

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition of Manitoba Pool Elevators Praying for the passing of an Act to amend and consolidate an Act to Incorporate Manitoba Pool Elevators.

MR. SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre. The Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne.

MR. M. E. MCKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): Mr. Speaker, I see my honourable friend, the Member for Inkster, is not in his seat, but I guess he'll likely come; but we do have the Leader of the New Democratic Party urgently trying to get some information about the insurance industry.

This resolution, what we are doing, and I think what was agreed by all, to adopt a report, and while I wasn't there at the last meeting, due to the snow storms, I was at the meeting of February 3rd, and I think the Honourable Member for Inkster placed great emphasis on the fact that the committee as a whole were trying to hold up proceedings of looking into the whole field of automobile insurance, but if anyone was to read the report of our meeting of February 3rd, which is exactly about three weeks previous to opening the session, there's no mention at all of anyone there complaining bitterly about the way the committee is operated. That was the time, I would think, that the committee members should have brought out at great length their concern about the operation of the committee and I think there's many of the members of all parties in attendance.

Now, I don't want to be as long as the Honourable Member for Inkster, because he went on at great length, trying to condemn all the insurance companies doing business in the Province of Manitoba and he made a terrific job of it - in fact I sent Hansards out to many of the companies operating within the Province of Manitoba and let them have a look at that speech because I think it won't be the last time you've heard about that speech; in fact it's on public record with the leading insurance companies right now in the Province of Manitoba.

But I think we have to all realize when the committee sat there, we were looking into the operation and due to the fact that B. C. had spent over a million dollars looking into the insurance industry in British Columbia, our committee felt it best that we should wait until the report was received. The report was received before Christmas and on February 3rd we had our first meeting. Now, Mr. Swaine, the Superintendent of Insurance, presented us with a summary of the B. C. report, which every member of that committee received. It's a two page report, mentioning the various things that, the Wootton Commission up there recommended, the important things that they recommended, stating them here in a number of - six different items. I think that the main thing that we should consider here in Manitoba, if we're going to look into this, is something that will meet the needs of all Manitoba drivers, no matter where they are, whether in Manitoba or all parts of the North American continent. This is one thing the Wootton Commission did not do because the report that they recommended is only good within the Province of British Columbia, and once you leave the province of British Columbia your insurance is no good at all. So this is one factor I think our committee, if we ever get reconstituted, are going to have to look at very seriously.

Now, much emphasis was mentioned there in the speech by the Honourable Member for Inkster the other day about -- and he always brought out "It's a fact." I have it here somewhere. If you ever want to put up a good argument where you haven't got much to work on, you always try to twist it around in such a manner as to make your subject matter look very good and that's what the Honourable Member for Inkster did on that particular occasion. Due to the fact we do have other important business today and a very important matter to deal with tonight at 9:30, I think it best that I just be very brief and to the point and do tell the Honourable Member for Inkster what has happened in the last few months in the insurance industry trying - they are always trying to improve the industry, they're not static at any time, and they have brought out this compensation without fault in all policies this coming year. Effective January 1st, all policies effective in Manitoba, and in Canada, I should say, are automatically covered at no

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd.) added cost. When your renewal comes up you have the option whether you wish to have this coverage or not, at the rate of \$7.00. So this does look after all the needs at the present time, and while it won't fill all the cost to the injured motorist, or the uninsured like the - or the medical expenses - it will help them in their immediate need. So this is one thing that the industry have done to change the policies in the past year.

The Member for Inkster always goes to great length to say that the insurance companies are cheating the public. I would like to take issue with him on that one particular point. I have right here, I can go back here, in a book here, in this book right here, and I wish he would read this book. "Annual Statistical Issue 1968", and that's got every figure on every company that does business in Canada right back to 1963, and if he wants to get facts and figures, and if he thinks insurance companies are stealing from the public, I would like to have him read this and then make another speech.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. My honourable friend has used two expressions . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member. You made a request of the Chair?

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. The Honourable Member used two expressions: (1) That I said that the insurance companies are cheating the public - I never said that. The second expression, that the insurance companies are stealing from the public - I never said that. I'd like the honourable member to withdraw the remarks that he made in this regard.

MR. McKELLAR: I'll withdraw them. I'll put it another way. You said that the companies were charging . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. A request was made with the point of order. I wonder if the honourable member wishes to comply with the request of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. McKELLAR: I withdraw the statement. I'll put it another way Mr. Speaker, to keep within the legal - I'll put it this way, that the Honourable Member for Inkster mentioned in his speech that the companies were charging the public excessive fees. Is not that right? -- (Interjection) -- Yes. And he mentioned that the government should hire an actuarial expert to decide whether the companies were doing so.

Well, I would like to say to the Honourable Member for Inkster, if he's such an authority on auto insurance, why doesn't he take on this job because he's a member of this committee, the same as the rest of us. We all have the opportunity as members of the committee to ask questions and I know he asked many of them, but he also does state in his speech here that the companies wouldn't answer the questions because they couldn't prove their figures. Now the figures are here on all their premiums collected, the amount of money paid out for liability losses, for physical damage losses - these are in this book right here, and I'll lend it to him for a week if he so desires.

But I think we must look at this whole field of automobile insurance and decide whether the government is better fitted to run this industry rather than the companies. And I would say, I would leave it to the companies, because these companies have been in business for many, many years and they have their good times and they have had their bad times. I would say that the one company, the largest mutual insurance company in Canada, which is in my constituency, started in 1896 and been in the automobile business since 1930, have expanded their business to one of the biggest in Canada. And how do they do that? Only because they pleased their policy holders. Yes, pleased their policy holders. Another one of which I am agent, in which the Honourable Member for Lakeside and I are well known, and also the member for Gladstone, are in this particular business too, and if you look at the records of the expansion of their business in the last five years you'll also find out that they did not get that expansion through other than pleasing their policy holders. I would say that this is one of the finest well-run industries that you have.

Now, you mentioned all these profits that the Board companies are making, but I would like to tell you there are many other companies in this business besides Board companies; and there are many other rate books besides Board company rate books - and I have one or two in my suitcase, right here. But there is quite a difference in rates.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): It sounds as though they have you in their suitcase.

MR. McKELLAR: No Sir. There are a number of rates, lots and lots of rates, if you circulate around and find out. I personally think that when you're condemning the insurance companies you are also condemning the co-op fire and casualty, and I know you're a good friend of the co-ops at all times and should always remember that. The mutual companies do not give these profits out back to their policy holders; they reduce their rates. That's the only way they can help their policy holders out if they have a surplus.

Now, I don't want to carry on much longer because I know the Honourable Member for Inkster doesn't want to listen anyway and I think I just wasted my time, so with those few words we'll carry on the business of the House.

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. John): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would permit two questions? I'd like to know whether he has read the Wootton Report carefully and thoroughly.

MR. McKELLAR: I have and I don't agree with it.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well then, would he indicate those portions which were read by the Honourable Member for Inkster which were not correctly read by him. Can he do that?

MR. McKELLAR: He didn't read it, he just took some pieces out. You have to read the whole thing to get the whole version of it.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, one of the paramount rules in this House is one does not question the statement made by a member as to what is the truth on a fact. I listened to the Honourable Member for Inkster, and I listened carefully. I have not read the Wootton Report, but I listened carefully because it seemed to me that he had spent a great deal of time in studying the report and coming to certain conclusions. And I recall that he said that he doesn't agree with the recommendations in the report either, so he and the Member for Souris-Lansdowne seem to be in agreement. But as I listened to the Honourable Member for Inkster, he made a number of statements about facts, or conclusions, that he stated came out of the Wootton Report; and when the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne spoke he gave me the impression that the Honourable Member for Inkster was not saying what he said he was saying, and that is that he was quoting from the report, so that when he was called to task for stating incorrectly that the Honourable Member for Inkster accused the insurance companies of stealing or - what was the other word? - cheating - he did withdraw, and he had to withdraw and I do think that it was a sort of an insult to you Mr. Speaker, for him to say, "Well, I'll put it another way". In other words, "I'll continue my suggestion of the statement but put in another way." And then he did it on the basis of saying, quoting the Honourable Member for Inkster as saying, "Well, the premiums were excessive." Well if you can in any way imagine a charge which is considered to be excessive as being stealing or cheating, then you have no concept of the principles of our laws dealing with criminal aspects. Excessive premiums can be perfectly legal, and they are legal in the case of insurance companies; and they are legal in the case of doctors and lawyers too, I might say. Excessive premiums are what is considered in the eyes of certain people as being too much, but that's not cheating and that's not stealing. It's perfectly legal, and the rates that they arrive at they have a right to arrive at.

The point made by the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne that the Honourable Member for Inkster should be studying, doing that work which he felt that an actuary ought to do, I suppose is recognition by the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne of the capabilities of the Member for Inkster, but I am not aware that he does have actuarial experience or knowledge nor even that of an accountant, and I would think that he probably is not the person who can give that kind of expert advice to the committee, which apparently the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne recognizes should be needed. And certainly the point was made, and made correctly, I believe, that when one is reviewing the detailed statements and arguments presented by the insurance companies, one has to have certain acquired capabilities, which members of the committee obviously do not have, and which members of the committee ought to have had in order to help them to bring in a report to this legislature which would be meaningful.

I'm informed, incidentally, by the Honourable Member for Inkster, that the insurance companies were asked to reveal their percentage profits that they made on their investments and did refuse to give that information. So now we have the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne saying the insurance companies did not refuse to give information - and I don't know, apparently he wasn't present at least at one of the meetings - the Member for Inkster informs me that they did refuse to give this information saying "it's none of your business."

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) And maybe it isn't. But the fact is that they did refuse, as it was reported to me. And incidentally, Mr. Speaker, I have yet to see minutes from a committee come down and say, "Mr. so-and-so objected to this or Mr. so-and-so had this or the other statement to make, or Mr. so-and-so felt that the committee had not been called in time." The reports that come down are pretty precise reports and they do not give a full report. I'm informed that there were protests but that becomes academic insofar as I'm concerned. I note also, with interest, that the Honourable Member for Souris sent copies of Hansard in which Mr. Green, the Member for Inkster is reported, to all the insurance companies. I would think that the Member for Inkster would not have any objection, but I would think that in all fairness now that the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne volunteered to do that, he ought to send copies to the constituents of Inkster constituency so that the people to whom the member is responsible would be aware of what he said. That would be the most correct way of dealing with it, because if the honourable member made statements that would not be acceptable to his constituents, they ought to know about it; and if the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne felt that there was so much said there that should be questioned or challenged, certainly he ought to send them to the constituents of Inkster; and if he needs any help in doing that, I think that we could find some people who would help him in addressing envelopes and seeing to it that it got out. I think that would be a good contribution which could be made.

Mr. Speaker, I had an experience with insurance dealers which I would like to recount to this House. It is an experience not dealing with auto insurance but dealing with fire insurance and I believe that the method in which I learnt of the operation is such that is applicable to the auto insurance and I would like to recount that by relating it as there are similar companies and similar forms of operation.

I was a member of the Winnipeg School Board at a time when we found that the insurance premiums charged on fire insurance of school board buildings were what we considered to be excessive -- and we were then paying, I believe it was, and I'm speaking from memory, some 39 cents a hundred for fire insurance on the school buildings. We had reason to think they were excessive but we didn't have actuarial proof nor the statements filed by the insurance companies as to their profits or methods of operation. But we did attend in a delegation of two, I was one of them, and the then chairman of the School Board, Mr. Peter Curry was the other member of the two-man delegation. We did attend on the board, on the insurance board, to discuss with them their procedures, and we discovered that they had various methods, various formulae for establishing a premium. They would arrive at that premium based on closeness to a fire hydrant and the type of material that was used and whether there were fire doors, whether there were extinguishers in the right place, and then they would say, well now we will apply across the board discount based on what we feel is a proper adjustment; and that cross the board discount, if I recall, it was something like 40% off the calculated rate as being the discount attributable to a school building which is not occupied at nights and where there is no great use of those services that endanger fire. And when we questioned them on what the 40% was, because it was the biggest factor, they said well when you are in the business as long as we have been, you learn to feel just what is the proper percentage discount. And I said I don't believe that it is just that simple. He said, "Oh yes, when you have the accumulation of experience we know that 40% is right". I said what about 50%? "We don't think 50% is right, we think 40 is". I said is it like a pilot that flies by the seat of his pants? He said, "yes, you can call it that". And the seat of those pants are what directed that insurance company in setting a rate which I believe was 39 cents. I do recall this. That before this committee had an opportunity to report to the school board on our discussions, a letter was received saying that "Due to a review that had been made of the entire history of the fire insurance coverage of the Winnipeg School Board, we have voluntarily decided to reduce our rate to 31 cents". And this "coincidental" study seemed to come out just about the time that we had had the meeting and were ready to make our report.

As of just a few years after I left the Winnipeg School Board, the rate had dropped to 21 cents from 39, and I am not aware that any company went broke because of that. I am aware of the fact that what the school board did, was let it out on tender and what the school board did was say that we will not discriminate against non-board companies. And that's what did it, Mr. Speaker, in my estimation. The non-board companies maintain a certain level which across the board sets rates, and then they say the non-board companies, the members that

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) don't belong to us, are parasites. They are people who rely on our statistics accumulated with our costs; we pay the experts, and they then see the rate and they can then afford to cut it, because they don't have that cost. One might have said to them well isn't that what the free enterprise system seems to be all about, but I didn't say that because I felt that they could run their business as they saw fit in establishing rates, and they did in fact, come out with rates which petered down to 21 cents a hundred. I wonder what they are now? I would assume that subject to inflationary costs, they may be even less, based on the pressure put on them when the business wasn't just delivered into their hands.

Well I am not aware that the individual purchaser of automobile insurance is able to go out and bargain with the insurance companies to try to arrive at a fair rate, based on the system of competition. I am not aware that an insurance agent that deals with two or three companies, bargains one against the other and says, "Well now I can get a better rate from one than the other and I am going to knock you down to the lowest possible price", which is, I suppose, his duty, but it may not be considered so by him. And therefore I feel that the statements made in the Wootton Report, as cited by the Honourable Member for Inkster and I believe that he cited complete statements that he did not distort - and that's the word used by the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne - that he did not distort but cited it, when he said the Government knows -- obviously you will recall, Mr. Speaker, he should have said that the government ought to know if the government has any interest in this business, what these facts are, because the government has been in possession of the facts in bound form for quite a time, and so is the Member for Souris-Lansdowne, so that I feel the contribution made by the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne would've been a good contribution had he dealt with the statements made, quoted by the Honourable Member for Inkster, and indicated in what way they were distorted and in what way they were in error. As far as I am concerned, every thing that was said by the Honourable Member for Inkster in quoting the Wootton Report still stands solidly and firmly without any challenge, without any question of any validity that might have been imposed by the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne.

Let me quote only with his suggestion, as a member of the Committee, and I believe the committee which was wound up and which is about to be re-established, probably has him on the list. I'm just wondering whether he has disqualified himself from the right to sit. Yes, he's on the proposed new committee and I wonder just what right he has to sit on this committee when indeed he tells us that the insurance companies have thrown out the concept of compensation for fault and accepted the compensation "without fault" and he says, that's all that has to be done. They've done it. I'll have to re-read what he said, but I believe that the import of what he said was that this committee has nothing more to do because the insurance companies have already done all that is necessary. He's shaking his head, so apparently he thinks there is more to do. Well let me encourage him, should he be a member of that committee which has yet to be informed. Let me encourage him to study carefully those excerpts of the Wootton Report that were read to him and come up with real answers or acceptance of statements rather than a blanket description such as would tend to indicate that the Member for Inkster was not correctly reporting. I think that would be a much more valid contribution from which much more discussion could emanate and from which we could learn a great deal more about the operations of the automobile insurance industry and its effect on the people of Manitoba who are the consumers, and whom this government and the members on this side, represent as being the representatives of the consumers of the product which is being sold by the automobile insurance industry.

I think it is up to this government which controls the committee, whose members have been put on it in larger number than members of other parties -- and I agree that I can recognize that as being an approach that makes sense -- that the government should therefore see to it that this committee does have the opportunity to investigate all the facts and all the features presented to the committee and in the Wootton Report by having experts who are objective on this, who are not people who are hired by a vested interest but ones who are capable of properly assessing the whole picture described in the instruction of the committee and be able to advise the committee, based on their expertise and not about their guesswork or about their special interest, or on speculation. I think that that would be something that the committee ought to be prepared to look into but can only do so if this government is prepared to have that sort of objective reporting made to it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin,

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, my remarks will not be as long as those of the Honourable Member for St. John's, I can assure you, but it concerns me, Mr. Speaker, at this moment that all of a sudden the NDP party are starting to speak for all the province. I have the Member for Ethelbert Plains talking about my constituency, which I drew to your attention the other night. He is not a resident of my constituency; all of a sudden he's an authority in Roblin constituency. We have a member here right now talking about automobile insurance who is not on the committee. I have attended the meetings in '67, of April 27th, I attended the meeting of October 7th. I attended the meeting of November 13th. I attended those meetings of December 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8th and I attended all the meetings in '68 and the Honourable Member from St. John's was not there. And how all of a sudden is he an authority to stand up and talk about automobile insurance? I am most concerned, Mr. Speaker, and I don't think this is the way to legislate the laws of this province - somebody that is not a member of a committee coming in and telling us what we should do. I support the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne who is on that committee and attended all those meetings that I attended, and I don't have to stand here half an hour, Mr. Speaker, to tell you what's wrong with that committee. There is nothing wrong with that committee. The problem is over here in the NDP, and I challenge, I challenge the leader of the NDP as I stand here this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, where do you stand on that statement that the Honourable Member for Inkster made - that charging excessive rates is not cheating? Now let me hear your answer. -- (Interjection)--

I would like the answer to my statement, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains.

MR. MICHAEL KAWCHUK (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak on this debate, however, I would like to take this opportunity of expressing my sincerest and warmest congratulations to my honourable friend for recognizing that I am an authority on all problems, not only in the constituency of Ethelbert Plains but also in his.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has a question of the Honourable Member of Roblin?

MR. GREEN: Yes, I want to ask the honourable member a question. -- (Interjection) --

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

Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface) introduced Bill No. 10 an Act to amend an Act to incorporate La Congregation des Filles de la Croix.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed to Orders of the Day, some of our visitors have left today, but I feel that I should introduce those that are here. Some of the school children have left but I feel I should announce their school and so on for the record. We did have or have 30 students of Grade 8 standing from the Roland High School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Weins. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Dufferin. We also had or have 15 students of Grade 6 to 10 standing from Ste. Agnes School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Posner, Mrs. Horch and Miss Baird. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks. We also had or have 44 students of Grade 8 and 9 standing of the Harold Edwards School. These students are under the direction of Mr. McKay and Mr. Sibley. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you all here today.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Health. Has he any further information to give the House regarding the number of doctors who have opted out of the Medicare program?

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Health and Social Services)(Gimli): Mr. Speaker, the chairman informed me this morning - 32.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I asked the Minister yesterday about two towns, Steinbach and Hamiota. Has he been able to ascertain anything about that situation?

MR. JOHNSON: No, Mr. Speaker, and I doubt if I will. I have just got the numbers that have written into the corporation, which is the only public information I have. I think this is a matter we won't know of until April 1st, quite frankly.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister aware the doctors in Pinawa have opted out?

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.)

Did the Minister not receive a letter from that area?

MR. JOHNSON: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I might advise him I have a copy of it which was addressed to him.

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

MR. PAULLEY: ... yesterday I asked the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce some questions pertaining to the possible loss of work for CAE Western Divisions Limited in Winnipeg, and possible loss of jobs for 150. The Minister replied to the effect that the Honourable the First Minister was in Ottawa and intimated that we may have further news today. I wonder if my honourable friend can give any report subsequent to the questions asked yesterday.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, as a result of the meeting of the Premier yesterday with the individuals that I mentioned, a meeting will be held 4:30 Ottawa time, in the Minister of Defense Productions office with his officials, with the officials of the Canadian Aviation Electronics, with a Member of the Department of Industry and Commerce and with a member of the Honourable James Richardson's staff.

MR. PAULLEY: The time of the day, Mr. Speaker - 4:30? Would you mind repeating the personnel?

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(River Heights): The meeting will take place in the office of the Minister of Defense Production with the officials of his department, with the President of Canadian Aviation Electronics, with the Manager of the Winnipeg operation, with a member of the Winnipeg Department of Industry and Commerce and with a member of the -- (Interjection) -- no, a member of the Manitoba Department of Industry and Commerce, and with a member of the staff of the Honourable James Richardson.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Provincial Treasurer. Could he advise the House when the budget is likely to be brought down?

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Finance)(Fort Rouge): I'd be prepared to bring down the budget toward the end of the present month. I can't name the exact day, but I'll be prepared by that time and if it's suitable, sometime shortly after that.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Education. After listening to the debate of this afternoon on the special committee on automobile insurance, is it the intention of your department to put on a crash program on logic for all members of future committees?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. EARL DAWSON (Hamiota): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister in charge of Tourism and Recreation. Can the Minister of Tourism indicate to this House whether the government has accepted the proposal made some months ago by the Leader of the Official Opposition that Manitoba make an all out bid for the 1971 Canada winter games?

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Tourism and Recreation)(The Pas): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could report on this matter. We got a letter, I believe it was late December, advising that there would be 1971 winter games and that various cities in Canada could make bids for these games, subject to support in their bids from the various provincial governments. At that time it was indicated that further material would follow with respect to the rules under which they might bid for these games and that material arrived on February 28th and the date for making the bid at that time was March 15th. We had been in consultation with the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg prior to that time. We also met with him in the week following, together with certain members of staff and our department agreed to put together a package of information that would be required if we were to make, through the City of Winnipeg, a bid for the 1971 games. This information was transmitted to the City of Winnipeg last Friday; we understand that it was considered at their council meeting last night and I have had no official report from that meeting, although I understand from news reports that they did give favourable consideration to it. So presumably a bid will be going forward within the next week or two. Incidentally, last week we also received word that the date for filing of the application for the games had been extended from March 15th to March 31st. So, we will be getting a bid in, in conjunction with the City of Winnipeg in plenty of time for the games. Unfortunately, the material was very, very late in coming and I believe, if I understand correctly, the Leader of the Opposition - the

(MR. CARROLL cont'd.) Official Opposition - had advance information that was not available to us in the department.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. DAWSON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. If this bid is successful, is the Government of Manitoba prepared to share with the Federal Government and the City of Winnipeg in any capital expenditures which may be required for facilities?

MR. CARROLL: Well, Mr. Speaker, that is a hypothetical question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains. Oh, order please. Did the honourable member have a supplementary?

MR. DAWSON: Another question. Have your department, Sir, examined all the existing facilities, and if so, does it agree with the statement that my Leader made, that we have all the facilities in Manitoba?

MR. CARROLL: We believe that we have all of the necessary facilities for the games at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains.

MR. KAWCHUK: Mr. Speaker, as you recall, last Monday I asked the question of the Honourable the Minister of Education, why there has been an undue delay in the construction of the school in Grandview and he said he would take the question as notice. I'm wondering whether he has the information now.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Minister of Youth and Education) (St. Vital): I'll hope to have the information very soon, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I rise first of all on, I suppose, a point of privilege regarding a comment made by the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. He stated that in December I was privy to certain information which was not available to the government. I'd like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that that information was available to the government in exactly the same way it was available to me. All they had to do was ask the questions. Had they done so, they would have got the same information as I obtained.

Mr. Speaker, while I'm on my feet, I'd like to address a question to the Provincial Treasurer again. He indicated the budget would be brought down towards the end of the month. Will the change in the unconditional grant from 3 to 8 dollars require any legislation, or can it be done strictly by the passage of the estimates?

MR. EVANS: I think I can say definitely that's an item of expenditure which will pass in the normal course through expenditure estimates, Committee of Supply and Supply Bill.

MR. MOLGAT: A supplementary question then, Mr. Speaker. Will this money be available to the municipalities for this fiscal year?

MR. EVANS: I imagine the Minister of Municipal Affairs will arrange the method through which it will be done. It will be a part of his estimates and no doubt he will answer any questions on his estimates when they come up in the House.

MR. MOLGAT: Then can I address a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, Mr. Speaker? Will this increase in grants be...

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, before we get too far away, I understood that the Leader of the Opposition was asking a further question with respect to the 1971 winter games.

MR. MOLGAT: making, on a point of privilege -- (Interjection) -- the Minister had made a statement which, in my opinion, was not correct and I was correcting it.

MR. CARROLL: Yes, well I just wanted to follow through, because you did, I think, leave the implication that we had not responded to illicit further information as a result of the letter that arrived, and I did want to point out to the House that a letter did arrive here from the Canadian Sports Federation which resulted in an inquiry going to our department and subsequent discussion with that body, which indicated that they would have somebody in the Province of Manitoba in December to discuss this with us fully, and at the same time they indicated that this further information would be available to us shortly. The subsequent trip did not develop in January and the next word we got from them was not until the last day of February, so that the time for bidding was made very, very short. But it was not through any fault on the part of our departmental people in trying to get further particulars with respect to these games that resulted in the bid just going forward at this stage.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for

MR. MOLGAT: I believe I was asking a question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs,

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) to which I have not yet received a reply. -- (Interjection) --

Yes. Will the increase in the unconditional grants from 3 to 8 dollars be available to the municipalities for this fiscal year?

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Osborne): No.

MR. PAULLEY: A supplemental question on the same subject. If I recall correctly, while the Honourable First Minister was speaking Saturday morning last, I asked him that precise question; and if I recall correctly, and this will be revealed in Hansard, the reply from the Honourable the First Minister was "yes", that it would be available for this year. I ask the Honourable House Leader whether or not he's in the position to verify the statement which I now make.

MR. BAIZLEY: I wonder if I could confuse this a little more by telling you that it is not available for this fiscal year but will be paid in the next fiscal year applicable to tax rates that are being determined at the present time.

MR. PAULLEY: Then for clarification, Mr. Speaker, and in the interests of the municipal taxpayer municipalities, am I given to understand then, that in compiling their budgets for this year, then the municipalities will be able to take into consideration the increased amount of the per capita grant in order that that might be passed on to the taxpayer for the current year 1969, even though my honourable friends hold back the payment of that until after the new fiscal year starting May 1st. Is that correct? So then the municipalities can go ahead with their budgets in the knowledge that they will receive \$8.00 per capita.

And one further if I may, Mr. Speaker. Has the Minister of Municipal Affairs notified all municipal governments accordingly?

I wonder if I might have an answer to that.

MR. BAIZLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I could answer my honourable friend, I think the gentlemen sitting up behind you have done an excellent job of not only notifying the municipal officials, but all people in Manitoba that this is available.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I remind my honourable friend the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the Fourth Estate often make comments and notify people of happenings that just don't happen. I want to hear in this House from the Minister of Municipal Affairs, or a responsible member of the cabinet as to whether or not this notification has gone forth?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, may I address a question to the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs. Isn't it a fact that the present fiscal year ends on the 31st day of March, 1969. Is it not a further fact that the new unconditional grant is going to be included in the estimates for 1969 to 1970? And would it not follow from that, that the new unconditional grants would be payable for that particular fiscal year - '69 to '70? And is it still not a further fact, that under the Unconditional Grant Act that these grants are to be paid by the first day of July in any fiscal year?

A MEMBER: Just stand up and thank him now.

MR. BAIZLEY: The answer is yes. The one date I'm not sure of is the date of the 1st day of July, but whatever the statutory date is and we have the necessary authority, why that is what is anticipated.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Well, it would be a fact the, wouldn't it Mr. Minister, that money would be available to the municipalities for '69 to '70?

MR. BAIZLEY: That's right. (Hear, Hear)

MR. PAULLEY: And in order that my honourable friend the House Leader or the Minister of Municipal Affairs may get the records straight, may I refer them to page 179 of Hansard wherein I asked the question: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Will that be available to this year's municipal budgets? The question being directed to the Honourable the First Minister. His reply: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, and I hope it won't be replaced with new programs in the municipalities as a result of that money. So there's no question of doubt. --(Interjection)-- That's right, but you weren't aware of it. -- (Interjection) --

HON. STERLING R. LYON Q. C. (Attorney-General)(Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I don't - with respect, I don't think there was any doubt in anyone's mind until my honourable friend asked the question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Inkster, would he resume his seat for a moment. I must regretfully again bring to the attention of the House that it seems to me that our question period is getting into a period of debate and I wondered if we

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.) might not come back to what the question period is intended to be. The question sharp and to the point and likewise the answer, in order that we can get on with the business. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Health and Social Services. Mr. Speaker, is the Minister aware of any move by the steel workers in Thompson to establish a separate clinic; and if so is the government intending to do anything to encourage the establishment of this clinic?

MR. JOHNSON: I have had no report, Mr. Speaker, at this time.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Can the Minister assure the House that any Doctors seeking to practice in Thompson, in other than the existing medical clinic, will be enabled to practice in the hospital in Thompson? Will they be extended hospital privileges, now controlled by this clinic?

MR. JOHNSON: That is the function of the hospital board, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, could the Minister ascertain from the hospital board whether any Doctors now coming to Thompson, Manitoba will be extended hospital privileges? -- (Interjection) -- Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm asking the Minister whether he will ask.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Education. Could he indicate to the House the number of classes in operation in Manitoba under the - what's commonly referred to, Program 5. I don't know whether it's still called that or - but I think it still is. And also were any applicants declined; and if so, how many?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I'd be happy to take the question as notice, if there is any question in determining what is meant by program 5. I could come back and ask the honourable member, if that's satisfactory.

While I'm on my feet, may I take the opportunity to lay on the table of the House the following annual reports. A report of the Department of Youth and Education for the year ended June 30th, 1968. The annual report of the Universities Grants Commission for the year ending March 31st, 1968, and the University of Manitoba Report of the Board of Governors to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council for the year ended March 31st, 1968.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. EDWARD I. DOW (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Minister of Education, following the Premier's statement on Friday, that the Foundation Grant contribution by the provincial government be increased to 70 percent, does this require legislation?

MR. CRAIK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, and will probably be introduced tomorrow.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders are called, I'd like to ask the Honourable Minister of Labour a question. It's with respect to the walk out at Gillam on February 15th. A Mr. Dick Dahl, a Workmen's Compensation inspector, had made a report regarding working conditions there. My question is have the recommendations in this report been carried out, and is the Minister satisfied with working conditions at Gillam now?

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Labour)(Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question, the workmen are satisfied with the conditions because they are back on the job after agreeing with management to the various problems that arose, and the conditions that were seen by the representatives of the Workmen's Compensation Board were ameliorated and that caused a settlement of the difficulty.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister of Labour aware that some dozen to 15 employees have not been taken back by the company, and is his department doing anything to prosecute this company for locking out those employees?

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, the matter has been settled between the union and management. The Department of Labour is no longer involved in it.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister telling us that the question of 15 employees who have not been taken back by the company has been settled between the union and management? My information is that that is not the case.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, the department is not involved in this matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture.

HON. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Minister of Agriculture)(Arthur): Before the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to lay on the table of the House several copies of the Canadian Wheat Board Report on the tough and damp grain situation. There are not enough copies for individual members, but I think enough for the Opposition parties.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question the other day of the Honourable Member for Carillon when he asked about credit unions in relation to the Agricultural Credit and Development Act: The Credit Union says, as I read out in the regulations, will apply to the corporation and in turn it will go through Cabinet by Cabinet Minute. It's not too clear actually, but I assume that any credit union that actually happened to be centred in an urban area and serving a rural area would be considered to be an authorized Credit Union. But I can't really give a clear answer on this.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE: I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. Will any money from the Manitoba Development Fund be involved in the establishment of a sawmill at The Pas by River Sawmill Ltd., or any of its affiliates?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of such information.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Will the Honourable Minister endeavour to obtain the information for the House?

MR. SPIVAK: I'm not aware of any information that I can give the House.

MR. HILLHOUSE: That's not answering my question. Will the Honourable Minister endeavour to "obtain" the information?

MR. SPIVAK: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Is it possible under the MDF - the way the MDF is set up for them to make equity investments?

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, under Part 2.

MR. DOERN: A supplementary question. Have they ever, in the past year, made such an investment? I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, have they in the past decade made any equity investment?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I filed the Annual Report of the Manitoba Development Fund under Part 1 and Part 2. The last report of the Fund was filed approximately 10 days ago and will contain the answer.

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, when it's possible to do so I think I should inform the House of any bond transactions entered into on the part of the Government and with your permission, Sir, I would like to make a statement now.

I would like to announce that the province has concluded a public bond issue in the United States. Some 35 million dollars worth of Province of Manitoba debentures have been sold through a group of major U. S. and Canadian bond houses. The price was negotiated yesterday, approved by Cabinet and cleared through the U. S. Securities Exchange Commission. The bonds will carry a 7-7/8 percent coupon, and are being sold at 99.729 percent, which will give the investor an effective yield of 7.90 percent. I think I should correct this statement. I read it incorrectly -- and are being sold at 99.729 dollars - not percent. And then I continue from that point - which will give the investor an effective yield of 7.90 percent.

The purpose of the issue is to make available funds which will be advanced to the Manitoba Hydro to enable it to carry on its capital construction program. The rate which we have had to pay is somewhat higher than our first issue in the United States which was negotiated last year. However, it's an unfortunate fact that the cost of money has risen very sharply in the last six months and we have had to pay a higher rate of interest in order to obtain needed capital. The terms of the issue which we have agreed to are comparable to the terms which have been approved in recent weeks by other highly rated borrowers of capital. In fact the rate which we are paying is somewhat lower than that which would be considered the going rate. When planning this issue we had decided we could use upwards of \$50 million. However, while the rate that we had been successful in achieving is lower than the going rate, I might add the issue has had a good reception; some experts suggest that there are indications that rates may

(MR. EVANS cont'd.) be more favourable in the future - hopefully in the not too distant future. The \$35 million we did borrow however, will be sufficient for Manitoba Hydro's needs in the meantime.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask the Minister a question on his statement. I'm speaking now from memory, but if I recall correctly, when we were discussing the Nelson River project it was indicated that the decision to go that way was a marginal one and that when we're dealing with hydro projects they are high users of capital. Now does the fairly major change in interest rates during the period of time since that discussion, changed the economics of the Nelson River project?

MR. EVANS: I think my honourable friend will recognize that's a pretty broad and technical question for me to answer, as it were, just on my feet and from the top of my head. I would not venture a qualified or a responsible answer informally and I'm sure that question can be entered into as we debate hydro matters or when Hydro appears before the Public Utilities Committee this year in the regular way.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, might I ask my honourable friend that before negotiations were conducted outside of the boundaries of Canada or of the Province of Manitoba, whether there were any, and if there were, what efforts were made to ask the people in Manitoba to jointly put up the money or to sponsor the need, the money - we know what the need is - in order that we can continue "growing to beat '70"; at lesser cost than the purchase of bonds outside the boundaries of Manitoba.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, before beginning on the borrowing program which the government undertakes on behalf of the utilities and certain other authorities, all of the sources of capital were examined and the amount that could be secured in Canada was estimated by our advisors, and further amounts that would have to be raised in the United States or other markets was also estimated, and it's my understanding that we are going to secure the maximum that is available to us in Canada. My honourable friend talked about Manitoba and I suppose the only instrument by which we would secure Manitoba money, as distinct from other Canadian money, would be by way of Manitoba Savings Bonds as has been done in the past, but there is no present intention of using that instrument. Consequently, we considered the amounts available in the Canadian markets, without distinguishing between provinces, found how much we could secure there and estimated what the price would be, then our requirements being still larger than that, we estimated or considered with our advisors in New York how much might be available in United States, and indeed in other markets. So I'm not able to tell my honourable friend that we contemplated any particular sum within the Province of Manitoba but we did contemplate the maximum that could be secured in the Canadian market.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: I'd like to question the Honourable Minister of Finance as to what rating does the Manitoba Government have when it comes to borrowing? I note the Moody's rating people given an AA to BC. What is our rating?

MR. EVANS: I haven't it before me at the moment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a further question to the Honourable the Minister of Finance. The statement that the Honourable Minister read would appear to contain some language, Mr. Speaker, that would indicate that this was the second borrowing in the United States. Is it not true that there are two issues already outstanding in United States?

MR. EVANS: Certainly this is the second "public issue", and I believe I referred to it in those terms: the second public issue. The first was toward the end of last year and I had some responsibility for that, having made the arrangements to clear our rating through the Securities Exchange Commission, and I feel confident I'm right in saying that was the first public issue in United States and this is now the second public issue. On previous occasions there had been some private issues, that is to say, a limited number of lenders had agreed to buy the entire issue, and that description of an issue makes it a private issue and not subject to control of the United States Exchange Commission. Consequently, I hope I said it correctly in the first place: this is the second public issue. If not, I make it clear now.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I believe that is the explanation as I understand it -- the term "public issue" perhaps makes a difference.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a further question of the Provincial

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) Treasurer. The figures to which he is referring, the dollar figures were in Canadian dollars, I presume, in his statement.

MR. EVANS: Oh, I think not. I think that the dollars quoted are the terms of the American issue. It doesn't say so here specifically and you're asking me for my opinion at this point. I must give it to you that that is what I believe to be the case. The figures I have read should be understood to be in American currency.

MR. MOLGAT: So then the repayment will be obviously in American currency when the time comes.

MR. EVANS: My understanding is this is borrowed in American funds to be repaid in American funds.

MR. MOLGAT: The cost then to us, as the Minister indicates, of 8 percent yield, or roughly 7.9 is in American dollars. What is our cost in Manitoba then for that money. Do we have to deduct the exchange rate in addition?

MR. EVANS: This becomes slightly complex. I am quite sure it would be the other way round. We're buying American funds; when we bring them to Canada we earn a premium and provided there is no difference in the exchange rate when we go to pay back then that premium is used to buy the American currency again.

MR. CAMPBELL: Might I ask the Honourable Minister if his statement included the term of the borrowing and did it also note whether or no there was a clause providing for early repayment?

MR. EVANS: I haven't those particulars. I think I'm right in recalling that the term is not mentioned in the particulars I have before me which were telegraphed to me this morning from New York. I haven't it on the paper and so I regret I'm not able to inform the House. I know of no provision that was intended to be put in the debenture itself providing for early repayment. I'm not able to answer that question.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye. The Honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. DAWSON: Mr. Speaker, much has already been said about the damp grain situation in Manitoba and I know that in reading Hansard on Friday that two things were established: (1) That it was a very serious problem. (2) That the Government had failed to act, although they admit in their latest sheet of farm propaganda, getting to do something about the damp grain; that it is an emergency measure; immediate plans must be made and something done about it if the grain is to be saved. I hope now that we will get some action, now that we have two Agricultural Ministers on the other side. You know, Mr. Speaker, it's a funny thing, this side of the House presented a resolution last year when we had a part-time Minister. It looks very much like we got to him from this side of the House because we now have two Agricultural Ministers, the second one being the new member for Morris, and I hope because of his acquisition that something will be done immediately. -- (Interjection) -- Well, there is a little.

MR. LYON: No shortage of talent over here.

MR. DAWSON: I wanted to say that apparently there's some division about whether the problem is serious or not, a division on the other side that is, because when the new member for Birtle-Russell was out campaigning he had to devote a lot of his time to drying grain, but it seems to me that at that time he and his campaign manager, in the person of the Member for Roblin, don't agree, because I read in Hansard where the Member for Roblin says, "Why should we dry damp grain? We might as well let it rot; you can't sell it anyway."

Now this is a defeatist attitude and it probably exists with many of the members on the other side, but it's a very very foolish statement because once this grain is dried it's just like money in the bank; things could change within six months. I am sure it's a statement that he will regret.

Mr. Speaker, we have 734 grain driers in Manitoba, according to the Minister of Agriculture, the first Minister of Agriculture, that is. He says there are only 259 in operation. Has he asked why there are only 259 in operation? Could one of the reasons be because the government will not exempt the tax on propane when there have been a number of requests. I don't know how many there have been to members on that side, but there have been a number of requests to me asking for some assistance. These people that are operating these driers

(MR. DAWSON Cont'd.)

feel that they want to hold down the cost to the farmer, but they can't take a licking themselves, it's impossible. I feel that one of the reasons why there are only 259 in operation is because the government refused to remove the tax.

This is a problem that is everyone's problem in Manitoba and everyone should be involved. I firmly believe that it's not too late; emergency measures should be taken immediately. There's one thought that enters through my mind that there are armed forces people in this province, they're good organizers, there are many trucks available, the Minister has mentioned himself that one of the things that he is concerned with is a shortage of trucks for getting to the grain and getting the grain back. These armed forces bases are strategically located throughout the province and there are provisions for the Minister to call on these people, provisions under the Act which is Aid to Civil Power. If the Minister was sincere I'm sure that he could adopt any one of the two suggestions I've made along with all the others.

Another thing the Minister should be doing is investigating the railway problem of shortage of cars which was mentioned by the Member for Turtle Mountain last Friday. And as I said when I stood up, Mr. Speaker, the problem was well hashed on Friday. Now's the time for action.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. LYON: I would presume that the Minister would accept it, subject to the usual reservations about obtaining permission from the Federal authority.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. LYON: We run in, I think, on this motion now to a rather complicated problem, because the House has just ordered the return of correspondence between the Government of Manitoba and the Government of Canada since August 1968 with regard to the serious problem of wet and damp grain in Manitoba in the last harvesting season. We are now presumably dealing with an Order which asks for copies of the same correspondence between the Premier and/or the Minister of Agriculture and the Prime Minister and/or any Federal Minister with respect to the processing of damp and tough grain in Manitoba, and the transportation of grain from Manitoba during the period of September 15, 1968 and February 15, 1969. In other words, there is a duplication in a large portion, with the exception only I think of the transportation and a slight difference in the date.

Furthermore, we are confronted as I recall, with a resolution on the Order Paper dealing in general terms with the same subject. I think it might be worthwhile at this point, if we could clarify, or ask you Sir to clarify for the sake of the House, whether or not there is duplication in these Orders, the extent to which the second Order is nullified by the first, and whether or not, in any case, there should be debate proceeding on an Order for Return, when there is a substantive motion appearing on the Order Paper dealing with the same subject -- not from the standpoint of trying to deny anyone the right to speak but rather from the proper standpoint, which I know you try to enforce Sir, of having the debate occur on the topic on which it can do the most good and avoiding repetitious debate in the House. So I merely raise the point because it does appear on the surface to be a bit of a confounding one.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I always love listening to my honourable friend the House Leader. He is always so keen. He is so -- (Interesting) -- pardon, -- (Interjection) -- yes, yes and I want to teach him something right now. In order that he won't make the same mistake twice. Yes, I'm speaking on the point of order, Mr. Speaker, and I suggest that

MR. LYON: speaking on a point of order and not making his usual long speech on an order that may be out of order.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder if my honourable friend would just pay a little quiet attention to what I am going to say on the point of order he raised, which isn't a point of order at all, Mr. Speaker; the point of order, if indeed my friend thought that he had one, should have been raised prior to the Resolution being introduced for discussion in this Assembly. I respectfully suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that my honourable friend go back to the archives and his bookshelves and read a few of the rules. We are now into the debate, the resolution was accepted by Your Honour the other day, notwithstanding the Order for Address for Papers which is now passed; it was debated; I introduced it; my honourable friend the Member for Rhineland

(MR. PAULLEY Cont'd.) . . . adjourned the debate and in all deference to the superior knowledge presumed of my honourable friend the House Leader, I suggest that there is a difference in the two resolutions, one dealing with the question of the processing of damp grain and also the question of transportation. So I respectfully suggest to Your Honour the Address for Papers standing in my name and under the adjournment of my honourable friend the Member for Rhineland, is properly before the House and it cannot be removed; may I suggest also, Mr. Speaker, unless by unanimous consent of the House or by a vote.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, as usual my honourable friend argues against himself. What the House has just done and why the point that I just raised is perhaps more in order now than it would have been before, is that the House has disposed of an item, a large part of which is already contained, or is presumed to be contained, in the Order which is being sought by my honourable friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party. The point becomes all the more valid that the House having disposed and voted upon a matter which is contained in his, thereby I suggest it renders his Order much more suspect than it was at the beginning, in terms of its being in order.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I respectfully suggest to my honourable friend he takes a look at the resolution, he possibly leaves the Chamber, goes into the library and does a little studying.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the honourable gentlemen for their opinions. I feel that -- I, too, considered these before they came before the House and in that the matter has gone to this extent, I am prepared to call the Honourable Member for Rhineland and the debate continue.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, in debating the previous Order the other day I made a number of comments which I do not intend to repeat on this particular occasion, but hearing the Honourable Member for Morris last night and some of the comments that he made, I feel that I would like to make a few comments in connection with the Wheat Board which is a Crown corporation of the Federal Government and whose responsibility it is to sell and dispose of our grain. I feel that if this was done properly, and that the farmers could sell their wheat, this problem wouldn't be on our hands, the problem of trying to prod the farmers to dry their grain. I think this would take care of itself.

Now how did the Wheat Board come into existence and under what powers? And when we take a look at the British North America Act here under Section 92, clause 10, sub-clause (c) and I would like to read that particular section, and I quote: "Such works as although wholly situated within the province are before or after their execution declared by the Parliament of Canada to be for the general advantage of Canada or for the advantage of two or more of the provinces". This is the section under which they feel they obtained the powers to bring about the Wheat Board and other marketing boards in Canada and the provinces, and when we take a further look at the Wheat Board Act itself, we note that this is the case, that as far as the definition of elevators they again quote "elevator means a grain elevator, warehouse or mill that has been declared by the Parliament of Canada to be a work for the general advantage of Canada". So that they are using that section to bring about and set up the Canadian Wheat Board as an agency to which farmers must now deliver and which is set up for the purpose of buying and selling our wheat. This is also borne out by the sub-clauses under Part 1, Section 4, sub-clause (a), and here are the powers that are bestowed on the Wheat Board and the object of the particular board, and I again read a certain portion: "The Board is incorporated with the object of marketing in an orderly manner in an inter-provincial and export trade, grain grown in Canada and possesses the following powers: (a) to buy, take delivery of, store, transfer, sell, ship or otherwise dispose of grain; (b) to enter into contracts or agreements for the purchase, sale, handling, storage, transportation, disposition or insurance of grain; and (c) to enter into ordinary commercial banking arrangements on its own credit and to borrow money on the security of grain held by it." So that the powers are certainly there for the organization to market the farmers' grain and they have the necessary power to borrow money for that purpose, to purchase the grain, and which is done every day. Then also they are authorized to delegate certain portions or certain powers and I think this is what happened, according to what the Member for Morris said, that the Wheat Board is delegating certain powers and which they should probably exercise themselves more fully and so that we would see better results.

Under Section 4, subsection 4, clause (g) we find, I quote: "to establish, utilize and

(MR. FROESE Cont'd.) . . . employ such marketing agencies or facilities, as it deems necessary for the purpose of its operations under this Act". So that here they also have the power to delegate some of their powers and to see that things are done. But I think, and from the following section the board is also obligated that they shall sell the grain, that they not necessarily only buy, but they are also obligated to sell the grain. And under Section 5 (1) we read: "subject to regulations, the board shall sell and dispose of grain acquired by it pursuant to its operations under this Act, for such prices as it considers reasonable, with the object of promoting the sale of grain produced in Canada in world markets". So, Mr. Speaker, I feel that when members say that the Wheat Board is not responsible to sell the farmers' grain that this is nonsense. Why else would the Wheat Board be set up in the first place; why else does this government set up marketing boards in the Province of Manitoba, when it's not for the purpose of selling and disposing of the product that they are responsible for. I certainly do not excuse the Wheat Board or its officials when our grain is not being moved. I feel that they should show results and if they can't give results, then they should be fired and get some other people to do the job, so that we get results.

So, Mr. Speaker, I still feel that if the wheat was sold that the problem of drying our wheat would be solved as a natural course of events and that we would not have to prod our farmers to get our grain dried.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question. The Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains.

MR. KAWCHUK: Mr. Speaker, I won't take too much time with this debate because I have had the opportunity to express some of my views last Friday. However, since then I have been in touch with some of the areas in this province that are seriously affected by the damp grain situation, particularly in Roblin, as well as The Pas area, and perhaps maybe it might be considered by some that it is not my responsibility or jurisdiction to conduct the survey and see what the situation is with respect to damp grain. However, in view of the fact the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture saw fit to go and investigate the situation in Vancouver, and that was a Federal responsibility, so I feel I am equally justified in conducting the survey that I did this afternoon.

However, before I do so, I would like to turn to the Hansard of last Friday and read a passage that was made by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture, and he said at that time, when he was meeting with the Federal authorities, "it was forcefully brought forward to the provinces that the provinces would be responsible for the drying of the balance of this enormous bulk of damp grain". Well if there was anything to be learned from that trip that was made to Vancouver it was the fact that the 3-bushel quota on the delivery of damp grain to the elevators wasn't going to cope with that problem and I think the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture should have got the message at that time and conducted or started to go ahead and do everything possible in this province to cope with the problem of drying grain. And in my survey this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, I contacted the ag rep in Dauphin, who had just conducted a survey last Wednesday, and he informs me that there are some 200,000 bushels of grain in the Dauphin-Ethelbert area that need to be dried and there isn't one drier going presently, and I said - "are the farmers not concerned?" And he says, they are very concerned, but the reason they are not drying is because they do not have the ready cash to spend for the drying operation. He told me that some of the farmers there are unable to pay their Hydro bills. I was also in contact with The Pas area; the ag rep was out, however, I was referred to Dr. Cotton who has a grain drier of his own and he informed me that there hasn't been one request made to dry grain; and he also informed me at the same time that there are at least 100,000 bushels of damp grain to be dried; and he further informed me that there has been substantial quantities of that grain spoiled already, sitting out in open piles on the fields that have spoiled as of now, and yet a grain drier is there and they are not drying. I asked him the same question: "why aren't the farmers drying?". And he said, they do not have the money to do it. And this government, having been informed by the Federal authorities that it will be the responsibility of the provincial government to see to it that the damp grain is dried, as is recorded by the remark made by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture, has failed to act in that respect. We have had similar emergencies occur in this province, and I do not want to re-state them, as the Honourable the Leader of the Official Opposition stated that last Friday; we have had programs where during periods of extensive drought there has been assistance made available to livestock producers by way of providing pumps and aluminium water lines to pump

(MR. KAWCHUK Cont'd.) . . . waters from wherever it was available to their dugouts or dams or whatever the case might be in order to enable to have water to water the stock during the winter, and I think that this program is of similar magnitude.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I would like to point out to my honourable friend that the farmers paid for the pumping of their dugouts.

MR. KAWCHUK: That's true, but the fact remains that there had been equipment made available. In this particular case, in the area of Dauphin, Ethelbert, Pine River, where there are some 200,000 bushels of grain to be dried there isn't a drier available. If you will check the data presented to us this afternoon, and this information was compiled as of January 31, it reveals there is only one drier in the Dauphin area, none in Fork River, none in Ethelbert, none in Pine River, one in Grandview. This is the information contained in this sheet we got this afternoon.

I don't want to stand here, Mr. Speaker, and plead with the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture that we need action. I think that his department has fully recognized there is a problem, as he stood here Friday afternoon debating the grain issue, as has been stated by my honourable friend the Member for Neepawa-Gladstone, that at the same time there was a press release being mailed out to all of us, which I was in receipt of Saturday morning at home, and in that press release it urges the farmers of this province that the damp grain is about to spoil. "Millions of bushels of Manitoba grain will spoil in the next few weeks unless farmers take precaution," say agricultural engineers in the Manitoba Department of Agriculture. Some reports of spoiled grain have already been received; some grain drier operators have stopped the driers due to high relative humidity. This is not necessary, the engineers say, and only adds to the amount of undried grain that will eventually spoil.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope, I know this government has a reputation that it sometimes doesn't seem to understand the meaning of the word "please", or the meaning of the word "request" something be done, but I, in no uncertain terms appeal to this government that if immediate action is not taken there will be vast quantities of grain spoiling in the next few days. And as the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is running all over the continent trying to bring in new industry trying to increase the gross national product for Manitoba, here is quantities of grain that's already produced, all we have to do is supply a few dollars to dry it and in turn it will produce, or would help the economy of this province.

The report I got from The Pas also indicated that the banks would not even make loans for the purpose of drying grain and I appeal to this government who seems to be always concerned about humanity, as has been outlined by the First Minister at a Provincial-Federal constitutional conference, I say to this government, if it's prepared to spend money for the industrial development in The Pas, which a lot of that money is taken from the public purse of this country and this province, then I say there is equal justification in furnishing money from the public purse to help dry this grain. -- (Interjection) --

There was an outright loan available to them and there was a lot of concessions made for these people in The Pas area. -- (Interjection) -- My friend is so sensitive on this point, Mr. Speaker, he's beginning to react as is usual when there's a very pressing problem, when it relates to rural Manitoba, especially. Who takes a sensitive feeling on that but, no other than the House Leader.

MR. LYON: My honourable friend's so unintelligible, we're just trying to find out. -- (Interjection) --

MR. KAWCHUK: Well, let's put it this way, Mr. Speaker. I will not appeal any more to this government. All I ask this government is that they take immediate action and remedy the situation. Let's dry this grain. Eventually the people of Manitoba will benefit as well as the farmer who owns the grain, as well as the Canadian people at large.

MR. WATT: Now, Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak on this particular resolution at this time, but in view of the remarks that my honourable friend has just made just now, and in view of the remarks that he has been making in the House here since the House opened, I think that I should say just a few words, and probably put him straight on the record for some of the things that he has said. And I want to say now, Mr. Speaker, that as far as the speech that I made in the House yesterday, I did not indicate that there was not a problem in the Province of Manitoba, I pointed out that there was 25 million bushels of wheat that was damp in this province and it would have to be dried. And my honourable friend apparently didn't hear me.

MR. KAWCHUK: I heard you.

MR. WATT: And he starts to read off the release from the Department of Agriculture which says exactly what I said in the House. So, I do not back away from the statements that I made at that time. Insofar as the cost of drying grain, Mr. Speaker, I'm quite aware that there is some problem insofar as a shortage of cash is concerned in the province, but we have made provisions, and I announced in the House the other day, for government guaranteed loans through the banks or lending institutions, and it is now available to farmers who need money to dry their grain. And until that source of guaranteeing revenue is depleted, I don't think that we need to move any further in that direction.

But there's a few other things that I want to mention here, Mr. Speaker, at this point. I want to say to you that I have been in the Department of Agriculture as Minister now for the past four months, and I want to say to honourable members around the House here that it has been very heartwarming in the past four months from the reception that I have got, from the grain companies, from the farm organizations all over this province, who have come to my office from time to time, who have offered me advice and who have offered to help in any area that they felt any responsibility. And I want to say further, Mr. Speaker, that since I have come to this office that I have been in contact, either by letter, by telephone or by direct personal contact with almost all the rural members. They have come to me, members from the opposition side of the House and from the government's side, representing rural constituencies, and discussed the problems in their particular constituencies. And I can say that I have appreciated the discussions, the correspondence that I have had with members opposite representing rural constituencies.

But what have I heard in the past four months from my honourable friend from Ethelbert Plains, Mr. Speaker? Not one word. As far as the Honourable Member from Ethelbert Plains is concerned, I would know nothing about the problems in his constituency. But I have learned a little about some of the problems up there, Mr. Speaker, because I have been there in that constituency myself, and I have had contact by letter and by telephone and by direct contact with responsible people up in that area, who have informed me of some of the problems. But I have heard nothing, not a word, Mr. Speaker, from the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains. Now, all I say - I should say not a word - we have heard some from him in the last few days since this House opened, since he came crashing out of the woods with his muzzle loader belching buckshot in every direction, and I look through the . . . and the garbage that has come out of the speeches that he has given in this House, and I look for some of this soul vaunted constructive criticism that is supposed to be emanating from that side of the House, and I find nothing that you could salvage from the incinerator, Mr. Speaker. I want to make it clear here, as far as I'm concerned I'm prepared to do all that I can for the farmers up in his constituency; and as far as I'm concerned, I have heard nothing and no sign of responsibility from that side of the House so far as that member is concerned. -- (Interjection) -- I'm talking about the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains.

MR. PAULLEY: What side of the House? Now let's get this straight.

MR. WATT: So, I thought probably that . . .

MR. PAULLEY: I wrote you frequently.

MR. WATT: That is correct. I'm talking about the Member for Ethelbert Plains.

MR. PAULLEY: You're talking this side of the House?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. WATT: And so I say again, Mr. Speaker, that we're watching very closely the situation insofar as damp grain is concerned; we're quite aware of it; and we are still encouraging farmers to dry their grain before the warm weather comes and we have made available, through guaranteed loans, cash for this purpose.

MR. KAWCHUK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture will submit to a question?

MR. WATT: Certainly.

MR. KAWCHUK: Well, does he not recall that he made a statement here in the House a few days ago when he introduced this new loan program, that he said if the bank refused the loan to the applicant they would have to apply to the board which would be a lengthy -- there might be a length of time involved here. And this is exactly what's happened. The farmers have already been refused the loan.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I made no reference to lengthy negotiations with the

(MR. WATT Cont'd.) . . . corporation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SAMEL USKIW (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to participate in this debate, as many others have mentioned that they also did not, but I find that I have to rise to the occasion when the Minister gets up on his feet and tries to defend a program which in fact is not a program at all, which in fact there's not even an attempt to deal with the situation. I, personally, Mr. Speaker, was involved in drying grain - wheat as a matter of fact - only a short while ago, and the total cost per bushel for the drying was 8 cents, the cost of trucking, Mr. Speaker, was another 8 cents because you require a great number of trucks to keep a drier going continuously - you're put into a position where you can't rely on your own physical resources. So, you have to hire your truckers; you have to hire your drier. The total cost, Mr. Speaker, was 16 cents a bushel as far as my own operation was concerned, and I wonder, Mr. Speaker, why the Minister feels that he has dealt with the problem when he recognizes, and he should recognize, that the farmer has already lost some 18 cents a bushel, in the price of grain since the last year, he's already lost because of the squeeze in the money market since the last year in the sense that he has to pay higher interest rates for his credit, and the Minister has the nerve to tell us here today, Mr. Speaker, that he is introducing credit legislation that is going to deal precisely with this kind of a problem.

Mr. Speaker, the other day when the Minister introduced his credit legislation, he mentioned to us that there was going to be an interest rate negotiable between the farmer and the bank or the credit union. It was an open question as to what that rate would be, which to me indicates that it could be 8 percent, it could be 10 percent, it could be 12 percent, depending on the extent of risk or at least depending on the extent of risk as far as the bank manager was concerned. So, Mr. Speaker, if you take the 18 cents a bushel that we already lost in the price of wheat, if you take into account the 16 cents that it takes to dry a bushel of wheat, if you take into account a 10 cent service charge for the credit to cover the cost of drying, you have a total of 44 cents a bushel, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MCKENZIE: But it's dry now.

MR. USKIW: I agree it's dry now, but you have spent 44 cents a bushel in these areas. The farmer is in the position of losing 44 cents a bushel. Mr. Speaker, the farmers can't afford to lose 44 cents a bushel and still stay in business, and it's in this instance that the government of Manitoba has failed, and the government of Canada has failed.

HON. THELMA FORBES (Minister of Government Services)(Cypress): Mr. Speaker. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I realize the importance of the subject as it is being discussed, but I would also like to take this opportunity to remind the honourable members that the motion is simply calling for correspondence and I wondered if we couldn't get back to that. As I said a moment ago, I realize the matter is of urgent importance but I wonder if we couldn't somehow or other curb the discussion. Now, the Honourable the Minister of Public Services.

MRS. FORBES: Well, Mr. Speaker, I was going to speak but I must bow to your decision that the proposed motion which, in my humble opinion, I think is out of order but nevertheless seeing we are discussing it, I know that you called us back to the contents of it and so I would be out of order if I continued along with the others.

MR. SPEAKER: I regret very much that the Honourable Minister found herself in that position, but I felt compelled to appeal to the House at this particular time for their co-operation in this regard. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, was the Honourable Minister challenging the Chair?

MRS. FORBES: With respect to the Chair. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. LYON: We accept this order, subject to the usual reservations, but I must say that in answering it, it will probably be answered under the Order that was passed previously.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . Mr. Speaker, because I'm asking for additional information that was not contained in the previous. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I ruled on that matter a few moments ago. Do we have to go over it again?

MR. LYON: If we are able to detect any difference we'll answer it under this Order. So far we're not able to detect it.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, am I allowed to close the debate on this Order? Is not this the same as an Order for Return, in which I have the right of closing the debate?

— (Interjection) — I take it, Mr. Speaker, that I can.

..... Continued on next page

MR. CAMPBELL: If the honourable member is going to close the debate, I think I would wish to say a few words. Mr. Speaker, with all respect to your suggestion of a moment ago with which I am in considerable measure of agreement, yet I think it should be pointed out that, taking this as a subject by itself and forgetting if we can, for a moment, that there has been quite a debate on the previous motion, the question of debating the damp and tough grain situation is, in my opinion, quite pertinent as to whether this address should be voted or not, and I think that there is, because of the urgency of the situation, there is good reason for discussing that question. Now, my own remarks will be brief. I do not need to cover the ground that has been so thoroughly covered on the other debate and this one, but...

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please. I see the Honourable Member for Lakeside wishes to proceed to discuss this, possibly to some length, I don't know, but I must assume that at this particular time. I feel that if he wishes to proceed why the House is its own master -- I feel that the Honourable the Minister of Public Services might have the same privilege.

MR. CAMPBELL: By all means, Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable the Minister of Public Services would wish to precede my few remarks I'd be delighted to allow her to go ahead.

MRS. FORBES: I would prefer the Honourable Member for Lakeside to continue.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, Mr. Speaker, it seems that we're in an unusual measure of agreement here, and if I have the permission of everybody concerned to go ahead I shall not take very long.

Now, I have listened with a good deal of interest to this discussion because I've been very close to the question of the drying of the grain that is undoubtedly now in a very vulnerable position and I certainly agree with the statements that have been made that the cost to the farmer that has already taken place is very great. No question about that. I agree with the Honourable Member for Brokenhead that, while it's quite usual to talk of 8, 10 or 12 cents a bushel for drying, that in general it costs the farmer an equal amount to do the job of drying apart from the drying itself, because the trucking, particularly if you have quite a distance to travel in order to get the storage and are carrying it back and forth, the requirement seems to be for two to three to four trucks, two to three to four men, and the cost is at least as high, I would say, for the physical handling as for the actual drying itself. So it is substantial; it is important -- there's no question about that. And certainly anyone who has not got the grain dried now should be on the job. But Mr. Speaker, so far as the areas that I am acquainted with, it's another case where the farmers have found that they have to pretty well take matters into their own hands and do the job themselves, and I am aware of driers in the constituency of Lakeside that already, at this time, have the one crew, have dried more than 100,000 bushels of grain and have done it well without a single sample, without a single batch being turned back as either overdone or improperly dried. Well, this can be done. I'm aware of other areas where, through local organization sometimes spearheaded by the elevator district of the particular village, that they have organized to use facilities which have been purchased on a community basis or where they have rented from a private individual who already was in possession of a drier, and have set up the facility at the most convenient spot, usually the elevator itself, and have dried a huge quantity. And while I always enjoy, under these circumstances, the opportunity to berate the government, particularly this government, and whereas these times I'm not too backward about berating the Federal Government a bit too, I do recognize the difficulty that governments face in trying to cope with a matter like this. It's just about got to be done primarily by the people themselves.

Mr. Speaker, if it wasn't trespassing upon your patience, because I know that this debate has gone on quite a while, I would be inclined to tell you about the story that used to appear in the, I think it was the Third Reader when I was a youngster going to school and it told about the lark who built her nest in the hay meadow and she became very concerned when she heard the farmer saying to his sons that the hay would soon be ready to harvest, and she told the little larks that while she was away foraging for food that they must listen carefully to what the farmer said. When she came home the first night she found the little larks in a great state of alarm because they had heard the farmer say to his sons, "The hay is ready to harvest; go out and ask your friends and neighbours to come in and help us cut down the hay." The little larks were quite worried but the mother lark said: "There's no concern yet." And then the next night when she came home they were still more alarmed because the little larks had heard the farmer say to his sons: "The friends and neighbours didn't come but go out and we'll round up your uncles and cousins and get them to come and cut down the hay." She said: "There's no

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd) cause for alarm yet." But the next night when she came home the little larks said that they had heard the farmer say to his sons: "We'll sharpen up the scythes and cut down the hay ourselves." And she said, "Now we've got to move."

Well, Mr. Speaker, the most of the farmers have been used, through the years - and I'm sorry that they have had to become accustomed in this way - but they have been used through the years to meeting these hazards that face them in one form and another time and time again. They've had to learn to live with these hazards, and goodness knows, I have all the sympathy in the world for the position that they're put into, but usually they sharpen up their own scythes and they get to work and they do the job, by themselves, by cooperation one with another, and even a hazard of this kind I think you'll find that they're going to get the most of it saved this spring. That doesn't mean that it isn't a tremendous loss to the farmers. It doesn't mean that it isn't a tremendous loss to the economy as a whole, because I'm one of those who believes in spite of the present pessimism of people much better informed than myself, I'm still one of those who believes that the food value that is inherent in these crops that we're having so much difficulty to sell now, will eventually mean that they will be marketed.

In the meantime, a tremendous problem faces these farmers and I do join in the concern that's been expressed for those who find themselves unable to finance this work. Certainly there is cost involved. My own guess is, though, that you will find that it will not end up by being as big a loss as most of the people have been predicting. And so, though I recognize the difficulties, I have so much confidence in the resourcefulness of the farmers themselves that I give them the credit of being the people who are going to pull this very tough deal out of the damp situation in the long run, and while I don't think that either the Federal or Provincial Government deserves very much credit in the situation, because I think neither of them has been able to extend it in an effective way up to date, while I don't see that they deserve very much credit, I'm not inclined to give them a great deal of blame except that that attaches to politicians so frequently -- I really think this attaches more to the Federal Government than to the Provincial one -- of trying to pretend three or four months ago that they were going to be able to do something about it. The farmers, as usual, have sharpened up their own scythes. I think they'll pull most of this crop out without too much loss.

MR. SPEAKER: I noted with some interest that we received the story of the bird anyway.

I regret the position that the House is in at the moment. However, I would like to call upon the Minister of Public Services if she so desires to rise at this time on this particular subject. I believe it only fair.

MRS. FORBES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My remarks shall be brief because certainly the Honourable Member for Lakeside, who just took his seat, covered the point that I was attempting to make and that is that I was thinking that in the good old days - and many of us don't like to go back to them - but I must say that they had the initiative to get together, to work out the problems that beset them when a catastrophe did happen to come upon the land, and I certainly know that we still have a good many people who feel the same, and when something happens they do have the initiative to either get together in groups or to set about it by themselves even though it takes a great deal of time. But I am afraid that there are far too many people in our midst today that, as soon as something does happen, they do shout and say: "What is the government going to do about it?" Well, if we are going to get the task done, and I believe that the farmers of this province will get it done, they will set about getting it done themselves and find ways and means, but I do recognize the fact that we live in different circumstances today and our costs are greater, and certainly I agree with the Honourable Member for Brokenhead when he mentioned the fact that the cost of drying was only one item; it's actually doubled by the other items which include trucks and help.

Mr. Speaker, in our own area our farmers knew the plight that they were going to be in, and they certainly did not have the cash because they too have not even sold the crop that they had from the year previous, let alone this year's, and so they do find themselves very short of cash. But in that area they did get to either buy a grain drier - and probably went into debt to do so - or they banded together in groups and bought the grain drier. And I think that I might say here that many farmers today have taken the position that a grain drier is going to be a piece of equipment that farmers will have to have, probably not individually, maybe this is too great to expect and too great an expense, but if we are going to take our crops off we probably have to have grain driers in our midst because we could be beset by wet weather many a fall, and with the expense that farmers are putting into crops now by the use of fertilizers, good

(MRS. FORBES cont'd) seed, larger acreage and so on, they have to make sure that they can take that crop off, and I believe that just as combines and other expensive pieces of equipment are necessary for the operation of a farm, one of them will be a grain drier in the future.

Now, the one thing that I think could be the cure, and I'm sure that we all agree in this House that it is the cure, that if the farmers could sell their produce, if they had a fair return for the crops that they do produce, then we would not be in this plight; and I admit that when it does become a catastrophe to the extent and size that it has in this particular year, that certainly governments do have to move in and attempt to do what they possibly can, and of course it is difficult. And regardless of whether I am a portion of the government here today, and all others or those of the Federal Government, it is a difficult situation to meet something head-on when a catastrophe like this happens. But nevertheless, I say to you that the farmers of this province still have the initiative to look after themselves if possible, and that possible ways for them to look after themselves is to be able to sell the produce that they do produce, then we in this House, and I believe in all other Houses, have to bend our efforts to attempting to sell it so that they will have a fair return and they won't find themselves in the position where they can't possibly rent, purchase or provide themselves with the necessary tools to carry on their job.

I thank you Mr. Speaker, for giving me this opportunity to say a few words and I apologize to you for saying, with due respect to the Chair, that I did think this was out of order but seeing that others had spoken on it I thought that probably I would like to get into the debate myself. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, listening to the remarks that have been made by the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: . . . could we remind the honourable member, and all honourable members, that we're still looking for the papers as called for by . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I think that your statement in this regard has good judgment, and I would like to remind yourself, Mr. Speaker, and the members of this House, that this party, this group was all alone last year; we were the only ones to vote in favour of the rule being that where there is a request for papers and the request is granted, that there be no debate whatsoever, because if the request is made and the government offers to comply with the request, we don't see the question as really being debatable.

MR. SPEAKER: I don't think we should get into a debate on the rules of the House at this particular time. Would you please come back to the proposed motion. If you wish to speak on that, I am waiting to hear you.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I did wish to speak on that point and you rose to your feet and, I may say with respect, you distracted me. But I will now get back to the point. I had intended, Mr. Speaker, not to speak in this particular debate but the last two speakers have caused me to rise to my feet. I originally thought, well, I'll have an opportunity because my particular resolution is first on the Order Paper and maybe I will be able to intertwine my remarks in speaking on that subject, but to be strictly in order I thought it would be better to get up on the resolution itself and that's what I've done.

No, Mr. Speaker, particularly the last speaker, the Minister of - what do we call her now? - the Minister of Government Services made some remarks which hit me as an individual because she referred to a spirit of getting together and doing things for themselves, and she referred to this as being in the good old days. She also referred to the fact that some people are continually asking for other people to do work for them. In this case I take it that there is some suggestion by some people that the government has responsibility in connection with the disaster that has arisen in the farm communities with regard to the damp grain. I think that we recognize that there was a public responsibility that arose when, for instance, we had the City of Winnipeg inundated by a flood. This was a disaster which called upon us to work together, as a government, to deal with that particular problem and I, Mr. Speaker, who I think would probably be identified by the Minister of Government Services as one who thinks that the government has a role to play in this area, I've always had, as an individual, exactly the spirit that she describes, that when there is a problem the way to solve that problem is to get a group together and deal with it.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, why she doesn't consider this Assembly as a group that has gotten together to deal with that problem. Does she consider that we are not here doing the very thing that she says that people should do, and in the very best way: by sending an elected

(MR. GREEN cont'd) representative to get together with every other elected representative in the province so that we can, as individuals, solve this problem by getting together and dealing with it? Because I see no difference between the spirit that she describes, of people getting together and handling a problem, and the spirit in which I sit in this Assembly as an individual who sees that the public is faced with certain problems and that the way in which we can handle those problems is to get together and get down to business and deal with them. Now why does she limit that point of getting together? Why does she close the door of getting together at that Chamber door? When we get into this room, what she is saying is that we no longer get together to handle the problem. Now, Mr. Speaker, my concept is exactly the opposite. I believe that we are doing exactly what she has suggested we do, and I believe that we are doing it in the best possible way, that is, in the democratic fashion by sending a group of elected representatives to discuss the problem, to deal with it, and to get together to handle it. I think that's what we are doing in this Chamber.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak, I would like to say a word or two in connection with the Address for Papers.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the honourable gentleman only has a word or two to say. I am waiting to hear it with interest.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, maybe I was a little premature in describing it that way, Mr. Speaker. What I intended to imply to you, I wanted to speak on the Address for Papers and outline what I have in mind, and I appreciate the very verbose debate that we have had, and I have found so many who are farmers and so many who are not farmers - as indeed I am not - become overnight experts in the field of damp grain. I do not profess to be an expert in the field of agriculture, particularly respecting damp grain. I do consider myself, however, a Manitoban who is concerned with the economic future and progress of Manitoba. I do recognize that, as a result of the adverse climatic conditions prevailing last year, there has been a considerable loss of revenue to the farmers of Manitoba. I do recognize the fact that there are still some 20-odd or 30 millions of bushels of damp grain at various points in the province. I do recognize, according to the most recent statistics that I have been able to obtain, that not only has the agricultural industry been affected but the farm machinery industry has been affected, and I am not going to talk as to whether or not we can receive a tractor from Great Britain at \$20,000 less than it's produced here in Canada, but the very fact that as a result of the lessening of the income to the agricultural industry here in Manitoba, approximately \$18 million less has been spent in farm machinery and implements than there was the year before, and I am sure that I don't have to tell my friend the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce, or my bearded friend, if he would but listen instead of talk, how much this really means to Manitoba. It means a lot to Manitoba so I want to know, by this Address for Papers, what the true situation is. I discount what my friend the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture had to say about my colleague from Ethelbert Plains, and I do so because I am sure that my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture is quite aware of the fact that I wrote him one or two letters dealing with the urgency of having something done in respect of damp grain.

Now we on this side of the House, or in this particular party in the House, don't have to act individually. We are a group of individuals who collectively are concerned with the problems of Manitoba, and I would like, Mr. Speaker, to tell my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture that just simply prior to writing the letter that I did, I had a telephone call from my colleague from Gilbert Plains, the member for Ethelbert Plains, asking me, because of my availability and the fact of facilities here, to raise the question with my honourable friend, so when my honourable friend stands up and attempts in this House to chastise my colleague from Ethelbert Plains, I suggest he take another look at the situation.

But Mr. Speaker, in this Order for Return, in all due respect to my keen, learned, capable, exuberant friend, the leader of the House, the Attorney-General, I respectfully suggest that I will not be satisfied and I am sure, Mr. Speaker, you would not be or any member of this House would be satisfied, if the Address for Papers, which they are prepared to accept apparently, were but a duplication of the Address for Papers which passed a short time ago. I suggest that there are two or three differences. I want to know -- (Interjection) -- well, my honourable friend can vote against it and he has just the type of mentality in some respects, so dog-headed and pig-headed, in many respects, Mr. Speaker, that he might change his mind, simply...

MR. SPEAKER: I just wanted to offset anything that may happen in the future with regard to language. It's on the way up I notice.

MR. PAULLEY: May I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker, that one of the greatest parliamentarians the world has ever known, that champion of democracy who led the world through the Second World War, Sir Winston Churchill, used exactly the same terms as I did, in the House of Commons, and it's not with malice, may I assure you.

MR. SPEAKER: I would hope the honourable member would not misunderstand me. It isn't what he has already said; it's what I anticipate he might say.

MR. PAULLEY: In all due respect, your Honour, you could anticipate what I would like to say, but may I assure you I will not say what you are anticipating I should say. There is a difference.

What I want to say in respect to the remarks and the interjection of my friend the Attorney-General, that this resolution deals with the question of the processing of damp grain. My honourable friend just says -- oh, I don't know if the Honourable the Minister of Health can aid his stomach ache -- he seems to be in pain. Possibly if somebody has a tum or two they might hand it to my educated friend, but there is a difference first of all in the question of processing, but there is another very important aspect of the agricultural industry in Manitoba and in Canada that my honourable friend, who is so wont to sit in his surroundings in his office and is not aware of, and I refer to the very important aspect of agriculture, namely transportation.

MR. LYON: I mentioned that an hour ago.

MR. PAULLEY: My honourable friend mentions lots of things. One of these days he will realize what he says. I hope that I'm still around. My honourable friend knows what he is talking about, because in the few years that I've been in this company here in this House, I have come to the conclusion quite frequently my honourable friend knows not what of he speaketh -- invariably and consistently. But I want to say that my honourable friend the Attorney-General, I presume, sat in on a council meeting of the government that decided that because of the transportation difficulties being experienced in the export of wheat, that they sent the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture all the way out to Vancouver to see what was obvious, that there were ships in the harbour that were not being loaded with grain to be sold and shipped to the parts of the world that required it.

Now I don't know if my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture was around or whether or not he was in one of his typical dazes, but send the Minister of Agriculture they did to Vancouver to look into the situation. The federal Minister of Trade, the federal Minister of Agriculture and one other expressed repeatedly the concern that they had over the question of the transportation of grain and the lack of availability at that time of box cars, etc., for the transport of grain and this was public knowledge, I presume Mr. Speaker, to everyone except my honourable friend the Minister, the Attorney-General. I want to know what this government did, if they did anything, in trying to get the offices of the federal administration to act with the railroads to make available cars for the transport of grain. I don't think I have to tell many of the rural members on that side or this side of the House that the granaries in Manitoba were chock-full of grain, that the quota was down to 3 bushels and in some -- down to 3 or up to 3; you can go up and down but the figure of 3 was the majestic figure -- because they couldn't take any more because it wasn't moving. Appeals were made to have available space in cars, railroad cars; and at the same time, Mr. Speaker, that the farmer was expressing concern over granaries and elevators being filled, the railroads themselves and the personnel on the railroads were on short time because the trains weren't moving. And yet my honourable friend, the agricultural expert from Fort Garry, suggests that this Address for Papers is the same as the other one. What poppycock! What nonsense! So typical -- so typical of my honourable friend. And he says do I want it or do I not. If that is the attitude of my honourable friend, so childish, so picayune and so small, if that is the attitude of my honourable friend, refuse the order. And I dare him to refuse the order.

MR. LYON: We've already accepted it. What are you arguing about?

MR. PAULLEY: Why are you suggesting that we are not going to get it?

MR. LYON: What are you talking for?

MR. PAULLEY: I am not arguing for it. I am arguing against the idiotic approach of my honourable friend, the Attorney-General. Never at any time in recent months have I ever come across such idiotic nonsense as is coming from the lips of one who is presumed to be an

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) intellect and presumed to be one who has at heart the problems of Manitoba and, in particular, the problems of agriculture.

So Mr. Speaker, with these few words I am content to have the government, through its House Leader, accept or reject . . .

MR. LYON: He's accepted.

MR. PAULLEY. . . . for they have the majority. My honourable friend says, "We accept it." Who "we" is, I don't know because he said just a few moments ago, "Keep quiet or we might not accept it."

Forked tongues - and it's so typical, Mr. Speaker, of my honourable friend he doesn't know whether he's coming or whether he's going.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. LYON: I should just reiterate that we accept the Order subject to the extent that it is not duplicated in the one that was passed earlier.

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

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I made most of the remarks which I intended to make on this resolution on last Private Members' day and I'll take the floor merely to summarize the remarks that I made and the reason for bringing this resolution forward.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if I may interrupt the honourable gentleman for just a moment. I maybe have some information that may be of interest to him. I have been given to understand you spoke the last time for 29 minutes so you have 20 minutes on this occasion if you wish to continue.

MR. GREEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that it is now 5:00 o'clock and this is the first Private Members' resolution that we have come to, and subject to your injunction, Mr. Speaker, I would like to indicate that we did propose a method by which this would not happen last year but it was voted down by all the other groups.

Mr. Speaker, the present resolution, as I indicated previously, is inspired by the fact that there appears to be a race amongst various provinces, indeed amongst various municipalities, to attract either development of one kind or another through the offering of tax incentives or tax concessions. This has been a procedure which has been applied towards trying to lure resource developments in the Province of Saskatchewan. It has been employed by the Province of Alberta in the estate taxes in an attempt to lure apparently wealthy people to reside in that province.

Now Mr. Speaker, we have indicated that this particular procedure is self-defeating to the organizations that partake in them and certainly will result, in the last analysis, in the situation being exactly as it would be without the incentive and the people suffering by virtue of the incentives which have been granted. In summary, Mr. Speaker, I think that the following facts should be obvious by a reasonable analysis of the situation.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, the objective of the development of resources should be that these resources should be developed in such manner as would provide the greatest return to the people of the province.

Secondly, that given the development of resources -- let us assume no incentives -- the more that is conceded or paid to the developer, the less that will be returned to the people of the province.

Thirdly, competition by incentives to attract development will increase the share of the developer and decrease the share of the province.

Fourthly, in any auction bidding to attract development, the stronger provinces have a distinct advantage over the economically weaker provinces and I would put the Province of Manitoba in that category, and Mr. Speaker, I think we have had a graphic example of that particular situation develop just recently where it's indicated -- and my colleague the Leader of this party has raised this point -- where it is indicated that the city of Winnipeg may lose a particular manufacturing contract by virtue of tax incentives which have been granted in another province which make it impossible for the City of Winnipeg to compete.

Now one might say, well, the obvious answer is to give an equivalent tax concession, but I don't think so, Mr. Speaker, because that answer means that the public generally in both provinces will lose. I think that there has to be a common understanding that a natural resource, or that the development of a natural resource, will not be unnaturally attracted to one province or another by reason of a false incentive of that kind, and I think that, Mr. Speaker,

(MR. GREEN cont'd) our province is the one that would profit from an understanding of this kind. So the fifth proposition, Mr. Speaker, is that a provincial understanding in this area would benefit all provinces, no one could lose by it, and would certainly benefit the Province of Manitoba in particular.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in closing I'd like to indicate that there has been a very recent development which I think throws the lie to suggestions that tax incentives or tax concessions are the way of attracting industry of one kind or another. I know that the Minister of Finance, who is now occupied, but I'd like him to hear what I have to say -- if he won't listen I can't force him to -- the Minister of Finance has often indicated that budgetary measures which have been proposed by the Honourable Member for St. John's would not be of value to the Province of Manitoba since they would chase away industry or chase away development of one kind or another. Now Mr. Speaker, if indeed the Minister of Finance's propositions are correct in that regard, then we won't need any tax incentives in the Province of Manitoba because if his proposition is correct the Province of Ontario is going to chase away all of the developments, all of the high income groups, by reason of the adoption of certain propositions in a white paper which has recently been revealed in that province.

I'd like to note, Mr. Speaker, that some of the things that this party has always spoken about and some of the things that the Member for St. John's has asked for in his budgetary addresses are: (1) Increased personal or corporate income taxes. (2) A capital gains tax. (3) Increased share of the natural resources, and as late as the other day, a rebate of sales tax to those lower income groups.

Now Mr. Speaker, let's listen to a summary of what the Province of Ontario, a good, solid, business, free enterprise province has said in its White Paper on taxation: "After all, a fiscal policy which opts for an independent, provincial income tax system, which promises a capital gains tax, which admits the huge mining industry has been taxed too lightly in the past, which talks of differentiating sales taxes designed to hit the rich and spare the poor and which accepts the guaranteed income principle, is, to say the least, completely out of character for a government dyed in the true blue conservatism of another era."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I remember the couplet that was framed by my honourable friend the Minister of Finance last year when he said -- in referring to the Member for St. John's' speech, he said: "For financial hallucinations, try a little NDP" and then he proceeded not to try it. But apparently his brother government headed in the Province of Ontario is not unwilling to try a little NDP, and I wish them success in their venture.

But in any event, Mr. Speaker, if, if what my honourable friend says is true, if these things are going to chase resources from the Province of Ontario, then we won't need any incentives. Just let them enact the legislation and, according to the Minister, the industry will just run out of Ontario as fast as they can into the affluent Province of Manitoba, in which they would prefer to do business. I don't think it will happen but, nevertheless, if that's the way of chasing away development the Province of Ontario has certainly opted for it.

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

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Dufferin, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. John's and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Selkirk in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. JAMES COWAN Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of the House to allow this matter to stand. If someone else would like to speak it would certainly be all right. (Agreed).

MR. SPEAKER: In regard to the next item, I'm afraid this has been misplaced. According to our Rule No. 60, subparagraph 2, that resolution in favour of the Leader of the New Democratic Party should be at the bottom of the list where it will appear on the next occasion of its reprint.

The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Burrows. The Honourable Member for Carillon.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): In the absence of the honourable member may we have this matter stand? (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate, the Honourable Member for Burrows. The

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd).... Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. FRED T. KLYM (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I beg the indulgence of this House to have this resolution stand. (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. John's. The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE: I didn't know whether we were going to reach this or not. Well, what I have to say, Mr. Speaker, in respect of this resolution is going to be supplementary to what the Honourable Member for St. John's has said, as I don't want to be repetitious and refer to the various documents and to the various arguments that have been put forward by the honourable member. But I do wish to make this point, and that is this: that crime in Canada is ever-increasing and I think it is a fact that there are over 40,000 crimes of violence reported to Canadian police each year. It's true that considerable effort is being expended in the apprehension, trial and rehabilitation of offenders, but with the exception of two or more Canadian provinces, little or no attention is being paid to victims of those crimes. It is true that our law does provide a civil remedy to any person who suffers an injury or damages as a result of a crime, but in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, this right is more illusory than real. It is also true that under our various social welfare legislation and schemes, some victims of crimes of violence may obtain some measure of assistance but the benefit of such schemes do not provide full reparation to everyone victimized by crime.

In 1967, the Osgoode Law School undertook a study of compensation for victims of crime, and fortunately, in the February, 1969 issue of The Canadian Bar Journal there is a very illuminating article written there by Professor Linden, to which I would like to refer. Now this study by the Osgoode Hall, the method used by them, and I'm quoting from Page 18 of that issue of the Canadian Bar Journal, it says: "The Osgoode Hall Law School research staff was given access, on a confidential basis, to the files of the Metropolitan Toronto Police Department where the reports of crimes committed in Toronto are collected. The serious crimes of violence that occurred in the year 1966 in Toronto were selected for study. The records of 431 cases were extracted for detailed study, including six capital murder, four non-capital murder, six attempted murder, two manslaughter, 22 rape and attempted rape, 138 woundings, 249 robbery, and four criminal negligence causing death or injury.

"The method which was pursued by the Osgoode Hall Law School was to send out a letter to each one of these persons who had been affected by these crimes, containing a questionnaire to be answered by these people and explaining the reason why they wanted that questionnaire answered. Subsequently, that letter was followed up by a second letter and by telephone calls. As a result of these efforts, 172 completed questionnaires were assembled for a response rate of 39.9 percent. Finally, only 167 of the forms composed of 11 rape, 31 woundings, and 125 robbery cases were processed and analyzed.

"Now, the study of these returns received by the Osgoode Law School showed that some economic loss was suffered by 74.2 percent of the people responding. The balance of 25.8 percent either had no expense as a result of their experience or they did not know whether they incurred expense. All of the rape victims studied indicated that they had incurred some economic loss as a result of their experience. Eighty-eight percent of those wounded stated that they suffered some expense and 68.8 percent of the robbery victims claimed some loss. The type of losses suffered by the respondents included medical, hospital, salary and property losses.

"Now, if we take each one of these offences separately, we find that the rape cases yielded medical expense in 81.8 percent of the occasions, hospital costs in 81.8 percent of the cases, salary loss of 45.4 percent of the instances, and property loss in 36.3 percent of the cases. In the wounding cases a similar pattern emerges - 80.6 percent of these victims incurred medical expenses, 87.1 percent hospital costs, 35.1 percent salary loss, and 25.8 percent property loss. In the robbery cases, there seemed to be less physical injury inflicted but, understandably, more property loss. Here 24 percent required medical attention, 22.4 percent hospital care, 23.2 percent suffered salary loss, and 60 percent incurred property loss. There were, of course, many individuals who suffered more than one type of loss and a number of them incurred all four types of loss."

Now this study further revealed, Mr. Speaker, that in spite of the fact that an individual who receives an injury as a result of a crime, or who suffers a loss as a result of a crime, in spite of the fact that that individual has a civil remedy at law, that remedy became more

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd) illusory than real, and the article, reading from page 21 shows this: "That doubts had been voiced about the efficacy of the legal right to collect damages. Because of this, the Osgoode Hall Research Team set out to discover how this theoretical tort right was translated into monetary compensation in practice. Probably the most startling finding of the study was how illusory tort right was, only 1.8 percent of the respondents collected anything from their attackers; that is, three individuals out of 167 people studied. Not only was the tort recovery rare but very few of the victims even considered suing. Fewer consulted a lawyer about their legal rights and still fewer attempted to secure reparation. Only 14.9 percent of all the respondents considered suing; only 5.4 percent consulted a lawyer; and only 4.8 percent actually tried to collect from their attackers."

Now the article goes on to give the reasons why there was such a poor recovery pattern, and it says that the most common response to the question of why no suit was brought was: "I did not think it was worth it."

"The father of a child victim case No. 7119, who was robbed of a few cents he had collected for UNICEF on Hallowe'en explained: 'The amount involved was too small to bother with.'

"In other cases the attacker was thought - probably right - to be financially irresponsible. Furthermore, one cannot collect damages from someone whose identity is unknown or from someone who is never caught. Some respondents felt that it would be too expensive for them to launch a civil suit, a situation that should now be eliminated by the event of Legal Aid becoming a fact in the Province of Ontario. Others did not realize that it was possible to sue their assailant civilly, while still others believed, wrongly, that their private rights were extinguished when the state punished the accused. A good number of people just wanted to forget the whole thing, as for example, Case 6004, a wounded victim, who in response to the question why he did not sue, explained, 'I wanted nothing more to do with it.' The Osgoode Hall study therefore disclosed that the tort suit, although in theory available to assist the crime victim, is in practice powerless to do."

Now this study further showed that in spite of the welfare benefits that were available to victims of crime in some form or other, there was still a large gap between the injuries or damages that these people received and the compensation which they received from welfare schemes.

And the article goes on to show that, of the 167 victims of crime studied, 93 were left with some out-of-pocket loss at the end of the day. Therefore, a majority of 55.7 percent of the respondents failed to receive full reimbursement for the expenses they incurred as a result of being raped, robbed or wounded. The rape victims fared the worst with 72.7 percent suffering out-of-pocket losses. The wounded victims did less badly with 64.5 percent incurring out-of-pocket loss. The robbery victims emerged with 52 percent, bearing some out-of-pocket loss. These data indicate that present tort and non-tort regime do not supply anywhere near full reparation to the people victimized by crime.

Now, I know from remarks that I have heard in this House, that there are some people here who wonder why a victim of crime should be compensated, and I think it would be worthwhile to call to the attention of the House the reasons given by Professor Linden in this article as to why he feels that the victims of crime should be compensated. And his reasons are, quoting from page 26: "There are reasons why we should single out the crime victim from the others at this time. Because the state has undertaken to protect individuals from criminal attacks by others, it should compensate its citizens when its security system breaks down. In other words, the state owes a moral, if not a legal, obligation to crime victims because it has assumed the responsibility for crime prevention. One variant of this argument is that, when citizens pay taxes toward the upkeep of a police force, they are in a sense buying insurance against loss as a result of crime, and thus they should be reimbursed by the state for any expense accruing to them as a result of this. A further contention in a similar vein is that, when the state establishes police protection, citizens are forced into a false sense of security. They cease carrying weapons to protect themselves and therefore are helpless in the face of a criminal attack. The state, therefore, because it made people rely on it for such protection, should bear the cost of the failure of that system. It may be that we could have proved crime detection by providing financial compensation for crime victims. There are many crimes that are never reported to the police. If the victim of a crime had the opportunity of receiving financial aid from the state, he might report a crime that otherwise he might not have. Consequently, the profit motive might operate here, as it does

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd) elsewhere in society, to stimulate better law enforcement."

Now the article goes on to say, on page 27: "Another reason to aid the crime victim has to do with consistency. It is inconsistent and unjust when the convicted murderer is confined to a prison where he is looked after for the rest of his life, while the widow of that murderer's victim is left to fend for herself. This inconsistency and injustice becomes even more pronounced when one realizes that the widow of someone killed by an uninsured motorist can collect up to \$35,000 in damages from an Unsatisfied Judgment Fund, but the widow of someone murdered by an uninsured and penniless murderer can collect nothing. Those who opposed the creation of a crime victim compensation scheme usually warn about the flood of fraudulent and undeserving claims that will be advanced. They fear that people will inflict injuries upon themselves or have relatives or friends do it, allege that an unknown assailant had done it, and claim compensation. If this were a real problem rather than an imaginary one, efficient investigation and the requirements of an early report to the police would solve it.

"Lastly, there is the worry about the costs of such a program and the additional burden that will be placed on the already overburdened taxpayer. Those who utilize this argument tend to point to the widespread welfare legislation, its enormous cost, and suggest that it is directed at assisting everyone including the victims of crime. But they are unduly concerned, for the expense of those jurisdictions that have adopted crime victim reparation plans shows that it is an inexpensive program. Only \$40,000 was appropriated in Saskatchewan for the first year of its plan, and only \$100,000 is allocated in California annually. In the United Kingdom a total only of 880,833 pounds was paid out to victims in 1966-67, while administrative costs amounted to 93,534 pounds. In Canadian dollars that is about \$2 1/2 million per year for a population that is about two and a half times the size of Canada.

"The individual awards in England have been small, 28 percent being below 100 pounds; 54 percent being between 100 pounds and 399 pounds; 11 percent being between 400 pounds and 999 pounds. Only seven percent of the awards exceeded 1,000 pounds. Of course, awards may well be higher in Canada because the standard of living is higher, but in any event the creation of such a program need not be a very costly one, as it is feared by some of its opponents. Because of these reasons, and because the cost would not be inordinate, Canadian crime victims should be granted protection."

Now the learned author goes on to set out the mechanics of the various compensation boards, but I don't think I'll deal with these. In Manitoba, the mechanics in respect of our Act, which is an amendment to the Attorney-General's Act, is simply a letter written to the Attorney-General, he refers it to a judge of the Court of Queen's Bench, an investigation is made, and if it's found that that victim has suffered damages, he will recover a certain amount of money - and there is a limitation.

It's true that the Resolution moved by the Honourable Member of St. John's is by way of censure, but I feel that it would be unjust and unfair not to extend to the government what we extend to an ordinary criminal: that is, the right of a second chance, and for that reason I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, the following amendment:

That the Resolution be amended by adding thereto the following:

"And Be It Further Resolved that in the interest of natural justice, and in order to give the government an opportunity of redeeming broken promises, this House urges the government to immediately reconstitute the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders in the hope that such committee, among other things and matters, will give favourable consideration to enlarging the scope of the present Manitoba law by making compensation available and payable to any person, or his spouse or dependent in the event that such person is deceased, who has suffered personal injuries directly attributable to a criminal offence or to acts of crime prevention, that is (a) the arrest or attempted arrest of a suspected offender; (b) the prevention or attempted prevention of the commission of an offence; and (c) in assisting a police officer while engaged in (a) or (b) above.

"And Be It Still Further Resolved that such committee be convened immediately following its reconstitution, and that a notice of such meeting be published in such news media as will ensure the greatest possible public participation thereat."

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, before you present the resolution I wonder, in view of the lateness of the hour, if you might consider holding the amendment until we have had a time to consider the same - and you too - as to it being in order or otherwise. It is rather late.

MR. SPEAKER: I proposed to put the question on the resolution, on the amendment.

MR. PAULLEY: Pardon?

MR. SPEAKER: I say, I propose to put the question to the House on this amendment.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . is that the amendment be held in order that we might have an opportunity of considering the same in view of the resolution as proposed by the Member for St. John's. If it is presented, then it's true an adjournment can be made, but then that properly puts the amendment before the House, and this is my point, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: You're suggesting that . . .

MR. PAULLEY: In other words, if you . . .

MR. SPEAKER: . . . be left open in the name of the Honourable Member for Selkirk, is that right?

MR. PAULLEY: Pardon? No, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that you hold the amendment in view of the hour, being the termination of Private Members until next we meet.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, Mr. Speaker, if you feel that the motion or the amendment is not in order I think that that's the proper course of action, but if you feel it's in order, then I think . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Well, we could raise the point anyway, Gil.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm not being given that chance by the suggestion from the floor. However, I will take the amendment under advisement.

MR. PAULLEY: That's fine.

MR. SPEAKER: . . . the House care to call it 5:30? It is now 5:30 and I'm leaving the Chair to return again at 8:00.