry to be brought directly to the reservation, to the community, and allow us in doing that to open up many parts of northern Manitoba that are not opened up now; allow us to bring in roads to communities where there are no roads now. It allows Northern Affairs to get along with the job of trying to develop a northern Manitoba. Go to the Indian Affairs and see what they think of it. Certainly they are interested.

But I wonder when we're looking for proof it we're not overlooking the statements that were filed when the Minister explained it to us in the first place. Their consultant engineers, Stadler Hurter International Limited and Arthur D. Little Incorporated, filed in this House, and they both go over the complete program, the agreement, and they state that this is a good one; it protects the people of northern Manitoba. It protects all of Manitoba. It protects the resources, and without the agreement such as it was laid out it would not be developed. These are all things, Mr. Speaker, that have been said over and over and over again in the House. We have lists of banks that the Honourable Minister went over, that assured us that the people behind this were responsible. They share with us reports on not only the people but the companies that they deal with - responsible banking firms from not only Canada but the United States of America and Europe. What more assurance can we ask for? What more assurance should we expect?

Going back to this whole program, I've heard different things. People say, "Where's the proof? Where's the proof that all this is going to take place?" And I think that all of the proof is in this House itself. Some are concerned that it's going to go ahead, others say it's not going to go ahead, but if they would go back and review the Minister's introduction and follow through stages 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5, they would see where their money is going to be spent; they would see where the investment is going to be brought about and they can see when it is going to be. These are the questions they are asking. They've asked them over and over again. The answers have been given; the papers have released them; they're publicized; and yet these things have been brought up continuously and it is hurting the development of northern Manitoba not only in the forest industry but in many others. Industrialists are afraid to come here. Are they going to be attacked because they come to Manitoba.

Goodness knows we need development. When we come to Industry and Commerce no doubt we will hear about the lack of industry in Manitoba - the old song again - but yet today we listen to people who stand up and say, "You're giving it away. They're going to be knocking at the doors, stampeding to take over our resources and our money. But it's funny how the

(MR. BEARD cont'd).....tune changes, Mr. Speaker, as we go from estimate to estimate, and I would plead with members here to lay the club down. Let's get along; open the door and see what happens. If this industry is good for Manitoba it is good for all of us. If it proves that we're wrong you've got a mighty good club, Mr. Speaker, to hold over the Conservative Party and this government - a real good club. But I would suggest to members opposite that they wait; wait awhile. Let's get along with this so that they've got the club to use to get over to this side of the House. I think the people of Manitoba would be willing to let this company come in and to test it, and to see who is right and see who is wrong.

I certainly hope that the principals behind this do not get discouraged but they allow us to work with them to provide the jobs for the hundreds, for the literally thousands of unemployed people on the reserve areas today. This is the black mark the member speaks about. It is not one that we are proud of; it's a problem that we share with all other provinces. It is one that we have in Manitoba which is great, if not greater, than any of the other provinces, and we are trying to get out from under it, under programs such as the pulp and paper industry. I think that this must have been behind the thoughts of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources when he submitted his submission on the marketing board to support a better deal for the fishermen, to allow many of the native people of Manitoba to obtain at least an opportunity, at least an opportunity of earning a better living than they have had in the past. And I think and I would hope that we, after airing this as well as we have over the last session and a half, we can let it go through this House and let's get along with the job of developing northern Manitoba so that all of Manitoba will benefit from our resource, because I foresee that this will grow and it will not help those that are in the area but those that are helping to pay for those people that are behind the eight-ball today. It's costing us dollars, and I think that if we can progress with a good program we can let these people come into the province and assist them and get returns for assisting them; then not only the people that are working will be helped but also industry in Winnipeg and other areas of the province, because it is through development in northern Manitoba that industry grows and Metro Winnipeg benefits. We often think of Winnipeg as being a giant warehouse where they participate in the profits of development of rural Manitoba. And this is good for metro and in the long run it is good for all.

In closing I would also remind you again as the Minister spoke on the effect that these large developments in northern Manitoba have on the railroads, the extra business for trucking, for trains; not only that extra business for the railroad companies and for the trucking companies but for all the little towns along the railroad. Everybody benefits. They tell me that 50,000 cords of wood sent to Churchill alone would be approximately 2,500 carloads of wood to be shipped out of that port in a year, and I think if you let your imagination dwell on that, that's a pretty big pile of cordwood to buck. There's going to be a lot of dollars spent and there's going to be a lot of dollars stay in Manitoba even out of this initial development. I would rather not extend this discussion any further but I would hope that members of this Assembly get together and let us get along with the plan, with the development of all of Manitoba.

.....continued on next page

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, it rather interested me that nothing was said on the government's side which would tend to indicate that this Order should not issue or that the government would vote against the motion to issue this Order. As a matter of fact everything that the government has said tends to support our position - tends to support our position that this information ought to have been disclosed long before this time and that there is nothing that is asked for now or had been asked for before ought to have been kept secret. However, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of Welfare speaks of the New Democratic Party and in particular the Honourable Member for Inkster waving a red herring in front of us, in front of this House, but I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the repeated references to the high character and integrity of the Board of Directors of the Manitoba Development Fund and of the credit references that Monoca came to Manitoba armed with are nothing more than red herrings either. Nobody is questioning the motives or the character of the members of the Board, of the Development Fund, there is no doubt that or there is nothing to prove otherwise that Monoca A. G. could have been a successful business operation in the country from which it came. We are not concerned about that here. But what we are concerned about is the contribution that it will make to the development of the Province of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker.

When the Honourable Minister of Welfare says that the Royal Bank in its credit reference says that Monoca A. G. would not undertake any commitment it could not fulfil I have no quarrel with that, but "could" does not mean "would", Mr. Speaker, nor does this statement mean or imply that the commitment entered into between Monoca A. G. and the Province of Manitoba is one which could be enforced or one which Monoca A. G. would feel compelled to honour.

I was rather intrigued by the repeated reference to the development of the north, that this would bring about the creation of the new jobs, improving the unfortunate lot and position of the Indian up there today and so forth. It was rather interesting though, in reading the Manitoba Development Fund Report to see this statement contained therein, and I'm paraphrasing this, I haven't the report before me, but there's a statement there that says about 3,500 jobs were created, or at least that the Manitoba Development Fund was instrumental in creating about 3,500 jobs, earning an annual payroll of \$12 million. I'm not going to do the mathematics for the government, Mr. Speaker, but applying the length of the average work week in Manitoba, which is somewhere in the vicinity of 41 hours, what we obtain is an hourly rate which is less than the average hourly rate currently prevailing in the Province of Manitoba. Now if that is the type of development that this Fund is bringing about, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you the people of Manitoba do not want it. If all it intends to do is to depress wages rather than bring them up to a reasonable level then there is no room for that type of development in this province.

The Honourable Member for Inkster drew the attention of this House to Section 4 which states that "the object or objects of the Fund are to encourage a balanced development of industry." To me a balanced development of industry means more than setting up a situation which will enable one company, one corporation or any group of corporations to come up with a profit figure on their Profit and Loss Statement for the operations of the year. It means - a balanced development of industry means a situation of a nature, of a type that would be of benefit to each and every individual in the Province of Manitoba; and from the reports of what the Development Fund have been capable of bringing about to date, of what we've heard said by the government to date, there's nothing. The government has not yet indicated to us that the Development Fund will in any way improve the position of the Manitoban from a state of affairs that it presently is in.

The Honourable Minister of Welfare himself stated this afternoon that the purpose of the Fund is to enable the utilization of our resources for the benefit of our people. He also said that the Manitoba Development Fund will contribute to the over-all economic development of our province. If we're speaking in these terms, Mr. Speaker, if we're speaking in terms of development of our province, we are speaking in terms of the one million people living in this province and not just simply in terms of a handful of directors, of a handful of corporations. In other words, Mr. Speaker, what I want to see the Manitoba Development Fund do is to bring about, is to be of benefit to each and every member of this province.

The Honourable Member for Churchill speaks of the Manitoba Development Fund as enabling the Indian population living in that part of the province to find employment. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, and the Honourable Member for Churchill knows this full well, that improved living conditions have not necessarily gone hand in hand with employment conditions and with the development of industry or at least not with the manner in which industry has been

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd.) developed in northern Manitoba. I was in northern Manitoba last summer and I did not find too many members of the Indian population of Churchill Riding living in Snow Lake or even in the Town of Thompson. And there is an existing industry in northern Manitoba. Why were not the Indians able to benefit from the existence of that industry, from the operation of that industry? Why must they promise the Indians that if we invest further moneys, further public moneys in accordance with terms secret to us, that then the Indian will be able to benefit from it?

The Honourable Member for Churchill speaks of Metropolitan Winnipeg or he compares it to a giant warehouse participating in profits of rural Manitoba. I cannot agree with that description of Metropolitan Winnipeg. There are millions of dollars of profits made within Metropolitan Winnipeg and other parts of Manitoba which do not remain in Winnipeg, Mr. Speaker. But I suggest to you this that what we are asking for is the establishment and the development of a type of economy in which each and every individual of this province could participate; a type of economy that would be of benefit and advantage to each and every resident of the province and not just to a select few.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to take part today, I would beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. John's), Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared to proceed with this resolution. I attempted to study it carefully to see whether or not any part of it was affected by either the Speech from the Throne or the White Paper which was presented by the Provincial Secretary. A good portion of it is not I believe affected by what was said there and I'm wondering if the government has any objection of any portion of this resolution being dealt with, then I would be happy to hear that and to suggest the deletion of any portion which may be objectionable to the government. Otherwise I'm prepared to move the resolution and proceed now.

MR. LYON, Mr. Speaker, speaking to what I presume is the point of order that my honourable friend has raised, I would suggest to you, Sir, that there is at least one or more portions of the resolution which of course would fall under the rule of anticipation because of statements either in the Throne Speech or in the White Paper presented by my colleague the Provincial Secretary. One need look only at Paragraph (f) of the Resolution as presently worded to see where legal aid is proposed to be discussed in the resolution and of course legal aid is part and parcel of the White Paper that has already been produced by the Provincial Secretary. And I say this in no sense of trying to squelch debate of these subjects because of course my honourable friend appreciates as do all of us, that the reason for the rule is that if a matter is appointed for debate either on the Order Paper or notice has been given of it in a government order or in a government speech, the reason for having another such notification ruled out of order is merely so that you will not be debating the same subject twice. There's nothing personal in it; there's nothing - the government is not defensive on these matters at all; it's merely a question of expediting the business of the House under forms of rules which have been found to be most beneficial to all parliaments over the years, and I know my honourable friend had no such thing in mind whatsoever. But I merely add that as a gratuitous comment.

I would leave it to my honourable friend the Provincial Secretary to advise us as to other matters within the resolution that he would consider as being anticipatory in order that His Honour might give further consideration to the matter but I do bring specific attention to paragraph (f). I believe that there are other matters in the White Paper that are dealt with relative to executions, judgments and judgment debts.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if I could have the Clerk of the House for a moment?

I believe the Honourable Attorney-General mentioned one of the Ministers that may take part in this discussion. I hope it'll be brief.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, in looking at the resolution specifically referred to in the White Paper is the item shown under (c) of the resolution, (b) rather, the Orderly Payment of Judgment Debts. I'm unable to offer any help at this time because a great deal of what is set out in this resolution will be covered, no doubt, in the debate which will take place on the matter of the White Paper itself, not to mention the legislation that will be introduced as a result of it and whether Mr. Speaker will consider that all of these items are covered will be a

(MR. McLEAN cont'd.) matter no doubt when those further debates take place on the White Paper and on the legislation that will come forward.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I fully agree with those Honourable Ministers who spoke that items (b) and (f) are mentioned either in the Speech from the Throne or in the White Paper, but unless the word "etcetera" in the Speech from the Throne can be taken for covering other matters, then I would suggest that none of the others are indeed in either the White Paper or the Speech from the Throne and I would then like to ask leave of the House, through you, Mr. Speaker, to present the resolution but deleting items (b) and (f).

MR. SPEAKER: I take it the Honourable Member from St. John's intends to withdraw this and eliminate those that are referred to in the Throne Speech, those items, and give us a revised motion?

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Speaker, you will have to rule, but surely by the permission of this House, by leave, I could move it only deleting those portions (b) and (f), by leave.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, if I may contribute my "two bits worth" I rise to support the Honourable Member from St. John's in his submission and contention. I think that this rule, I appreciate the fact that clauses (b) and (f) are definitely covered in the Throne Speech debate, but I think this rule of anticipating government legislation is being carried a little too far. I can visualize the Throne Speech saying "that my Ministers advise me that they're going to bring down certain amendments to the provincial laws." Now that would prevent any discussion in the House dealing with any matter which comes under provincial jurisdiction. And I think that rule should be "unless" - unless the matters can be specifically identified with the particular legislation that's being brought in by the Crown, or unless the Minister of that particular department can rise in his seat and say in relation to items a, b, c, d, e and f, we intend to bring in legislation, I submit that the honourable members should be allowed to propose this resolution deleting items (b) and (f) and let's get on with the others.

MR. SPEAKER: From what I can deduce I have given considerable thought to this particular resolution and as the Honourable Member for St. John's has mentioned that there are items there that can be construed as being part of the Throne Speech. However, if it is the will of the House that we proceed with those items (b) and (f) being eliminated, I'm prepared to call the Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. LYON: Still speaking to the point of Order I would not object in any way whatsoever to your ruling on this matter, I say perhaps not so much to be helpful to you Your Honour but perhaps to be helpful to my honourable friend from St. John's, that we

MR. DESJARDINS: made your decision already and is this debatable? You made your decision and it's not debatable.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. LYON: As I was saying, I can't give a firm undertaking to you, Sir, at this time, as suggested by the Honourable Member for Selkirk on these specific pieces of legislation that are dealt with in my honourable friend's resolution. I have every expectation that most of these will be coming forward. I have that expectation but I can't give him the undertaking or I would. On the other hand, I raised the rather interesting question that if the resolution proceeds and remains on the Order paper, can I then bring them in because the matter is something that is already under discussion in the House.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, if I may on that point in order to assist the government and the Attorney-General who is leader of the House in planning his program of activity I think the resolution ought to proceed with the deletion of (b) and (f) so that he will then have the support of the whole House in doing what he wants to do. May I move that - do I have leave to move the resolution with (b) and (f) deleted?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. John's has leave to move the suggestion.

MR. CHERNIACK: Then by leave, Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster:

WHEREAS the Legislative Assembly did on the 23rd day of February 1966 receive a report of the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders which recommended certain specific legislation in the following areas:

(a) The Garnishment Act to increase the basic exemption and to relieve the Debtor from undue hardship because of excessive garnishment orders.

(c) To increase the exemptions as provided by the Judgment Act.

(d) - call it (b)? I rely on the - call that (b).

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. John's has the floor by the elimination of (b).

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you.

(c) To increase the exemptions as provided by the Judgment Act.

(d) To facilitate dealings under the Executions Act.

(e) Amendments to the Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act.

AND WHEREAS on the 25th day of April, 1966 on motion of the then Attorney-General the said Legislative Assembly did concur in the said report;

AND WHEREAS on the same date the then Attorney-General stated he was not prepared to proceed with the aforementioned legislation at that time but that same would doubtless be proceeded with by that government or one which would have responsibility for doing so in the future;

AND WHEREAS many Manitobans are being adversely affected by the failure of the government to carry out the aforementioned recommendations.

BE IT RESOLVED that this House record its desire to have legislation such as is proposed in the said Report brought forward by the Attorney-General during this session.

Mr. Speaker, may I ask leave that the numbering or the lettering should be changed to conform with the deletions.

MR. SPEAKER: I didn't get your -- and the Honourable Member for St. John's, I didn't get your seconder.

MR. CHERNIACK: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SPEAKER presented the Motion.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, the suggestion has come from the other side of the House that the question could be called without any debate, but in view of the fact that the subject matters dealt with in this resolution were proposed a long time ago, were approved a long time ago and not acted upon, I feel it's rather important that we give the government an opportunity to first hear about its delinquency and secondly to attempt to answer for its delinquency and thirdly to give it an opportunity to remedy its delinquency and get on with the business, which is an expression which is favoured among some members of the government.

There has been a considerable amount of discussion on the matters raised here, Mr. Speaker, and as a result these matters were referred to the standing committee on statutory regulations and orders which was appointed at the 4th session of the 27th Legislature on March 10, 1965. It is almost two years since that committee had been appointed, and at its first meeting on April 8, 1965 the present Provincial Secretary was appointed chairman. The committee sat on this matter, and not only sat on it but dealt with it, heard representations from various bodies and brought in a report, and as mentioned in the resolution the report was brought to this House and finally on April 25th 1966 there was a motion of concurrence by the present provincial secretary and this was concurred in I believe unanimously by the House. Now I don't know whether its the present Provincial Secretary or the present Attorney-General that should be charged with the responsibility of carrying out the recommendations of that legislature. But I'm afraid that in the shuffle that took place with ministerial responsibilities, something was lost, and that may well have been this report which I'm bringing to the attention of the government at this time.

I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that inasmuch as the shuffle was made in responsibility but not in the physical arrangements in this House that the present provincial secretary look through his desk and see just what may have happened to that report which was his responsibility. I suspect very much it may well be in his desk, tucked away into a little corner where it does not see the light of day. And possibly then when he finds it he would assume the responsibility of either dealing with it or giving it to someone else who will deal with it. Because, Mr. Speaker, these are vital and important matters.

The Honourable the Provincial Secretary said last year that there just wasn't the opportunity to proceed with it but that same would be done and as was already suggested today by the Attorney-General it may well be that this government would eventually get around to doing it, but it's a long time, it's a long time, Mr. Speaker, and people are suffering because of that. Both the present and the former Attorney-General are members of the profession in which I earn a living but since they are not finding it necessary these days to be occupied in that profession actively, they are not aware probably of the difficulties that people face up to when they are unable to cope with the debt burden which they are carrying, and when judgments are obtained and garnishment orders are issued there are people that suffer, day by day.

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.)

The exemptions under the Garnishment Act are still very low, Mr. Speaker. Over a year ago my leader sent instructions into the Legislative Counsel to prepare a Bill to amend the Garnishment Act to increase the exemptions, bearing in mind the importance of recognizing the increased cost of living. And lo and behold he learned that the government itself had prepared a bill increasing the exemption even higher than my leader had the courage or the temerity to do. And we thought well isn't that wonderful. Where my leader thought that he better not ask for it too high unless it be thrown out, the government indicated that it was prepared to recognize this need, over a year ago. Mr. Speaker, the fact that they undertook to recognize it and did, means nothing when they did not carry it out. And whether they blame the new tax policy or problems that they have or not on this very measure, they must surely recognize that the people affected can do nothing but wait for this government to move. The report - and since it may well be that the report is so well buried somewhere in the files of the government that they can't get a copy, I might indicate that I have a copy which I could make available as to whatever Minister should be responsible for it. It deals in great detail with the suggestions that were made by the committee which the Honourable Provincial Secretary indeed chaired; and it deals with specific recommendations for increasing exemptions under the Judgment Act. It even provides for facilitating the dealings under the Executions Act which is a hardship that occurs on creditors, not only on debtors, and it deals with amendments to the Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act.

Mr. Speaker, I submit there is no excuse for the government delaying with this type of legislation. There is no excuse I can think of and it may well be that whatever Minister is responsible is busily now trying to think of the excuse which ought to be presented to us. I have read the White Paper, Mr. Speaker. I don't know when we would have an opportunity to debate the White Paper as suggested by the Honourable the Provincial Secretary because I don't know that there's any motion affecting it unless he'd like to have it considered under his salary. -- (Interjection) -- Soon he says. But the soon must mean legislation which he proposes to bring. Well if the legislation which he proposes to bring will be the legislation set out in the resolution which I have proposed today, well then I will be happy to share with him the responsibility of stimulating it being brought here because certainly there is no mention of this in the Speech from the Throne or in the White Paper. So that I urge the government to accept this responsibility, do the job which it undertook to do not long ago, just a year if time is so transitory that a year is of little importance to this government, and relieve the burden which is placed on people who cannot really manage to work under these outdated archaic rules under which the government still sets the exemption rates.

I would urge therefore that the government quickly accept the responsibility, encourage its members to vote along with members of the New Democratic Party, and hopefully even the L. P. Party, to support the resolution which is to the effect that we believe that Manitobans are being adversely affected by the failure of the government to carry out these recommendations and indicate that legislation should be brought forth as quickly as possible in line with the pious statements made by the Honourable Minister last year.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. LYON: If no one else wishes to participate in the debate I would move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Highways, the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. CHERNIACK: let this matter stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave of the House? The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to have this resolution stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Russell. The Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne.

MR. M. E. MCKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): Mr. Speaker, after hearing all the excitement over forests and lawyers' interpretations this afternoon, I'll get back on some good solid subject of wheat. I'm sorry to say that in the House I think our farmers are losing ground. In fact I think we're down under 10 members in here now and I'm sorry to see that. The lawyers I think are increasing a little but it'll be a sorry day for the Legislature if the lawyers ever outnumbered the farmers.

I'll never forget the words of the Honourable Member for Virden one day, he said "You

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd.) . . . could do away with all the lawyers, you could do away with all the school teachers" he says "and the world would still exist. But if you did away with farmers the world would starve to death." So I hope that each and every one of you, your hearts will be in the right place when I'm dealing with this important subject of wheat, oats and barley and the prices attached to the same.

I'm sorry that the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell isn't in his seat because I'd like to congratulate him on his speech he made that day in December on this very important subject of the initial price of these three grains, wheat, oats and barley, and the speech that he made in putting up his argument for the same. I imagine he's likely at the Canadian Federation of Agriculture Convention which is on in the city today. Is that right? I'm sorry to say that I'm not there too. Had it not been for this resolution, of the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell I'd been there myself likely. Because I'd like to know what the expressions of opinions are in that organization which represents most of the larger grain firms in Canada today and other farm organizations also in Canada. At this time I think that the farm organizations need to be united. I'm sorry to say that after all the trouble they took to get both organizations in Manitoba together that we still have two farm organizations representing the farmers of Manitoba. In fact I've always said that there's more farmers that don't belong to any organization than that do belong to two of them put together, so I hope that some day the two farm organizations will get together and maybe we can come up with a united farm policy.

Speaking on this resolution, I agree wholeheartedly with the honourable member that we need an increase in the initial price of our grain. This in turn would bring it up to \$1.75 for wheat, \$1.10 for barley and 70 cents for oats, and to most of you non-farmers in the House, you likely read where we got the big cheques a week ago, this last week -- (Interjection) -- it's all spent, yes it's all spent -- but it came at a very needy time. The month of January is always a pretty hard time on the farmers, they're away curling and they've got a lot of extra expense. They need a lot more money keeping their payments up during that month for that reason.

The Honourable Member for Pembina mentions that Christmas has just been over too, and this also takes a large sum of money out of their pockets to contribute to that worthy cause. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, the government gets most of it back anyway. That's quite right. But I think what the farmers are interested in - there's always been the argument on the rebate system in Manitoba and I heard one fellow call it stupid in here the other day. I'll take all the money they give me. I won't call it stupid. I'll pat anybody on the back that hands me a dollar. And I don't think the farmers call it stupid. What they did call stupid, and I partly agree with them, is the way it was paid out. I think there has been some mention in the White Paper, the Honourable Minister of Education's White Paper this was being changed providing the farmers and all the other electors vote against the single division board. If the single division board is turned down, I'll take this money no matter how it comes, with open arms. -- (Interjection) -- I don't agree with you there either. I'd like to argue on that point.

But if it's this way the baby bonus and all the other moneys that are paid out - old age pensions are costing about three for one because they got a long way farther to come from Ottawa, so I don't think this argument holds. In fact the Federal Government's attitude is the more money they can pay out the more votes they can get. In fact they're starting to pay the milk producers, or the dairy producers handout cheques the last couple of years. So this is -- (Interjection) -- back to wheat.

If there ever was a time when the farmers needed more money it's right now. And for the benefit of you non-farmers, I'd like to suggest to you that the farmers haven't had an increase in their wheat payments in the last 20 years. In fact the years 1946 to '52 were the six best years in the history of all farming, for the money they received and the money they had to pay out. I only wish those six years would come back again to the farmers of western Canada because they were getting on the average a \$1.65 a bushel in their pockets, and it's only this year this has come back - we have equalled this in the 1965 crop year, with initial price and the final payment. And to myself who like others in that '65 crop had 4 tough wheat we're averaging exactly \$1.60 in our pockets. For most of us who have about three occupations this is all right. We can survive. But the farmer who has only got one occupation he's in really deep trouble.

As the Member for Birtle-Russell mentioned considerable more money is being borrowed today from banks, finance companies and credit unions than any time in the future to buy machinery which has doubled, as the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell mentioned, has

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd.) . . . doubled in the last 15 years, combines, tractors and all other farm equipment used on the farm. With this large increase in the cost of our operations and no increase in the price of wheat in the final payment, I think it is due time that our International Wheat Agreements will have to be looked at with a higher minimum and higher maximum and I hope that in due time when this agreement is being dealt with, negotiated on this coming year, that they take this into consideration because increasing the initial price of wheat will not put more dollars in our pockets. It will only help for the first year and after that we'll get the same number of dollars. But I think this should be the first start anyway that we increase the initial prices of grain. To many of you who do not get this Canadian Farm Economics Book from the Federal Department of Agriculture, not only the farmers in the House here, I would suggest to many more of you, you can get this book here at no cost at all and I would advise you to read this from front to back because it gives you the full story and the problems of farming in Canada today where the increased costs are going up and the price of our products have remained firm over the years.

Also too, I got in today's mail the Farmers' Union, the resolutions that they forwarded to Cabinet, and I think they state too that there has to be more attention paid to the farming industry than there has been in the past.

I notice that our Minister of Agriculture at Ottawa, he's definitely told the dairy farmers where their position lies, that there's no more increase in subsidies to them. He's also mentioned that they are not going to interfere with the price machinery in any way. I'm inclined to think that the farmers of Canada are going to have to bargain a little harder when they are dealing, when buying new machinery; they're going to have to be a little rougher on the local dealer in order to survive. I'm surely pleased that we in Manitoba have one company who is now manufacturing machinery because I think this is the answer to the farmer's problem.

Also this fall there was another announcement made where Cockshutt I think are going to start manufacturing swathers in Minnedosa and I think this is partly the answer, that in the past this machinery has been manufactured in the east and we've always had to pay these high freight costs for transporting this machinery from eastern Canada to the west, increasing our cost by considerable sums. Also a large part of our tractors are made in United States which creates an added cost too to our cost of operation.

But getting back to the price of wheat, I'd like to remind you of - back in 1952 I think it was, when they were negotiating the International Wheat Agreement at that time, I think there was a difference, from what I can remember, of five cents between Great Britain and the International Wheat Agreement and in turn Great Britain dropped out of the International Wheat Agreement and it hurt our export market considerably. After that our prices dropped and it's only back in '61 and '62 when our world markets opened up by shipping wheat to China, Russia and other countries has our export market expanded to the extent where we are now changed from a surplus market to shortage and only last fall we had the open quota for 20 days. This I think emptied all the granaries practically in western Canada.

But I think the most important part when you're dealing with the price of wheat was the devaluation of the dollar and I think this has always been forgotten because it's ridiculed from one end of the country to the other. In 1962 we can all remember the Diefenbucks, I think they were called at that time, but I always recommended what I thought was a good policy, and that was many years ago, that seeing that our wheat is sold on the American dollar that I always thought we were put at a terrific disadvantage and I thought at that time if our dollar could be devaluated to 90 cents it would mean about 20 cents more a bushel for our wheat that we sold in the world markets and this is the type of money that we need in meeting our increased costs. This at that time was reduced to 92 cents which made a difference of around 16 cents a bushel and at today's prices, which are par with 1951 and '52 for what we're getting, we're exactly about 15 cents lower than we were today had it not been for the devaluation of the dollar. This dollar has remained firm as we all know which means that the farmers have been getting that increased gain in price on our final payments over the last four years.

Another thing that I would like to say at this time would be that - one thing that has bothered me in this last few months is the consumers have been putting on a little war against the price of food and in 1949 I am told the farmers got, I think it's 58 cents or 59 cents out of all the consumer's dollar, all the dollars that were spent. Today it's only 41 cents of the consumer's dollar. I don't know whether the people are eating a different type of food or any change that's been made, but I do know that in the olden days - mind you not too many years gone by -

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd.) ... that people didn't buy a loaf of bread, one loaf, they bought 100 pounds of flour and made their own bread and their own buns and they made their own soap instead they have to go and buy a box of soap with a dishrag in it and think they are getting a gift. -- (Interjection) -- No they didn't get any gifts out of the flour either, but they got their value for their dollar anyway when they were buying the flour. But changes in our society take place and the women all want to get on even par with the man, as I heard one man say on the television the other day. This means that you've got to buy all these T. V. dinners to take home to prepare them and if the wife doesn't prepare them the man does. So this changes the whole cost of living, a whole change takes place in the cost of living and still brings it down to the fact that the farmer doesn't get five cents more out of the whole deal regardless of what the people are paying for their food. This bothers me considerably because I had it told to me by a very good source that when the ladies started boycotting bacon there before Christmas that it put the farmers in a very precarious situation and the market was in a pretty shaky position there for about a month. I only hope that all you men start eating bacon and help the hog producers out in the future because I think it would be a sad day if our hog producers were affected in any way because of the fact it was a cent or two either way on the cost of bacon.

Getting back to the price of wheat, some of them will say we can't do without the wheat farmer in western Canada, we've got less of them than we ever had before in the past and I'm afraid that all the sons are leaving with all these high -- I think they are all going to be going into the teaching profession I think pretty soon by the wages that are being paid. It's impossible to hire anybody on the farm today for the high wages that you've got to compete with industry and the teaching profession and the lawyers and I think that it will boil down to the fact that each farmer will do as much work as he can in a day and then quit. It will mean that most of the farms will be a section or section and a quarter or less and we hope that if there is a son on the farm that's making a decision we hope that he will stay on the farm and keep that enterprise going. I am afraid that if it comes to the point that we do not have the sons staying on the farms with their parents helping them out it will tend to go to large corporations and that would be a sad day in the farming industry because you would take the whole spirit of community out of the farming profession. Farming is a most unusual occupation in that you tend to help your neighbour out and by getting large corporations into that you tend to get away from that -- (Interjection) -- No, farmers are free enterprise. They have no part of socialism at all; they never will have as far as I'm concerned.

I don't want to delay the procedures any longer other than to say that I think the resolution -- I'm glad to see him back, the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell, it's only about six or seven years since we had an association like we were together here in the legislature -- and you're back again with us and I know that we had many good arguments before in the past and we'll have some more -- but this time I agree with you, I agree with you. I know that I'm not as big a farmer as you are and never will be, but I know that you run a terrific operation in your area and you're doing a good job for the farming industry.

In closing I would like to move an amendment though, which I know you'll all vote for. I know even the Socialists will vote for this because this is money in the pockets of the farmers if it comes about.

So in closing I hope you all support the motion, the original motion with the amendment and help the farmer's cause, that he can purchase more machinery, pay more taxes and carry on in the good of the country. So, Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina the resolution be amended by adding thereto the following words: Further be it resolved this House urge the Government of Canada to negotiate an increase in the maximum price under the International Wheat Agreement of not less than 34 cents a bushel, thus raising the maximum price to not less than two dollars and a half a bushel and a minimum price not less than two dollars and ten cents per bushel.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne, seconded by the Honourable Member from Pembina that the resolution be amended by adding thereto the following words: and further be it resolved that this House urge the government of Canada to negotiate an increase in the maximum price under the International Wheat agreement of not less than 34 cents per bushel thus raising the maximum price to not less than two dollars and fifty cents per bushel and the minimum price be not less than two dollars and ten cents per bushel.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, in view of the resolution that has been submitted by the Member for Turtle Mountain on page 16 I think

(MR. GUTTORMSON cont'd.) this amendment is out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: I rule the amendment is in order. Are you ready for the question. Those in favour of the amendment. . .

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Ethelbert, the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, for the same reasons as previously mentioned I would like this resolution to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave? The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. George. The Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains.

MR. LYON: At the top of Page 6 there is a resolution standing on the Order paper in the name of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: We'll move back to that resolution. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CAMPBELL: Could we ask for that motion to stand please, Mr. Speaker?

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

MR. MICHAEL KAWCHUCK (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Speaker, the reason I adjourned the debate here last Friday was to give an opportunity for the Honourable the Minister of Highways to be back in the House and of course give him an opportunity to vote in favour of this resolution.

While I'm up on my feet of course I would like to stress one extra point on there in view of the fact that this resolution was brought in before this House a year ago and no concrete steps were taken and the fate of course very unfortunate, I would just like to impress upon the other side of this House that perhaps in view of what happened to this resolution last year it is high time that a program of orderly development of our highway system was incorporated whereby the members of this House could have an opportunity to see what was on the priority list insofar as our highway construction is concerned. It is up to the government to give a dynamic drive in leadership to have this highway system developed to a 20th Century system like was oft proclaimed by a lot of the candidates in the last June 23rd election.

Our road building program of course is lagging, lagging behind, and despite the fact that our Honourable Minister, the First Minister had made such statements as the recent development projects of the north can do as much for Manitoba as development of the west did for Canada at the end of the 19th Century, may I only impress upon them that at the end of the 19th Century at least there was consideration given to another railway system across western Canada. Today perhaps that same consideration should be given as to an alternative highway route for the forgotten people of the north.

This road for northern Manitoba is not only a good thing for the people in the north but it is a good thing for all of Manitoba. It is hard to believe that these people as our friend here the Honourable Minister of Welfare said -- I forget the terms he used now -- but neglected and so forth, and the point he had stressed however, Mr. Speaker, was that he was greatly concerned with the position a lot of our farmers were in at this present day, and perhaps that is one extra point that should be considered why this road should be extended up to Highway No. 391, in the event that a lot of these farmers will be seeking employment elsewhere, and predominantly the logical place would be the northern development areas and perhaps the International Nickel Plant at Thompson. I know perhaps the government is not going any place. They had their wings clipped the last 23rd June, and I only submit to them that before they have their wings further clipped may they go ahead with this project and construct it, and I of course solicit the support of all this House on behalf of my deskmate here to give it due consideration and a favourable vote this time.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, if I might add a few words to my colleague from Ethelbert. I find that there are a number of items here that I would like to touch on regarding the development of highways in Manitoba and I have listed them as numbers 1, 2, 3, and 4.

Need for a province-wide planning authority in regard to the development of the highways in Manitoba. I think that as a rural member of this province I probably might recognize more so than some of the urban people the need for adequate highway facilities, for better communications, for better development, and indeed for a balanced development of Manitoba. Logically I am sure we all agree that in order to promote development in the areas of northern Manitoba one

(MR. USKIW cont'd.) of the requisites of course is that we provide the transportation facilities. If you look at the map of Manitoba I am sure you will agree with me there are vast areas of Manitoba that do not have access to, that if we did provide highways into these areas that we would encourage the tourist industry, we would in fact promote tourism into the far northern parts of Manitoba, we would develop the areas in terms of forestry as has been pointed out, in terms of mining developments and so forth. I for one believe that the government should in all consideration establish a province-wide planning authority - unless they have one now which I know not of - but they should establish such an authority whereby they would scrutinize the province to see where development should be taking place to establish priorities of development and of course to let us in on some of the secrets of that development so that we wouldn't be debating individual propositions of whether we should have a highway in this corner of the province or a highway in the other corner of the province and so forth. I as a member don't believe that it should be necessary for MLA's to make representation to the government in order that some highway programs might be initiated. I think if all the members were familiar with the overall blueprint of highway development of that a lot of us would be sort of -- we would be rest assured that something is going to be done in some of these areas and would not be making various, you might say sometimes vicious attacks on governments for lack of action. So I'm sure it's in the interest of all members of this House that such an authority should be established and that this authority would confide in the House and introduce to the House the planned development of highways in Manitoba. Let's have some blueprints. Let's see where we're going.

The highway development plan should provide the information for not only the MLA's in the House but to the people in the various areas which might project various business ventures into the area. It would be an encouragement to private citizens to invest in some areas which otherwise they probably wouldn't unless they have the assurance in one way or another that transportation facilities, communication facilities would be provided. So I share with my colleague the member for Ethelbert Plains the concern in whether or not Manitoba is going to develop highways on a planned basis. I might suggest that the government of Manitoba, that they take a leaf out of our socialist philosophy, if you like, and do a bit of planning in the highway department.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak, I'd like to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Welfare, that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move, seconded by the Honourable the Member from Birtle-Russell,

WHEREAS the young people of the country constitute a most important human resource;
and

WHEREAS young people at age 18 are considered fit for military service in times of war;
and

WHEREAS young people between the ages of 18 and 21 are considered mature enough to participate in the economic, social and athletic life of our country; and

WHEREAS it is in the interest of good government that young people between the ages of 18 and 21 participate in the political life of our country;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Province of Manitoba grant its citizens, 18 and over, the right to vote in provincial elections.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, this is not a new subject; it's not a new resolution; but it seems that in many of these we call progressive resolutions or progressive ideas, we have to come back two or three times before the House will approve and change their ways. I think it was Dr. Lorimer just a few days ago that said that the greatest fact of modern life is change, he said, but we get persuaded that what we're doing is the best way to do things when it isn't so, and I think this is a case here.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this resolution is a vote of confidence in our young generation, this generation that Time magazine thought so important to choose as the man of the year just at the start of this year. Now on a previous occasion a former Minister of Agriculture of this province, Mr. Hutton, speaking for the government while discussing the same topic, a resolution such as this one that I'm presenting today, said that we expected too much from the youth today; we gave them too little; we didn't give of ourselves. And then he went on to say that we should not place young people in positions of trust in political organizations. Well I think, Mr. Speaker, that to you and all the members here this is contradiction in itself. How can you say that you're not giving enough; you're not -- there's a note I'd like you to see, Mr. Speaker. You might find out my embarrassment. What was I saying? I think I was talking about voting at 18 years old.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we have to be reasonable and we have to look at the facts when we study these things. How can we say to young people or to his mother that this son is ready and should do his duty and fight for his country but on the other hand that he should have no part in the shaping of the affairs of his country, in the political life of his country? Would you, Mr. Speaker, like to be the one that would tell a mother whose son just gave his life on the battlefield that he had no business, that he should not take part in shaping the affairs of his country? I don't think that it makes sense at all. I think that we have to be realistic. I think of course that this is not the only thing we do. We have to make up our mind if boys or girls 18 years old are ready to drive a car, to join the services, to get married, and if so why shouldn't they have a chance to vote?

Not it is a known fact - this is something else that Dr. Lorimer mentioned just a few days ago - it is a known fact that boys and girls are brighter today than they were fifty years ago. They are more mature; they are more educated. Why? Because they have a better chance at education, a chance that other generations did not have, probably also because of the news media that are always giving on-the-spot coverage, giving us the news of the world through the newspaper, the radio and the television, and I think that we must be ready to take this young generation, our greatest of all resources, to take them as full partners, to show them that we have confidence. Oh, I know many of us are worried about young boys running around with long hair. In our days maybe it was brush cuts or zoot-suiters or something else. Everybody, I think, went through these things and I think that this is another example of people that want responsibility, want to take part in the discussions that are going on in the world. The former -- I think that the Honourable Member of Pembina also during this last debate expressed the fear that we should let our young people of 18 vote. I hope that she has changed her mind because I think now that we -- if we want to be serious and if we want to be realistic we must know, we must realize that this is a must, that we must give a bigger load to carry to this young generation.

Now the former Minister of Agriculture, as I said, also was saying that the young people today were rebelling against government, law and order, losing the respect for authority. Well, can we blame only the young people on that? I think that we can say that nine out of ten Canadians are losing respect for authority if we are talking about politicians, and many times it is our fault here. Is it that we're afraid? We're talking about ombudsmen. We know the courage and we know the ambition that the young generation has. Are we afraid of this young generation? Are they afraid of them showing us, pointing to us our mistakes because they might come in like crusaders and they might want to do something to change things.

Now, I think that it is wrong to say that only the young people are rebelling. Maybe we are living in a world that has more and more a tendency of rebelling against governments, against law and order, but I think that it is most unfair to point the finger at the people 18 and under and say they are the guilty ones, they are the people that are rebelling, because you see some of the best soldiers, airmen and sailors who are ready to follow discipline when they are treated like ordinary citizens, not like babies but like growing people, when they are told that they have a stake in this country, that they have some responsibility and some contribution to make. And I think that if we tried to understand these young people, through their eyes, not

(MR. DESJARDINS, cont'd) only look at them through our eyes and say, " This is what I would like them to be, " but let us try to realize, to understand their way of thinking, and we will see that they can offer an awful lot.

Now what better training -- you have to start some time. I think there's a motion or there was a statement made by the Leader of the NDP Party that maybe we should force the people, that they should be subject to a fine if they didn't vote. Now this is what we're facing. We're saying that the young people cannot face their responsibility. We will not give them a chance to face this responsibility and we are trying to force the adult to vote by bringing in a fine for those that will not exercise this franchise. I think that it was right here in Winnipeg at the Metro election where only 12 percent of the people voted. Twelve percent. And we want to deny the young people this right, and I say it is a right. I say that we cannot reconcile ourselves, we cannot say on the one hand, "Yes, join the army; we need you to fight for your country. Give your life if need be, but you're not going to have a word to say in the running of this country, in the managing of your affairs, the affairs of all the citizens.

The former Minister also was saying that Lenin and Hitler built their dictatorship because they had captured the mind and hearts of youth. Well a statement like this when you apply it, when you're trying to bring this as reasoning why these people should not be given a chance to vote, I think is ridiculous; that Lenin and Hitler captured the mind of youth. Well this is what we should do. We should capture the mind of youth now. We should try not only to wait till we have delinquents and so on, we should try to prevent. They say that preventative medicine is the best and here again is the chance to make these people aware of their responsibility, make them realize that there are such things as taxes and so on. Teach them at an early age to respect politics. Maybe we would have a better class of politician also. I don't think that we should be afraid of giving these people the chance, and if we are afraid that we will form dictatorship by capturing them, well let's try to have to capture them by something good, something worthwhile. It's not going to change anything and I don't think that all the people that served in Hitler or Lenin's army were people 18 years and under. It's true that they started -- the only validity of this statement is that you start early, at an early age, to educate the people, to give them something to work for and this is what they did. In China they are doing the same thing now because youth is a force, and we can see what's going on in different universities and so on. Well we can't just say we're afraid of them; we don't want anything to do with them or we'll try to hold them under our thumb for as long as possible. This is false. This is the wrong attitude, the wrong approach. Let's make of them full partners. Let's give them the right but also the responsibility right from the start, and I think we will have a better chance of educating them, of getting them in the right path right from the start and I think that they will certainly keep the older generation on our toes. There's a lot of things that they might not understand. Mind you, I don't think the youth of this country would stand for the way this Cabinet voted itself a raise. I don't think they would go for this. Is this what we're afraid of, things like that? I think that they would give a little bit of respectability to politics and I submit that maybe we're afraid of these young people because they don't understand all this stick-handling in politics, and so on, and they just go on in what they feel is right. They'll make mistakes, but who doesn't? Mr. Speaker, I think that these statements that were made on a previous occasion when we debated this very subject were not serious, were not valid, and I say that we must be reasonable, we must be serious. There is no point in saying that we're afraid of you. We've got to try to educate them the right way. We've got to be able to give them the right and then sure, of course, insist that they should accept their responsibility but I think they would be ready to do so if they were treated like full partners instead of second class citizens.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable for Kildonan that debate on this motion be now adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Carillon. The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned this particular resolution, it was before the introduction of the White Paper, and now that the White Paper has been introduced I am very happy that the government has conceded that it has been wrong in trying to woo the voters with their own money and that the method used by them was indeed a very awkward one, an expensive one and should never have been put in in the first place. By now, from the White Paper, and I assume that the White Paper will now become part of the Statutes and will be passed by this House, I am pleased that they have taken

(MR. MILLER cont'd) this decision to eliminate it and not only eliminating it have now agreed with the spirit of this particular resolution which calls for the municipalities to handle whatever rebates there are left after the vote of March 10th. So I am pleased that the government, as I say, has conceded that their attempt at this sort of wooing of the voter in Manitoba was very unsuccessful and inefficient and have seen the light of day.

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

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon): Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to say very much. I just would like to say this, that I'd like to thank the government for taking the attitude or the change of attitude concerning the handling of this school tax rebate. I think possibly enough has been said about it. I feel that all of us are very happy concerning this reverse decision. However it is much appreciated that in the future, as the Member for West Kildonan just mentioned, that the municipalities will be handling the rebate, if and where the single district referendum may be defeated.

I would like to congratulate this government in this respect that in taking this, I would like to call it a progressive attitude, regardless of what politics are still used in other provinces, that the playing of politics in respect to this school tax rebate has been acknowledged and seen fit to reverse by the members on the other side.

But before I sit down I would like to encourage or urge this government to clean up the rebates that are still outstanding. Continually, still every day people are phoning and asking, "When will my rebate be coming?" and I wish that as soon as possible, and it must be as nearly immediately as possible, they should be cleaned up because I think by paying them soon, or by paying them now, might even have a good effect on the referendum that will be held on March 10th.

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

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

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, Be it Resolved that the minimum wage in Manitoba be established immediately at the figure of \$1.25 per hour, and Be it Further Resolved that the minimum wage be reviewed at least every two years.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, when this resolution came before you before Christmas you reserved your decision to rule on it because of the rule of anticipation because it was mentioned in the Throne Speech that the Minimum Wage Board is going to study the minimum wage, but I do want to thank you for allowing me to proceed with this resolution.

When the Federal Labour Standards Code introduced its legislation some two years ago and established the minimum wage \$1.25 it was thought at that particular time that most provinces would follow and establish their minimum wage as well \$1.25. Unfortunately this did not happen and as I see at the present time in last week's Globe and Mail, the maritime provinces, Ontario and Quebec at the present time are considering in their Legislatures to establish their minimum wage \$1.25 and I feel that the House and the government here should act at this time and establish our minimum wage in Manitoba \$1.25 as well.

At the outset, Mr. Speaker, I want to warn the government that there is a tremendous amount of dissatisfaction in the ranks of the working people with respect to the low wages in the Province of Manitoba. The average income of Winnipeg's personal income tax shows that Winnipeg is in 49th place on the list of Canadian cities and much below the average level, and if I may say the information that I get there's quite a few technical people are leaving one of our public utilities and going other places because they are getting much higher wages and I'm sure this must be a great concern to our government here.

Manitoba's population has also declined while other western provinces have increased and I'm inclined to believe that to some extent the low wages paid in this province is the reason for people leaving Manitoba. So I urge the government to act immediately and raise the minimum wage to \$1.25 per hour. I know that some members in this House will say raising of the minimum wage to \$1.25 will be inflationary and it is not justifiable to cripple one industry to benefit another class, especially since the well-being of the worker is dependent in part on the state of the business. But I wish to quote what the Committee on Manitoba's Economic Future had to say and I'm quoting: "The Committee on Manitoba's Economic Future found that managerial and plant efficiency were more important factors in reducing costs than the scale of wages." Said the report: "The dominant factor affecting labour costs in Manitoba has been productivity rather than earnings. This finding is contrary to the popular belief that

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) . . . earnings primarily or even exclusively determine labour costs. " In other words, an efficient productive industry should have no trouble paying good wages.

MR. SPEAKER, at the present time our iminimum wage in Manitoba is \$1.00 which at the Dominion Bureau of Statistics figure of average work hours per week at 40.6 per week would give us an income of \$40.60 or somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$176.00 a month. As can be seen this represents a standard of living which is dangerously low. I wonder what would be the lot of a married man on these wages let alone of someone with numerous bills or medical bills, unavoidable expenses. In fact the minimum wage at present I feel is an insult to the people who receive it and it may be much more beneficial to some people to receive relief because the Winnipeg Public Welfare pays for a family of seven people, with five children, \$1.32 per hour which is much higher than our present minimum wage. Thus a strong case can be made solely from the basis of equity for raising the minimum wage in Manitoba. Moreover the figure should not be established to become permanent but should become for review every so often.

A minimum wage of \$1.25 would again, using 40.6 hours work week would yield an income of \$50.75 a week. I feel this is still far from a fortune. A family living on this income according to Canadian government definition is still living in poverty. I feel the greatest effect of wage increases will be in the area of commercial services, especially restaurants and similar service industries. This would destroy much of the arguments for these industries are typically neither exporters themselves or are their services significant and factors to the other firms. I don't believe that we can attract industry at sweat shop wages, Mr. Speaker, because we haven't done this to this point. We should not try to perpetuate this low wage in our province. If people have no skills I think it's the responsibility of the government to retrain them to increase their productivity and not to have . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I must interrupt the honourable gentleman. It is now 5:30 and I'm leaving the ..

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I'm almost finished, I just have a couple more words (Interjection)

MR. SPEAKER: He has leave.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I feel if people have no skills, because I know some of the members have used this argument last year, we're only hurting some other industry by paying some people a wage they don't deserve. Well I would like to disagree with this point, because if people have not got skills I think it is the responsibility of this government or of any government to retrain the people to increase their skills to increase their productivity, and I would like to ask all the members in this House to support this resolution.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Burrows, the debate be adjourned on this matter.

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

MR. SPEAKER: It is now 5:30 and I am leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 P. M. this evening.