

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, July 7, 1971

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): . . . have a ministerial statement, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to table a Return to an Order of the House No. 15 on the motion of the Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C. (Leader of the Opposition) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the First Minister. I wonder whether the First Minister can indicate whether the government is seized of the information by the former Assistant General Manager of Manitoba Hydro that professional engineers have altered the facts to fit their conclusions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): I'm well aware that the former Assistant General Manager of Manitoba Hydro has a certain point of view with respect to Hydro development.

MR. SPIVAK: Did the Assistant General Manager inform the government and the First Minister of the conclusions that were reached which he said were not correctly based on the facts?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'm aware of the fact that the professional staff of Manitoba Hydro includes a number of professional engineers, that the Board of Directors of Manitoba Hydro now includes a number of professional engineers, three or four, three to be exact, and I have heard no such indication from any of them.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder whether the First Minister can indicate whether he has had an opportunity to discuss with Mr. Kristjanson his allegations.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, quite some time ago I did have a brief conversation with the gentleman referred to and it was clear to me that this individual did have a very definite point of view with respect to the future development of Manitoba Hydro. It was a point of view which was not shared by the majority of the Board of Directors nor by this government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture and ask him if he has had an opportunity to determine whether or not the government has in fact rescinded the regulations pertaining to the Egg Marketing Board. The question was asked in the House last night and the First Minister agreed to take this under consideration.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, we didn't pass any regulations. We proposed to pass regulations which were then referred to the courts. We did not in fact pass regulations in Manitoba.

MR. JORGENSEN: I wonder if the Minister of Agriculture could answer the further question that I enquired of the First Minister last night relating to the movement of eggs into the Province of Quebec. I'm not sure whether he is familiar with the details of that question, but if he's not I'd be glad to outline them to him.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I didn't have an opportunity to relate to the Minister of Agriculture the nature of the question. I would undertake to do so this afternoon and perhaps the Member for Morris would be agreeable to have the Minister perhaps answer him at the session this evening or tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: . . . restate his subsequent question I might be able to answer.

MR. JORGENSON: If I may be permitted to do so, Mr. Speaker. The question I enquired about was whether or not the government was taking any action to ensure that the decision of the Supreme Court was being adhered to by the Province of Quebec or that the Federal Government was indeed making sure that the Supreme Court decision was being adhered to by the Province of Quebec, and my understanding was that the Province of Quebec said they were going to ignore it.

MR. USKIW: In that connection there have been one or two public statements made by both Mr. Turner and the Prime Minister that they intended to enforce the Constitution in this regard. Now I have to accept that as being meaningful. I may add, though, that next week we are meeting with the federal people and the people from Quebec and Ontario in the City of Montreal to discuss the question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, failing to get an answer to my question this morning from the First Minister, I wonder if the Minister of Municipal Affairs could advise the House as to whether or not it is the intention of the government to appoint a team of investigators to handle Autopac problems in the days ahead.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Honourable members opposite should know that if they address a question to the First Minister that there is no possibility of them getting an answer from someone else unless the question is being taken as notice in the absence of the Minister to whom the question was directed. And I rise furthermore on a point of privilege. As I told the honourable member this morning, Bill 27 has no relationship whatsoever to the matter of Autopac and the honourable member should take my word for that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River speaking to the point of order.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the First Minister if he feels that I have overlooked it, but I still am concerned on the matter. I gave my opinion and I'm entitled to my opinion and I'm not satisfied with the answer.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. As all honourable members know, questions may be asked, answers may not be forthcoming. Our rules do not provide that anyone has to answer. I'm sure all honourable members will understand this. The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the First Minister could advise whether the Chairman and General Manager of Hydro is back in Manitoba yet.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'll have to make enquiry. I believe not.

MR. CRAIK: A further question, Mr. Speaker, to the House Leader. If in the event that the Telephone System hearings are wound up tomorrow morning in good time, will we be going on, or will he take under advisement going on to the Hydro report as well.

MR. SPEAKER: If I may. I realize that the question may have some pertinence but it is also hypothetical. The Honourable House Leader.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate that the meeting of Public Utilities tomorrow is for the purpose stated in the notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Public Utilities Committee has been called not tomorrow for the specifics of Manitoba Hydro but has been called into session at which Manitoba Hydro, or at least Manitoba Telephone System will be discussed. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the representation made by the House Leader that the committee is limited to discussing Manitoba Telephone System and Manitoba Telephone System alone is incorrect.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: I'm not sure, Sir, if there is a point of order before us. If there is, I would simply point out to the honourable member that the committee of course can decide to conduct other business, but the information is to, if we are completed in good time, to reconvene in the Assembly here as we would normally during the speed-up period.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, might I ask in conclusion if we are going to be prevented tomorrow from discussing the Hydro Report?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I indicated that the meeting was called for the purpose as

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) stated in the notice. What will happen at the meeting is something that I assume that the members of the committee will decide.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Question to the House Leader. Is it the intention of the government to call other meetings of the Public Utilities Committee during this session to discuss the Hydro question or not?

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the Public Utilities Committee has already been called on three occasions I believe, if my memory serves me correctly, to discuss the Manitoba Hydro, and the committee will be called again if it is deemed by the government that it will be useful to call the committee again. That's who calls the committee meetings.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: May I ask whether it's the government's intentions to have this session concluded before the report of that committee, the report of Hydro has been approved by the Legislative Committee?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, we are in mid-session and it would be presumptuous of me to be able to define now everything that will happen during the session.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. It is pertaining to an ad that appears in "India Calling", a Toronto-based newspaper for the students from the country of India, and the ad says, under the authority of Honourable Sidney Green, "Where is your work permit?" Could the Minister tell me the purpose of this ad?

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would have the ad passed over to me and I'll determine just what it involves.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I'll be happy to do that, Mr. Speaker, but a supplementary question. Is it the policy of this government to advertise jobs for students of another country when the students of our own province are without work?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I'm certain the honourable member is aware that policy questions should not be asked in that manner.

MR. SCHREYER: . . . honourable members opposite I would hope will take it in a spirit of goodwill, and that is that questions of the detailed kind that the Honourable Member for Portage has just asked, valid though they may be, surely they are of the kind that require some prior notice to a Minister, and I would ask in the future that similar valid questions with details should be -- prior notice should be given to the Minister before the question is put in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the First Minister. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker. Is it now the custom of the Farm Credit Corporation to instruct farmers who are negotiating loans to not employ accountants?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: I don't know how I can answer that question, Mr. Speaker. I can take it as notice. It sounds a bit silly to me.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact on request I would give the document to the Minister. Is it not a fact that officials of the Farm Credit Corporation are instructing farmers not to employ an accountant to fill out their request for Farm Credit Corporation help.

MR. USKIW: It sounds to me as if that's a matter for the Government of Canada because we're not at all connected with federal Credit Corporations.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Minister of Finance. I wonder whether he can indicate the staging and the likely amounts to be asked for of the borrowing of the province for the remainder of this year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister of Finance can indicate whether it's the intention of the government to borrow money in the United States in the next issue or the next . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, that will depend on the circumstances at the time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Tourism I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister. I wonder if he could advise the House of the policy, as suggested in the Tribune issue of yesterday, that trailer camping grounds will become controlled by government. The suggestion is that whether or not they are privately owned.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, obviously it would be preferable for me to take that question as notice and relate it to the Minister of Tourism.

MR. GIRARD: If I may, Mr. Speaker, I would like to pass on the article to the First Minister so that he can identify the article in question.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I wish to clarify my question to the Minister of Agriculture. It was the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation I'm referring to.

MR. USKIW: Well I did take the matter as notice, Mr. Speaker, but I'm not quite sure of the details.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - CONCURRENCE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (Minister of Finance) (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister for Agriculture, that the Resolutions reported from the Committee of Supply be read a second time and concurred in.

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

MR. CLERK: 57 amended.

MR. SPEAKER: 57 amended — the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak on the amendment and I'll speak very briefly — on the amendment I believe proposed by the Honourable Member from Assiniboia. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry the Minister of Industry and Commerce is not present at this time but my remarks will be addressed to him through the First Minister. — (Interjection) — Well, the Member for Winnipeg Centre says he won't miss anything. I have no intention of repeating the speeches that have been made before.

Mr. Speaker, I have to take this opportunity to indicate once again the great concern that I and many others in our community have for what is taking place with respect to our economic development in this province. Mr. Speaker, you cannot be but moved with the knowledge of the business activity that has been directed out of this province and with the loss of our management capability that is occurring as a result of the misplaced emphasis, confusion and fuzzy way in which the government has approached the problems of economic development in this province.

Mr. Speaker, we are in bad times in Canada and there is no doubt that Federal Government policies have played a factor in our problems in economic development, but the continued confused way in which the economic development of this province is handled by the government, its failure to liaison and to join with those people within the private sector to carry on the activities that are necessary for the expansion of our economic activity and for the widening of our economic base, this failure has resulted in disillusionment, disappointment and, Mr. Speaker, we would be burying our heads in the sand in this Legislature if the pronouncements that I am making are not made.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I for one do not want to talk in terms of doom and gloom, but I suggest to the members opposite that as we concur on the Department of Industry and Commerce, which provides really the last occasion in this House in which the economic matters will be discussed, I can only hope that the government will take the initiative that it has lost and will join with those who are directly involved in carrying out economic activity to see to it that the stalemate that's occurred in the last year and the bottleneck that has occurred is broken, because Mr. Speaker, if we examine the institutions and see the number of executives who are leaving, see the number of private entrepreneurs who are leaving, sense the frustration that the entrepreneurs find in being able to move at this particular time, there is much to be

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) concerned about and much to be done.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there may be many on the other side who'll say to those people who want to leave, let them leave, but the truth of the matter is their actions affect many of the people in this province, their actions directly affect the ability of our people to have rises in their income and the ability of our people to find jobs in this province, and if this continued stagnation occurs then we are looking at a period of time in which the movement out of this province will continue and will continue at even a higher rate than it has in the past, and the deterioration that has begun will have very dramatic and much more long-term effects than many would be prepared to admit.

I have indicated in my opinion that the activities of the government in industrial activity have been pathetic, but having said that, Mr. Speaker, I once again repeat a plea that they revitalize their whole approach to economic activity and to try and initiate and do certain things which will instill the kind of confidence that will keep our people here, and will allow our industries to expand and will draw the kind of major activities and industrial activity which will help for job formation immediately and which will have the multiplying effect of job formation for the supporting industry. Unless this happens, Mr. Speaker, when we discuss Industry and Commerce six months, eight months or a year from now or possibly even three months from now, we are going to be dealing with statistics that will be extremely depressing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, it is perhaps not commonplace for a member of the government to rise every time in debate, every time that a motion of non-concurrence is moved, but in light of the comments just made by the Leader of the Opposition with respect to the motion moved by the Member for Assiniboia, I feel that a few answers, comments are in order at this time.

The Leader of the Opposition again makes reference to the economic development performance of this province and he attempts to do so in a way that would have the matter looked at in isolation to what is happening elsewhere in our country. And I say to him again, that if he wants to analyze the economic performance of this province, this province's economy, to be intellectually honest about it he should do so in relation to the rate of economic growth in the other provinces and regions of this country. And if one does so, Sir, one will find that the rate of economic performance and growth in this province, although much slower than we would like it to be, nevertheless compares quite favorably with the other provinces, better than some and not as good as others.

But it is important to point out that if the rate of economic growth in this province is not at the pace that we would like to see, what was it like through most of the decade of the 1960's. If one draws a comparison between Manitoba's rate of economic growth in the '60's and calculate it as a ratio, the percentage rate of economic growth in other provinces through the '60's, then the Leader of the Opposition will have nothing to feel very smug about. If anything, in proportionate terms, in terms of expressed ratios in comparison with other provinces, there has been no worsening at all in the rate of economic growth in Manitoba.

The fact is that in the last two or three years there has been general economic slowdowns in this country and some provinces have been harder hit than others. Our two sister provinces on the prairies have had in most respects an even more difficult time in terms of economic development than we have had. My honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition should keep that in mind when he addressed himself to this general topic.

If one wants to take, for example, the index of the value of factory shipments, manufacturing shipments, he will find that the performance of the Manitoba economy in that respect has been quite good in relation to the performance of that specific sector in other provinces. Why does he keep forgetting that? If one wants to take the rate of construction starts - yes, there has been a turndown in the rate of construction starts, but in comparison to the rate of construction starts in Saskatchewan the Manitoba situation is very healthy indeed. As a matter of fact, I am told that the value of construction starts in the city of Brandon last year was greater than that of the entire Province of Saskatchewan. What do my honourable friends want to make of that?

In terms of percentage increase in provincial product there was a larger percentage increase in provincial product in relation to the national average of percentage increase in national product, larger in Manitoba last year than was the case through most of the years of the 1960's. The fact of the matter is, Sir, through most of the 1960's in relation to Canada and the national average of all the provinces, Manitoba's economic performance was not very good

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) at all. If honourable friends want to talk about image, I can tell them that the four years that I spent in eastern Canada made it pretty clear to me that the image of Manitoba's economy in the 1960's was one of sluggishness. My honourable friend can bang bang the drums all he likes and he can try to create certain image projections as to the buoyancy and the rate of economic expansion in Manitoba, he can have advertising firms use the motif of the boy banging the drums and -- (Interjection) -- yes, please do use DBS statistics for Manitoba's economic performance in relation to that of other provinces, and he will find that Manitoba in relation to the rest of the country was losing ground in relative terms.

He tried last year to make something about population movement in the province and he mentioned it again today. He mentioned the movement of population, and in particular that of managerial personnel. I notice that he isn't trying to make much of population movement any more because data for the last year shows that Manitoba did not have a population loss but in fact a modest increase -- (Interjection) -- a modest increase, yes, the fact remains, a modest increase, net increase, whereas on at least two occasions when they were the government they had a net loss of population. In 1966 a substantial net loss and in 1961 or '62, I forget just which, there was a loss. Yes, interject if you like.

MR. SPIVAK: . . . 10,000 people as a result of out-migration, lost as a result of out-migration, the net loss, not births over deaths.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: . . . not to compare apples and oranges, nor can one compare dissimilar categories of statistical data. What I am referring to is the net population movement. The honourable member is trying to confuse the issue by talking about out-migration and births over deaths, etc., the so-called natural population adjustment. I'll take him on on either category, out-migration netted out against in-migration or simply taking the final net population movement figures, whichever one he likes, I'll discuss it on either basis. The fact remains that, calculated either way, there was better performance in this respect last year than there was on at least two years in which the previous government was in office. And I say again that 1966 stands out as the year of Manitoba's greatest population loss in this century - 1966 - and my honourable friend simply cannot erase that fact.

Now he talks about managerial personnel in particular and I say to him that there may well have been a movement out of province of certain numbers of persons with managerial skills. On the other hand, this has been happening in Saskatchewan as well. It is partly the product of the general effect on the economy of the agricultural conditions of the past couple of years. And furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member cannot pretend for one moment that there has not been periodic out-migration of persons with managerial skills in this province over the decade. One need only go to Toronto or Montreal or Vancouver, or even Boston or Minneapolis or New York to find a surprisingly large number of former Manitobans, native Manitobans who have arisen to executive positions in various firms and now resident in many different cities in this country. There's nothing wrong with that. In terms of the national interest it is in a way, of course, disadvantageous to Manitoba.

But that is a phenomena that one can trace through the entire prairie region, through the entire Maritime region and through the entire mid-western United States. There has been a general, if my honourable friend is interested in demographic studies, he will find that there has been intensive study of population movements over the years and decades and there has been a general phenomena at work, which I am sure my honourable friend will recognize and admit when it is pointed out to him, that there has been a movement both in Canada and the United States population out away from the central interior areas to the coastal areas of both the west coast and the so-called industrial heartland. In the case of Canada, the golden triangle, lower St. Lawrence Valley; in the case of the U.S. the Chicago-New York, Boston-New York axis. This is a general pervasive phenomena. The fact that there's been some loss in managerial personnel is something that cannot be pretended to be a phenomena of the last year alone or two, or the last five or ten, it has been something that has been going on over the years.

In conclusion, may I say that the implications or the inferences in the motion moved by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia asking, or regretting the alleged failure of this government to decentralize government departments and agencies throughout Manitoba on a regional basis, I say to my honourable friend that perhaps we have not had as impressive a performance in this regard as he would like to see but it certainly has been no worse than that of the

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) . . . practice of previous governments, including that of the previous Liberal government. We have, in Manitoba, decentralized departmental operations. We have, for example, the Ag Rep offices in the various regions; we have the Highway Department District Offices in the various districts; we have Public Health offices in the various Public Health Unit areas; we have Veterinary Clinics which the Minister of Agriculture and others are working on to set up on a regional decentralized basis. The headquarters of Autopac will be in Brandon. This is a first in terms of decentralization. -- (Interjection) -- My honourable friend is interjecting, following which I will give him further examples.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): I'm glad that the Minister agreed to allow me to ask a question. A lot of the things that he is talking about has been in practice for many years, but is he aware that the other day one of his members in the front row disagreed with our resolution for decentralizing any agricultural or mining departments being moved away from the city. Is he aware of that or not?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member, I would have to know in precisely what sense the discussion or exchange took place because I am not aware that there is any problem of consensus or agreement with respect to the general objective of providing presence of provincial departmental services in the several regions of this province. In fact I would tell my honourable friend that my colleagues and I, this government have in common a very distinct desire to provide for a better and more efficient regional presence of government departments. Now, if my honourable friend was talking about headquarters, departmental offices at the headquarters level, this idea of course can become quite impractical. However, to a certain degree this can be done and we are frankly experimenting when we are establishing the headquarters office of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation in Brandon. We are hopeful it will work very well, but it is admittedly an experiment in that sense.

We have no opposition whatsoever, in fact we are in favor of balanced regional development. I've said so many times. I am quite in favor of the concept that lies behind the federal legislation, for example, Department of Regional Economic Expansion. I believe that a healthy country must have balanced regional growth and it would be hypocritical to say that the same does not apply at the provincial level. Honourable friends, if they can show specific examples where previous administrations have had a better performance with respect to decentralization of government operations, I'd be quite prepared to listen to them because perhaps I could learn something that would be helpful in pursuing the objective that we have in this respect.

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

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, maybe we can dispense after a little while as the Member for St. Boniface suggests. However, I think I should say a few words. You would expect that the Member for St. Boniface would get into the debate and try and defend the government. -- (Interjection) -- Well, when I sit down you stand up and give us a deal.

Mr. Speaker, the motion before us deals with regional development, and development in general for that matter, and in order to have development certainly we need capital, and I feel that this government should register a protest to the Government of Canada to have, for one, the interest rate reduced to make enterprise expanding, to make it more competitive. We have to have lower interest rates if we want to be competitive. Just this afternoon I noticed an article in the Free Press captioned "Real Estate Reaps Fortune for Frenchman". Maybe the Member for St. Boniface will be very interested now, because this article concerns a former French cavalry officer, North Africa, and a graduate of the Sorbonne and Harvard School of Business Administration, and he has amassed a fortune. I would like to quote from this very article. It says here, and I'm quoting, "There, he and his partner, Sandy McTaggart" -- (Interjection) -- the first one was French - "own and manage more than 3,000 apartment units, 7 shopping centres, and a few office buildings with combined assets of more than \$40 million. His company, MacLab Enterprises Limited, in which he and Mr. McTaggart each hold 50 percent interest, is planning a \$22 million 1400 unit apartment project in Vancouver and has half completed a six million 45 storey apartment building of circular design near downtown Edmonton. 'Basically, I like very much the times when money is tight', he says. He explained that no real estate company can afford the risk of paying the maximum interest rates; rates fluctuate. Say you sold your mortgage last year for 10 1/2 percent and this year a competitor put exactly the same building next to you, if he's paying only 9 percent his apartments are

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) . . . going to rent for \$30 less than yours for the next 35 years. To avoid such an impossibly competitive position MacLab recently gave away substantial shares of the equity in some of his large projects to such companies as Standard Life Insurance in exchange for lower interest rates. We own less of it but it means we are going to be competitive. The mortgage companies like this very much because it is a protection for them against inflation."

The article goes on further, telling us what expansion plans they are going to proceed with in the future. But when we read these articles, it is Edmonton, it is Vancouver, what about Manitoba? Why don't we see more development in Manitoba? I think this government, the least they could do is protest, register a protest with the Government of Canada for lower interest rates and for a greater money supply, to increase the money supply and make more money available to the private sector. It seems that this government is only interested in having money made available for the public sector so that they can be in business, and building homes. I feel that we should have more development come from the private sector.

Just the other day when the government tabled their report from the Department of Industry and Commerce in connection with the provincial bank, there was an article in the paper telling us that when monies are tight, when the Federal Government imposes a tight money situation that Manitoba is the first one to be restricted, and when money is made available it is the last one to receive when funds are being freed. This certainly works to our disadvantage and I think we should let our views be known and register a protest with the Federal Government in this connection. Surely enough, unless monies are made available we will not have the development. Or are there other reasons? Are the reasons because we now have a Socialist government that the development doesn't want to come here? Is that it? If that's the case, then the government is the only one that can help in this matter and change their philosophy and their course of action so that we will get development even though they are in office.

I certainly feel very strongly that we should have regional development in this province. Our rural areas need it in the worst way to provide new jobs for the people in rural Manitoba. More farmers are going out of business and this means that they will have to find work elsewhere, and if they can't find it in rural Manitoba they have to go either to cities where they can get employment or move outside the province. I feel it is incumbent upon us to see to it that the environment or the conditions are such that business can develop and expand here in this province.

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

MR. CLERK: Resolution 57, 58, 59, 60.

XI. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,544,300 for Labour, Resolutions 61 to 67, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1972.

XII. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$26,014,800 for Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, with regard to Resolution No. 68, while concurring in Resolution No. 68, I wish to move that this House regrets that the government through its water resource policies has failed to call public hearings to recognize the recreation, residential and agricultural interests around Lake Winnipeg - seconded by the Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, over the course of the last few weeks we have had a very curious sequence of circumstances as the question of control of water levels on Lake Winnipeg and the associated Hydro development have been discussed, and while the Opposition has pressed to have this matter opened up and discussed in all its many ramifications, the government has been very reticent to see this discussion take place, and I think, Sir, that they have made every move that they can possibly make to suppress any open discussion in the last two or three weeks in particular.

We've seen any number of developments that have shed a lot of doubt on the technical decision that is being made and I think we have even more reason to doubt the political wisdom of the decision being made by the government. The Minister of Mines and Resources has complained somewhat that the Opposition is trying to flare this into a political debate, and of course nothing could be more true than that, that the decision is basically a political decision and not a technical decision.

(MR. CRAIK cont'd.)

What turns out to be the most curious, Mr. Speaker, is that if the government's position on this is correct and we could take it at face value, it leads to the logical question as to why the government in the first place did not call for open hearings. Why in God's green earth they would decide to grant an interim licence, that was anything but interim because they let a \$12 1/2 million contract on the heels of it before a full licence could be granted, just staggers the imagination, to even go so far as to suggest that an interim licence on Lake Winnipeg was being granted. This in face of the fact that if the benefits from the control of Lake Winnipeg were in fact intended to lead to some recreational value, why then would the government not, in the initial instance, give the recreational interest a voice in the decision and let them at least think that Lake Winnipeg was going to remain a recreational lake rather than a Hydro lake, because with the course of events that has taken place, despite the technical question marks and the financial non-justification, why in the face of this would the government not take advantage of what it claims are the assets from a recreational point of view.

And the question there, Mr. Speaker, must surely be that either there aren't any real recreational values or in fact that the government does not know and has not studied this full enough to know whether there are benefits or not. We had the chairman of Hydro say that there are going to be three million dollars worth of recreational benefits but Hydro will assure the responsibility for any damages, a completely contradictory statement knowing full well that in the long run the average levels on Lake Winnipeg are going to be higher and that likely damages are going to exist, but nevertheless hedged his . . . by saying that using the rather questionable recreation study that was done by a couple of the consultants who said that possibly three million dollars worth of benefits would accrue but they would pay all damages. -- (Interjection) -- The level right now is 715 1/2. -- (Interjection) -- Well, Mr. Speaker, one question at a time. The First Minister asked what the level is now. The level is 715 1/2 I believe - that's probably within half a foot. -- (Interjection) -- Well I think, Mr. Speaker, the feedback we are getting here is indicative of -- it was a pretty valuable comment just made by the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, we might be able to bring it down to 714. The trouble is that the whole question mark is the size of the "might" that is on all of the facts that are available.

We know that no model study has been done. We know that no computer study has been done unless it's been done in the last couple of weeks, and I don't think it has been because the information that go into it is not all that good, and as they say in computer language, garbage in equals garbage out, and since there is very little value to put into it, it is likely that there is very little value to come out of it.

The Water Commission itself has been sitting stewing over the fact that it has not been allowed to have its hearing, particularly in light of the fact that at least two of the members who were very vociferous a year or so ago have now had their wings clipped, or whatever you might call it, by their appointment to the Manitoba Water Commission.

At any rate, the great contradiction, Mr. Speaker, is that if in fact there are to be benefits accrue other than Hydro benefits, why would the government not see fit. I think in this case that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources must accept the responsibility directly. He is not responsible for the Hydro decision but he is responsible to see that in particular that those users of water resources, other than Hydro, are well served. This has not been done and this is the point in question in this particular resolution. It's not what Hydro's going to do or not do, and the Minister has not seen fit to handle this in a proper manner. It comes back, Mr. Speaker, to the reason why in the initial instance I believe the Leader of the Opposition moved his non-confidence on the Minister's salary. It was his lack of response to the people issue that was involved here rather than the technical issue, and to this point we have not had the type of response that should have been.

Now the long term -- apart from the autocratic approach, Mr. Speaker, and that's what it is, apart from the autocratic approach, he's putting the non-Hydro users interests on a very poor footing if and when the day comes for a board to control the Lake Winnipeg levels. If this had been done in the initial instance, if it had been done in December rather than granting an interim licence, or if it had been done last October better still, in anticipation that an interim licence was going to be granted - and surely the Minister must have looked at this for some time - he would have possibly been able to convince a great many of the people, if there were any benefits, that they should wait and see. I think he could have easily convinced them if there are two channels out of Lake Winnipeg it might work better than one, which is a pretty

(MR. CRAIK cont'd.) simplified type of argument. But if it's to become a Hydro lake, which is now the only conclusion that can be drawn, it's making it a Hydro lake without calling the hearings in advance and carrying on the Water Commission hearings that have been held in 1968. Lake Winnipeg has now been made a Hydro lake whether the government likes it or not.

The power interests, as a result of the staging of the government's decision, has now rendered Lake Winnipeg a Hydro lake, which is good from Hydro's point of view and is not good from the recreation point of view. It does however have pretty limited value from a Hydro point of view but that's not the point in question. The point in question is not the fact that the development of power on Lake Winnipeg is a bad investment from a power point of view, what's at question is that in addition to that, the recreation interests that are concerned about Lake Winnipeg have not been given a fair chance at a right stage in this development, and the government in its great anxiety to make a political decision, or at least to thrust one, get Hydro to thrust one on them, abandoning their responsibilities for making political decisions, in their great anxiety to make this decision have decided that there should be "an interim licence granted on Lake Winnipeg" and then followed it up with a \$12 million contract on a \$50 million project and still calls it an interim licence.

But they are going to go in and look and they are going to tell the people - they are not going to listen to them, but they are going to tell them - and sometime a little later on they are going to set up a governing board that is going to govern Lake Winnipeg. But by that time of course the channels are in, the thing has to work, the frazzled ice is causing them difficulties and they need an extra half a foot on the lake to control it. And guess who's going to win? It's not going to be the recreation interests. But if it had been, if it had been that the Minister had been a little more responsive to people like he responded to giving an extra grant to the fishermen on Lake Winnipeg when he realized the inhumane position he was in, if he had just learned from that that there are people involved and gone out and said we have a problem here and we may have a benefit, we would like you to take part in the decision, he may have had them on his side rather than against him. Despite the fact that it was still basically a bad dollar investment for the province, he may in fact have been able to convince them that there were some recreational benefits.

But the way it sits now, the Minister is sitting with having had to take much of the lump of responsibility for the decision that has been made on Lake Winnipeg, the granting of the licence, whether it's interim or not, for the sake of a political Hydro decision and he's now in the position of not having brought people in nor convinced them in any way, shape or form that there are any benefits to accrue to them. And it's only with a great deal of difficulty, Mr. Speaker, that I can foresee in the future the opportunity for the recreational interests of the lake to get back into the position where they are going to have any meaningful say in the levels of the lake that they have to live with.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution 69.

MR. CLERK: 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74.

XIII. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$20,656,800 for Municipal Affairs - Resolution 75.

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

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Riel, that while concurring in Resolution No. 75 this House regrets that the government through its Autopac policies has failed to give serious consideration to the insurance agents of Manitoba, the three insurance companies with their head office in Manitoba and the Village of Wawanesa.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

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

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to say a few words on this resolution. I know this is a subject matter that's been discussed many times but I thought it was only right that I should bring this motion of concurrence up at this time to remind the government that once again they have failed the people of Manitoba. They have failed the people of the Village of Wawanesa; they have failed the insurance agents of the Province of Manitoba; and they have really failed the three base companies with their head offices in Manitoba. One only has to realize what this means to the Province of Manitoba. It's more important for this government of the day, for their philosophy than it is for the people who have spent many many years in

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd.) . . . their business. And this is what the people are saying right now. As mentioned by the Member for Assiniboia, 14 insurance companies have already pulled out, more are pulling out, 800 jobs already affected. Does this not mean something to the government of the day? Well, I doubt it. I doubt if they have any -- blood doesn't even run in their veins anymore. It's cold, their blood is cold, and this is the problem that we face in the province.

The government has no concern for people, no concern for people at all, and one only has to go to the Village of Wawanesa to appreciate that. The government were told by the Minister of Industry and Commerce he's going to try to do something for them, yet no word has come forward and yet they are facing four months from now, four months from now the company will have to reduce their staff by half. What will this mean to the Village of Wawanesa? It will mean that the village cannot exist as an incorporated village from then on. It will mean debentures that were approved by these very same people in the Village of Wawanesa -- I don't know what will happen to those debentures. Who's going to pick them up? What will happen to the new school? What will happen to the new senior citizens home in the Village of Wawanesa? Those are the matters that the people are really concerned about and yet no answer from the government of the day.

And what's going to happen to the insurance agents in the Province of Manitoba? The Minister of Municipal Affairs this morning said they're getting a good deal, we're giving them seven percent. He said that's comparable with other companies. Let me tell you something, Mr. Minister, that you haven't lived on seven percent in your day. You'd starve to death if you went out selling at seven percent, and this is what's going to happen to the insurance agents. Did you ever read this Order-in-Council that you passed? Did you ever read it? I don't suppose you did but your signature is on it. What that means -- what is a man going to get, insurance agents going to get under transitional grants. By the time your formula is worked out they'll get very very little, very very little.

And what have the agents built up over the years? They've built up a capital asset and yet you're treating the employees of the company with the same respect as you treat an agent with a capital asset, the same thing -- (Interjection) -- Terrible. Yes, that's all, the courtesy. What would you think, Mr. Minister of Mines and Natural Resources if the government of the day said to you that you could no longer practice as a lawyer? What would you say? And what would you say, the backbenchers, some of the school teachers, that your licence is cancelled as a school teacher? I'll tell you what you'd do. You'd go crying all the way down to the next province. You'd go crying to the next province. You sure would, and yet you're expecting the people of this Province of Manitoba who have built up this capital asset, who have mortgages on their homes, who have debts to pay, to laugh and say thank you, Mr. Government, thank you for everything you have given me. I'm only expressing, Mr. Speaker, the feelings of the people which I represent, and I tell you I'm putting it in a lot milder language than they have put it to me, a lot milder language. It's only with the respect of this Legislative Assembly that I cannot express their words in the way that they told me.

This morning we witnessed a speech by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and he condemned the Portage Mutual and he ripped them apart. He ripped their rate book apart and I'll bet you he never ever read that rate book before in his life. He doesn't even know it because I know he doesn't know what's in it by the words he brought out this morning in his speech. And I'll have a lot more to say to you in committee, when we come back in Committee of the Whole on that Bill 52, because you don't know how to read a rate book. I don't know who you got, whether you got Nick Mancier to read it for you or not. You likely got Nick Mancier, I imagine that's who you got.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. I would suggest the honourable member address his remarks to the Chair. The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, it's very difficult when you're hit in the pocketbook by an individual over here to not look him in the eye. And that's what he's doing, he's hitting me right in my pocketbook and for that very reason, for that very reason it's most difficult not to look at him because there's always another day in court I suppose, but after your pocketbook is empty you're a pretty desperate case in court I tell you. But this is what he's doing. This is what this gentleman over here is doing to the insurance agents of the Province of Manitoba, taking the last quarter out of their pocket, and along with you, Mr. First Minister, you're assisting him with your policies that you're provoking on the people of Manitoba. And I tell

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd.) . . . you it's nothing to smile about, it's nothing to smile about, it's nothing to smile about I tell you.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable First Minister .

MR. SCHREYER: I recall, Sir, that yesterday you admonished us against repetition in debate as being against the rules.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I didn't hear what the honourable member said. It's just as well maybe because the honourable member was a professor in a college before when he first came in here and I remember him so well, and I suppose if he was defeated tomorrow in the House here that he'd go back as professor. But how would you like to be losing your licence, teaching licence? And it's the same thing; it's the same thing. One of the reasons why people go into business for themselves is to be their own boss, and they can work 20 hours a day if they want. They don't have to, they can do things the way they want. And they can build up a capital asset, and at the end of their lifetime they've got something to show for it. And what has happened in this Province of Manitoba? That's no longer true; it's no longer true. There's no chance of building up a capital asset because you're treated the same way as an employee in an insurance office who has no investment at all, no investment, and this is what the Order-in-Council says. The Order-in-Council reads that way, and I am very ashamed to say that I got to get up and say these words. This must be my 25th speech, or I don't know how many on this very same subject, very same subject. — (Interjection) — No, not until after I'm finished.

Mr. Speaker, I always thought that my honourable friends when they sat over here they had concern for people. They showed it every day they got up to speak. It was always people, people, people. Now it's philosophy, philosophy and more philosophy. No matter what the end result, no matter how the Province of Manitoba, whether it'll go down the drain as the Member for Rhineland has said many many times, the end result is that philosophy is the only thing that pays off, the only thing. And I want to say something about this. Maybe the honourable member here has got something. We are approaching a very far far left in our province - very far far left. As long as the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is sitting in the front bench you can be sure this approach will be the approach for all time to come. — (Interjection) — Tell the waffle? Well what I heard at the convention down there is he was backing the waffles and they were backing him and that's why he didn't become a vice president again; he was outnumbered. That's the way I read it anyway. — (Interjection) — Yeah, they chopped him down. The right wing boys won out, the right wing boys won out, David Lewis' crew, the labour union boys like some of the back red benches over there. They defeated the Minister here. They wouldn't let his name stand. I wasn't at this particular convention but I heard a lot about it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I can only say once again that the people of the Village of Wawanesa have lost hope, have lost hope in the government of the day, and I must say now that the people I'm sure, of Portage la Prairie, have lost hope because they're going to lose a great amount over the policies of the Provincial Government. The way the Minister condemned these companies this morning was a tragic thing, a tragic thing, a tragic thing. A company, the Wawanesa, celebrating their 75th anniversary this fall in the month of September, the month of September, and yet the Minister has the gall to say, the Minister has the gall to say that the rates that they reported this year were put off, they're untruthful, deceitful. He called them every name. — (Interjection) — These are the rates -- (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, Portage Mutual Insurance Company was established in 1884 and the Wawanesa Mutual Insurance Company was established in 1896, by a group of farmers in both cases insuring thrashing machines and later going on to insure all lines of insurance, and the Wawanesa having been in business over 40 years in automobile insurance and yet the Minister of Municipal Affairs has the gall, the gall to come out and say that he knows more about insurance than the Wawanesa Mutual do, the management of the Wawanesa Mutual, Mr. Claude Price, and I'll defy that you can't — you couldn't even sweep his office because you wouldn't get a job in his office sweeping and I know that. That's about as much as you know about insurance. This is a terrible thing when a man tried to scuttle Manitoba based companies the way the Minister of Municipal Affairs has with the support of the First Minister.

Now what has happened to their great friends, to one other company? What has happened

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd.) to one other great company that the government of the day being the friends of, the Co-op Fire and Casualty. What's happened to them? He drove them right out of the province - drove them right out. They didn't even stay around till the first of November. They didn't stay around that long, they didn't want to get clobbered any more. They didn't -- (Interjection) -- I tell you, the great friends of the cooperative movement, great friends. I don't know what friends -- I wouldn't want friends like that. I wouldn't want friends like that. No, I wouldn't want friends.

Mr. Speaker, the day will come, maybe not as long as we think, where the people of Manitoba - and it might be only four or five months away - the people of the Province of Manitoba will see the light - see the light. They'll see it all right, and I tell you, all you do is got to meddle around with enough people in the province to . . . and all you got to do is give them a good kick, a big kick in the rear-end like you've kicked the insurance agents and like you kicked the other thousands of people who were operating insurance businesses, and I'm telling you the next kick will be right at your backside and it's going to come a lot quicker than you ever thought. And I'm telling you it won't be long, it won't be long either.

And for the member - and I want to just close with this point - they act as the great saviour for minority groups in the Province of Manitoba, and when it comes to Hutterites - as I've mentioned before, you're all in favour of the Hutterites and so am I - but when it comes to minority groups, one or two in each town in the Province of Manitoba that's trying to do their job for the Province of Manitoba and trying to mind their own business, you're against that minority group and I want to put that on the record right now.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: I rise on a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, within the context of the statement that you read yesterday. The honourable member has insulted me by accusing me as being against Hutterites. He has no -- (Interjection) -- he said "you". -- (Interjection) -- For?

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

MR. McKELLAR: I'm for Hutterites, but I said when it comes to insurance agents it's a different ball game, and because of the fact that we're not living in a communal, we don't grow whiskers, this is a simple fact of life, that your group is against a minority group called the insurance agents of Manitoba, and if I ever was in favour of Human Rights Commission - I'm not one of those that goes around begging or raising a flag every time there's a storm - but there's a good case for Human Rights Commission here to deal with but I don't suppose they ever heard of the insurance agents - or civil rights.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, may I say once again to the Premier of this province that before you chase, or cause to be chased out of the province any group - after they have chased the insurance agents out, that I hope you have a second thought before you bring in further legislation because the people of the Province of Manitoba -- there will be nobody left, nobody left to build this province as was built in the past. You can't build it on people that are going to work eight hours a day, and one of the few groups left in society are the insurance agents in the Province of Manitoba who are willing to work long hours to put enough aside for their families when they retire. That day is gone because there's nothing left in the honourable member's pocket from Roblin, the Honourable Member for Assiniboia or myself, where our capital asset is destroyed.

And just in closing, Mr. Speaker, I hope that when we get to committee on Bill 52 that somebody is here from the insurance industry to challenge the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs on some of the statements he made this morning.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Selkirk): I had hoped that when the honourable member saw fit to address the House this afternoon, that he would have dealt specifically with a number of the comparisons that I drew this morning. I had fully expected that he would have challenged the particular rates one by one that I gave in the House this morning and have attempted to demonstrate to this House that his leader was correct in the rates that he announced to this House and that I was incorrect. But what did we hear? We heard a great deal of protesting, a great deal of generality, and we saw him hit his pocketbook and say, "I'm emotional, because it's hit me in the pocketbook."

We heard those statements, and Mr. Speaker, I think that it has just been one further

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd.) demonstration that the opposition in the legislature are not prepared to associate themselves with legislation of a progressive nature, that is directed towards the improvement of an important area within our society because they are afraid that it is — they say no, they say no, because they do not want to look forward to the results that this legislation will bring about in the next year or two. And I repeat as I said this morning, that I am fully confident what the reaction of the public of this province will be three years from now when they look back, and they will be the judges as to whether the government was right of the day or whether the opposition was correct of the day. But let me warn the members opposite that they will be judged accordingly and the voters will decide accordingly and I suggested to the opposition this morning therefore in their declarations and in their indications to this House they should at least attempt to be correct and honest in the representations that they make.

I would like to deal now specifically with two statements that have been made already. One is, a statement was made by the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney that in some way or other I attacked the figures given by Wawanesa. This is far from the truth. I attacked the rates that were read out in this House by his leader the other day as being false and incorrect; and I'm certainly assuming that he didn't receive those rates from Wawanesa because I have too much respect for the integrity of certain people in Wawanesa that they would have given his leader the rates for 013 and 023 Wawanesa rates in the figures that he read out to this House a week ago. I have enough confidence in the management of Wawanesa that they would not do such a thing. The rates that I attacked were the rates that were read out by his leader as being false and incorrect, not the rates as given by Wawanesa. And let that be clear and let that be on the record.

Secondly, I sometimes am very surprised at the continued repetition that thousands are going to be losing their jobs. You know, Mr. Speaker, during the height of the demonstration in front of the Legislature last year the figure of 4,000 was thrown about. Well, you know, to my surprise, two weeks ago I read an excerpt in the Winnipeg paper of an address that was given by the Leader of the Opposition, who again is not in his seat, to students at Red River Community College and the figure that was used by him in that speech according to the newspaper account was 11,000. Now just where are you going to stop in manipulating these figures? Has it now grown from 4,000 up to 11,000? If the newspaper reporting was incorrect and he hadn't used the figure of 11,000, at least I would have expected that he would have seen fit to have corrected that report in the newspapers because certainly he would not want to create such fear about the province that 11,000 people would be losing their jobs if the newspaper reporting was incorrect. I have not heard any such attempt to correct this impression that was left by newspaper reporting, and therefore I can only assume that the newspaper reporting was correct as to the figure that was being hurled around at Red River Community College.

Let me say to the honourable member specifically, that we have already received numerous applications from agents. We have the records, the records indicate that the vast majority of agents receive less than 50 percent of their earnings from automobile insurance, contrary to the representations and the impressions it was attempted to leave to the public last summer by the opposition in this House. The records show clearly that only a minority of the agents receive 50 percent or more of their income from automobile insurance. We didn't have those records last year; they're available for survey insofar as the appointment of agents are concerned this year. It was very telling to ascertain that these representations have been incorrect, that 1,100 agents are going to be out of business, because it just doesn't wash.

Secondly, I would like to refer to one more item. You know, there's been a great deal of complaint about the commission of 7 percent and 10 percent that has been offered to the agents. I think I know why the honourable member is unhappy about the proposed commission, because the Insurance Agents Association of Manitoba wanted the Autopac to agree to insist that all motorists in the Province of Manitoba deal only with agents and not through the Motor Vehicles Branch. This would have been a very nice type of situation, but contrast that with the statements that were made last year of freedom of choice, that the motorist could have the choice to go to the agent of his choice or to deal directly if he so wished. This was the argument that was presented last year; the tune had changed this year: make the people of the Province of Manitoba captives to the agents. We turned that down because we did not feel that in all conscience you could say to every motorist in the Province of Manitoba, you must

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd.) deal through an insurance agent; but if the honourable member wishes to join issues on that question, I welcome him to do so, and the people of Manitoba will make the decision as to what is the proper course of action to undertake.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY McKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I can't sit here and let those remarks go unchallenged that we got from the Honourable Minister. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, I can only take so much of that kind of garbage that we got across here today from that Minister. Let me tell this House and tell this Legislature and tell that Minister . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I would suggest before the honourable member gets into full flight of his oratory that he do consider what he's going to say. There are some expressions that are unparliamentary; I'm sure he's aware of them, and I'm certain he's going to be cautious how he approaches his subject. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I'll do my best to refrain myself from language that's unparliamentary, but under conditions such as this it's a very difficult challenge for me to hear the Minister of the Crown stand up and make statements like he made this afternoon.

He talks about rates — rates. This Minister can juggle those rates any way he wants. He's set up a Crown corporation without legislative scrutiny, without any audit by this Legislature. No way can any member of this Legislature ever again check that Crown corporation, so it's quite easy for him to stand up and talk about rates. He can manipulate the rate book any way he wants because nobody can challenge him, nobody; not even this Legislature can challenge his rates, so don't let him stand up and tell me, you know, that the rates of Wawanesa are not accurate or the rates of other companies are not accurate because he is doing the same thing, he's deliberately manipulating rates to suit his own position and to suit the government of this day. — (Interjections) — Certainly, and everybody knows it. When you put everybody else out of business, you can set the rates any way you want. You don't need a book, you're just setting the rates deliberately to put these insurance companies out of business. It's quite simple, it's easy to do, a Crown corporation can do that and the Minister has done it; but for him to stand up and criticize other companies that have done business in this province for 40 years or more and say that it's garbage that they're offering, he doesn't even know what it's all about, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I had . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Point of privilege. The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't mind sitting through and listening to these comments except when you are grossly misquoted. At no time did I ever suggest that the insurance companies of this province were selling garbage.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, it must be a great honour to the insurance agents of this province to have the opportunity to find an application to do business with this gang. I just tore mine up, just like that. There's no way I would work for that kind of a . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I'm certain the honourable member is again letting his words escape before he gives them thought. The members of this Assembly are not a gang, they are honourable members. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I apologize -- I'll say "the honourable members opposite." There's no way, I have more principle than to work for that Crown corporation with a pittance of money that's offered to do business for a Crown corporation such as that. Seven percent commission the first year; six the second; five the third and then kick him out — going to use a punch card system. Sure, I know, this Minister needs the insurance agents of this province to get that plan to function, otherwise he can't possibly put it into force by the 1st of November. There's no way that he can make that system function without the insurance agents of this province, and he knows it; so he's going to deliberately throw out the hook for them and suck 'em on for seven percent this year, six percent next year, five percent the third year, then use the punch card system and kick him out.

I'm not going to get trapped into that society, Mr. Speaker, in no way. And on a supplementary, ten percent.

Where's the Honourable Minister of Labour? That's not even a decent minimum wage in this province, and I challenge the Honourable Minister to stand up and tell me otherwise. It's a disgrace to ask anybody to work for a Crown corporation for those wages. Mr. Speaker, he said that 50 percent of the agents in this province earn their livelihood from automobile insurance. I'm not going to quarrel with those figures, but I ask him, mark it down in your book today how many there are doing business in this province; come back 12 months hence

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd.) . . . and tell me how many are doing business in this province, and come back three years hence, Mr. Speaker, and tell me how many are doing business in this province and I'll bet you can count them all on your two hands.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. The Honourable Minister.

MR. PAWLEY: I insist if the honourable member wishes to quote me that he do quote me accurately, not continue to misrepresent the statements that I made only ten minutes ago in this House. I didn't indicate that 50 percent of the agents in Manitoba earned their income only from auto insurance.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I'll be very brief. The Honourable Minister doesn't like what I'm saying, he's challenging my remarks at every occasion, but I just ask him, what's the difference between the commission that's offered in Saskatchewan and the commission that's offered in Manitoba? Why discriminate against the agents in this province? Why don't you pay the same commission that they're paying in Saskatchewan? We're second-class citizens in this province, that's why. The insurance agents of this province are not comparable with the agencies in Saskatchewan, so he's giving us a pittance seven percent. He knows the commission they pay in Saskatchewan. — (Interjection) — Yeah, what did they get on the extension?

Mr. Speaker, I regret today that this occasion has had to happen in this province. I feel sorry for the insurance agents and their families, I really do. I know some of them are packing their houses up today and trying to get out; others have already gone; insurance companies have left; and it is indeed — and I'm not going to work for this Crown Corporation, I can tell you — of course, I didn't have a chance anyway, Mr. Minister, because I asked the question of the honourable minister during debate earlier in the session, and he said "no way would I qualify; no way would the Member for Souris-Lansdowne qualify, and no . . ."

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: The Honourable member is again deliberately misrepresenting what I told him — deliberately — the statement that he just made is absolutely incorrect.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I'll close my remarks again and remind the Honourable Minister to take a look 12 months hence and see what he has done to the insurance agents of this province and their families; take a look at it two years later; take a look at it three years later and then tell me how many are left.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J. R. (BUD) BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, I don't want to enter this debate as an authority on rates because I'm not an insurance agent, but under the new plan I think I pay about \$4.00 more than I did under a private scheme, being in one of those select rates; I was fortunate, no accidents and all the rest of it — but that's not what I wanted to address myself to.

I want to address myself to one of the questions raised by the Member from Souris-Killarney, and it's one that I can certainly understand his apprehension having been through a comparable situation where it was necessary for, because of a situation at the time, business conditions, that I had to go through with the insurance agents in this province are going through. Perhaps just in a thumbnail sketch I could give it to you. My wife and I were in business and we had, as the member suggested, by hard work and developing it we had established one lunch counter, then we got another restaurant, then we got another restaurant, a couple of catering trucks and then if you remember back in 1960-'61 when the credit squeeze come on and they cut out the overdrafts for small businessmen and things got a little tight credit-wise. The main component of my operation was located in an area that sustained it until Inkster Park started to develop as an industrial area and some of the trucking outfits which gave me some custom moved out, Duffy's Taxi moved out, Salisbury House built a store down the street, the Concord Hotel was established and as a result things just kept getting tighter and tighter and it came to the point that I had no other alternative but to lock my door. The legal advice I was given at this particular time was to file bankruptcy and I didn't, being a stubborn Irishman, I chose to pay off a hundred cents on a dollar and I was fortunate because all the creditors, including the income tax department of the country, Hudson's Bay Wholesale, McLeans, people who were in business in the community that I explained the situation to, that I said that I had qualification to become a teacher and I would become a teacher. I didn't particularly enjoy it, but — by the way may I go back just a bit. The real thorn, the thing that really stuck hardest in my craw was when the Metro Transit Company came around and they slapped "No Parking" signs around this place and it cost me about \$20.00 a day profit and it was just too

(MR. BOYCE cont'd.) much. My wife and I tried to sustain this place working 12 hours a day, each one of us, and I know what families are involved in, in a necessity of going through a transitional period, and nobody likes it, nobody enjoys it, and I personally don't like to be responsible, whether it's 11,000 people lose their jobs or 4,000 people, 4 or even 1, I personally don't like to be responsible for it. But I think, Mr. Speaker, that the members on this particular side of the House have more faith in the insurance people, the insurance agents than some of the insurance agents have themselves, because if these people had the guts to do the work, if they had the guts to go out there and do what is necessary, I know what's necessary in building up a business. I'm once again involved in it in another endeavour that I'm starting because I can't teach any more because of being a MLA, so I have to revert to what I know how to make a dollar and I started a small company again and I hope the thing is successful. I have no guarantee that it's going to be successful, but I do know that people who have the faith in themselves and got the guts to do the work still have a chance in this country.

And once again I would say that -- you know, we have heard much mention about Friedman, I think it's Friedman's study, the necessity of helping people through transitional periods where things happened to them over which they have no control. We assist people who suffer flood damage, they're assisted; when people suffer famines or acts of God, they're assisted. So now we're trying to implement a new philosophy where by acts of government people suffer that we can help these people through a transitional period. I for one would like to see that the insurance agents in the province didn't lose a dime for a reasonable period of time for them to adjust but it's just not economically possible. So that I do sympathize with the members and their reaction is a normal reaction - the insurance agents in the province. I was mad when these things happened to me. I was mad when the first year in the transitional period I was reduced to an income of \$2,500 gross for the whole year and had to go to school. I didn't particularly appreciate it so I know what the insurance agents are talking about.

But one other point that's come through, Mr. Speaker, and in my view a very important, a very important point, is the responsibility of politicians to the people that they represent. I wasn't here for most of the debate, as I have been reminded often, during the Session last year when the heat of Bill 56 was permeating these august chambers, but before I left I sat down and I wrote responses to all the people from Wawanesa who used to stuff our mailboxes - the people from the Wawanesa Company, the elected officials in the town, and I suggested at that time that the arguments that they were putting forward why the government shouldn't proceed with the Crown corporation were darned good arguments in my mind for the establishment of a head office in Wawanesa. This was before the decision was made that the head office of the Crown corporation should be in Brandon. And I suggested to these people that if a Crown corporation was going to be established, as it appeared that it would be, that the politician, to be responsible to the citizens of the Town of Wawanesa, should shift their ground and be responsible to the people of this town rather than the company, Wawanesa Insurance Company. I didn't get one response from any of these people.

And a comparable situation - I don't want to digress - is happening relative to Bill 36. It appears to be inevitable that the reorganization of Winnipeg is going to come about, so where do we get the King Canute attitude where they, you know, stand out there and you sit on your throne and try and hold back the tide. They're behaving in an irresponsible way once again, that they're not, in my view, being responsible to the people that elected them. They're not trying to address themselves to the problem. You know, much of the debate about putting people out of work, the human element of it, I really resent, Mr. Speaker, some of the charges that are hurled across the floor because there's no one here in this House that is more concerned, no group in my view in politics in this country that is more concerned than this particular group as far as the individual, and this displacement and transition is going to be more prevalent in our society as we become more complex.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I was absent when the Minister of Municipal Affairs made reference to his speech in which there was some statistics quoted. I am not aware of the particular article I am aware of the fact that I did speak on that occasion and I think it was in reference to the fact that I suggested there will be 11,000 people displaced. Well the fact was reported and I am assuming that the Minister has made a correct statement of that article, that that information is correct, I believe and I think I can indicate that I said a thousand families

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) would be displaced and I said there was a multiplying effect of the people who were going to be affected by it, but I did not in any way indicate 11,000, I'm quite sure of that and I'm quite prepared to indicate that to the House at this time.

I listened to the few remarks of the honourable member from Winnipeg Centre and I feel it's important to address myself to his presentation, because in many respects I think he reflects the thinking of many people on the other side who view this situation as one in which there is progress with its ultimate effect on some segment of society, albeit a minority group, and the necessity of the government in some way assisting those people because progress has taken place. Mr. Speaker, that is based on a false assumption and the presentation is not valid, notwithstanding the humanity that comes forward or emanates from the presentation that the Honourable Member from Winnipeg Centre has presented; notwithstanding the humane desire as expressed by him to assist people who in fact have been affected because of actions of government, the facts clearly do not bear out the effort that the government put forward or the justification for its action.

Mr. Speaker, governments can be heartless and can be cruel; governments may not be responsive to the needs of people; governments do not have to be humane; and I'm suggesting that in the course of action that was undertaken by the government with respect to auto insurance, and is borne out by the information that we now have as to what the rates will be, that the course of action was not justified; that the actions were inhumane; that they were not responsive to the needs of people and that the need or that the objective of reform that the government wanted to undertake could have been performed if they had examined this situation closely without affecting so directly the lives of so many people in Manitoba. These people are being offered a pittance as I've indicated before for what has happened to them; and these people have been offered a pittance only because they protested and only because they used whatever resources they had to try and mobilize public opinion, because I daresay, Mr. Speaker, that had the meeting not taken place on the grounds of the Legislature and had the Minister of Municipal Affairs not been shaken by the reception he received, and had the First Minister not realized that auto insurance wasn't going to meet with the great approval that he thought it would and that he would not be able to necessarily fight an election on it, if those factors hadn't entered into play the kind of transition that would have been offered would not have been offered, because the government had really no intention at all of acting in any humane way to the people who were going to be affected, but they were plodding along because of two things: First, this appeared to them to be an action that could be undertaken which would have no basic cost as far as government is concerned. They could argue that this was a program of social reform, they could argue that they were living up to an obligation undertaken at election time and they would have the benefit of being able to say we made a promise, we're going to live up to that promise and at the same time we could do it without trying to get into the very essential requirement of looking at government programs, of paring government costs, of transferring monies to those programs that must take priority in the 70s at this time. So in effect they have substituted what I've referred to as a cheap reform for the real kind of reform that should take place in society and for the kind of change that should occur when administrations come forward and replace other administrations. Now I'm not suggesting that no government has so far been able to build within it the kind of change that will necessarily take care of the reforms that must occur year by year in government action, and therefore we have governments defeated at election time; but at the same time without in any way going back to the reasons for the loss of the election, it was anticipated and expected, Mr. Speaker, that the NDP Party who for so many years talked the rhetoric of social reform, would come in and in fact commence those reforms; and because they were not prepared to do that, and because they were not prepared to put the kind of effort that many people suspected that they would put it, and because they were not prepared to live up to the language that they had used in opposition, they substituted auto insurance as a means to satisfy the political need of meeting the obligation of reform, the obligation of one promise that would be made, and after all who were they affecting but the insurance companies with whom many of them wanted to have some revenge because they represent the large corporation and a small group of agents whose political cloud was nil.

The truth of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is that the actions that were taken were taken because the agents represented in political terms nothing; that they had no force, they had no way in which they could fight back against the arm of government. I resent very much and I will not allow the members opposite to suggest as they like to suggest and stand up, that reform

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) requires and affects people and of necessity people are affected and therefore we did nothing that other people have not done either in private industry or government hasn't done in the past. Because, Mr. Speaker, I suggest in doing this they are fooling themselves and kidding themselves of what actually happened; because, Mr. Speaker, if we examined all the information that the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs has presented with respect to Autopac, the savings aren't there. And he can stand on his head and he can talk all he wants; the truth of the matter is the savings are not there, the savings are not there. And for the Member for Radisson who knows nothing, says nothing, I would hope that he would keep quiet, because he knows nothing on this. Those savings are not there, and they couldn't have been there in the first place, Mr. Speaker. At the very most, at the very most, at the very most all the government could have ever offered, was the saving of the commission given to the agents; but having now had to pay transitional assistance, having now had to pay commission, the actual savings, if they were as efficient as private industry, would be very much smaller; and all one has to do is look at the rates to realize it.

Mr. Speaker, without going into the argument again, every reform that was required with respect to auto insurance could have been undertaken by government control and regulation without the government going into business and without the government directly affecting the people's lives. Mr. Speaker, let me suggest to the honourable members, because I do not believe and I will not from my point of view allow them to think that they can stand up and rationalize their position now and simply believe that by rationalizing it they're finished with it. Mr. Speaker, too many people's lives have been affected, and I know these people, and I've seen these people and I know who's leaving Manitoba as a result of it, and I know the disgust, despair that they have that their life in this province has been finished by the action of a government that wasn't responsible to them. Mr. Speaker, these people are not the people who are the powerful people that the NDP would like to talk about; these are little people; these are people of modest incomes; these are people who have very little in savings, they are the people who have had to disrupt their lives and leave this province because of an action of a government that was not responsive to them.

So, Mr. Speaker, let me characterize this debate and the remarks of the honourable member by simply suggesting that the government has not been responsively humane in its actions with respect to auto insurance; it has not at all justified its claim and it can stand on its head and argue that what it is accomplishing is for the good of the people; the truth of the matter is that all the reforms that have in fact been introduced could have been introduced by legislation, by control, and the savings could have been passed to the people. What the government did, is they substituted this as a course of action to be able to say at the next election, we said we would bring in auto insurance legislation and we did, and we therefore have lived up to the obligation, and have in fact cleared their own conscience of the real necessity of commencing the kind of program reform that should have been commenced.

Mr. Speaker, there's a recent article, it's the newest article I guess in McLean's magazine on Eric Kierans and on Prime Minister Trudeau, and in the course of it there is one remark that is very appropriate. The remark has been made, or the discussion took place between Mr. Kierans and I guess the person who wrote the article, about Mr. Trudeau. Mr. Trudeau said: "You know, if I didn't do this and I didn't play politics and I didn't make any political decisions," — and curiously enough one of the decisions mentioned is the pulp mill in Manitoba in that article — "if I didn't make all of these decisions in terms of supporting because of the politics, I wouldn't be here and the country wouldn't be as well off. It's better that I am here." Well, Mr. Speaker, that was a pompous, arrogant answer, and I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that really is the rationale behind the government's position; because their position is that if they didn't do these things they wouldn't be here; they've got to do these things because by their being there it's better. Well, Mr. Speaker, is it really better? Let's understand — are the people in this province really better off? Are the people as a result of this great social reform action and a whole year that's been spent and the divisive way in which it has divided this province and the kind of conflict that exists within our society in Manitoba as a result of it, and the pressure it's had on the investment climate — are all of these things justified? Can they justify it on the basis of the reform that they introduced, or would it have been better to have spent their time on the kinds of reform and the kinds of programs that would in effect really have helped the human condition in Manitoba? Well I think the answer is very obvious. The answer is no. They have failed to reduce auto insurance costs by any

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) substantial means in this province; they have disrupted the lives of many people; they have affected the credibility of the government, because no one knows for sure where their action is going to take place next; they have in fact taken a minority and clobbered them on the head and kicked them in the stomach, and that's exactly what they've done, and they want to at this point suggest that what they're doing is they're acting in a humane way. Well, they haven't and it's on their conscience now and forever for what they've done.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre have a question?

MR. BOYCE: Just a question of clarification. In the first part of your presentation you said that the only reason we reacted at all was because of the pressure of the agents and in your latter part of your speech you say that we don't give a tinker's damn about the agent. You know, I don't understand . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: I indicated that the question of compensation, the transition that was offered only came about as a result of the pressure of the agents who instead of being only able to mobilize 1,000 people were able to put 8,000 people out there, and it was only at that time that the government made any official announcement that they were even going to consider anything. And I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that that wasn't in the books at all.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: You said my argument was based on false assumptions. I wonder which assumptions were false -- you never did mention them. Well, I'm sorry, you don't recall. One more question. Don't you think things are better for the Province of Manitoba because you're here?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I think things would be better if we were over there, yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Would the Leader of the Opposition submit to another question from myself? Would the Honourable Leader of the Opposition indicate whether or not he still is of the opinion that the rates that he gave in this House on June 28th, 013, 023 are applicable to 64 percent approximately of the motorists in the Province of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Did you quote directly from Hansard when you made that statement?

MR. PAWLEY: Yes, if the honourable member had been here this morning he would have heard the direct quote on Page 2, 240 of Hansard.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question. The question is the amendment moved by the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney. I'll read it again. "That while concurring in Resolution No. 75, this House regrets that the government through its Autopac policy has failed to give serious consideration to the insurance agents of Manitoba, the three insurance companies with their head offices in Manitoba and the Village of Wawanesa."

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

MR. CLERK: (Resolutions 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80 were read and passed) 81 --

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make one or two comments on 81(c) in regards to Grants to Municipalities in lieu of taxes.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I'd like to indicate to the honourable member that we are taking resolutions by number in total, not any one particular item, although he may address himself to . . .

MR. MOUG: Yes, I'd like to speak briefly, Sir, on 81 and the item I refer to, or the section I refer to rather with great latitude in regard to the grants in lieu of taxes throughout the Province of Manitoba. There has been from 1971 to 1972 approximately a 10 percent increase, which is understandable because I think that one new building or two new buildings could cover up for this 10 percent increase, although at the same time without that, I'm sure we could expect some increase of some kind.

I make reference to this simply because on the fiscal year along with this increase the Department of Urban Affairs has come up with \$1-3/4 million which would look after the City of Winnipeg area during that fiscal year. Some reference has been made in the past that possibly this \$1-3/4 million would be going only towards the calendar year which the municipalities operate on and the calendar year of 1972. Well, regardless of how this is worked, during the fiscal year that the government operates on from March 31st, 1971 to March 31st, '72 we have this 10 percent plus we have another million and three-quarter dollars which is close to

(MR. MOUG cont'd.) half of the budgeted money for municipal affairs - regardless of how this money is spent, there's a million and three-quarter hidden here. There was some reference made by the Minister responsible for urban affairs during the Estimates that this money would be put out on a month to month basis to stop the problem that some municipalities have waiting for payment to come through from the Provincial Government. Now if this is the case, I agree with him wholeheartedly that this is fine. But this money covers up till next March 31st, and if as he says was right that the 1-3/4 million was going to cover from the 1st of January to the 31st of March, it's a great amount of money and the comparison is not right for the three million that is set out in this budget for Municipal Affairs, because a portion of it is not right.

The 1-3/4 million is probably satisfactory to take care of uni-city for a full year on a 50 - 50 basis because half the population is in here and I realize more than half the buildings and more than half the grants would go within the uni-city area. But I have to question, Sir, and I suspect that there's money here that was incorrectly budgetted. There's money here that is going to be incorrectly spent. There's no way that by the time our budget comes out for the fiscal year of March 31st '72 to March 31st, '73, undoubtedly by that time we will have in the Urban Affairs Department grants in lieu of taxes. So for that reason I suggest that regardless of what happens in the calendar year of '72, if the Estimates of this department are correct, then the Estimates in the Urban Affairs department is wrong. One and three quarter million dollars is here by mistake one way or the other.

I realize that the Minister of this department was unable to explain when I brought this up previously, I hope that he is in a position now to correct the situation and clear the minds of those of us on this side because we realize that there's an error somewhere in the budget for close to \$2 million, and if not at least 1-3/4 million.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution 81 — passed.

MR. CLERK: Resolutions 82, 83. (XIII) Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$59,816,600 for public works and highways . . .

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I wish to move a resolution on Resolution 84. While concurring in Resolution 84, this House regrets that for the first time in the history of the Manitoba Legislature a Minister of the Crown has refused to answer legitimate questions put to him during the consideration of his Estimates pertaining to the spending of \$59,816,600 of the taxpayers' money.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the lack of debate and the refusal of the Minister of Highways and Public Works to give answers to questions put to him by members of the Opposition is well known and well recorded by the recent events that transpired in this House a week or two ago. I might say that I regret that the Minister is not in his seat; I might say that usually he's a good attender but I notice today that there are only three or four Cabinet Ministers in their places all during the day while concurrence motions are being dealt with and I think that this is something that should go on the record.

So I'm suggesting to the House and to the public that we have over 10 percent of the expenditure of the taxpayers' money for the coming year have gone through the House without any proper discussion and by the course of action taken by the Minister where he willfully refused, willfully refused to answer questions and to discuss in a responsible manner the Estimates of his department. I think that this should be recorded and I think that members of the House should have the opportunity to vote a censure on the Minister who acts in such an irresponsible manner.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: . . . submit to a question. Would the honourable member desire to specify where the Honourable Minister in question willfully refused to answer.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well if the Minister of Municipal Affairs was in the House at all during the time that the Minister spent reading reports and insulting members opposite who tried to ask questions and he stated, it's in Hansard for all to see, that he would refuse to answer the questions that he considered other matters more important and he continued to read reports, and after some hours of this action the Member for Morris finally decided that it was

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd.) pointless to go any further and made the motion that the Estimates be passed because of the fact the Minister refused to discuss them.

MR. SPEAKER put the question.

MR. SPEAKER: The House is undecided.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. Order please. The question before the House is a motion of regret on Resolution 84 moved by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

A STANDING VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Bilton, Einarson, Ferguson, Froese, Girard, G. Johnston, F. Johnston, Jorgenson, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, Moug, Patrick, Spivak and Mrs. Trueman.

NAYS: Messrs. Adam, Allard, Barrow, Borowski, Boyce, Cherniack, Doern, Gonick, Gottfried, Green, Hanuschak, Jenkins, Johansson, Mackling, Malinowski, Miller, Pawley, Petursson, Shafransky, Toupin, Uskiw, Uruski, Walding.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 16; Nays, 23.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the Nays have it. I declare the motion lost.

MR. CLERK: 84, 85.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: I beg to move, Sir, seconded by the Member for Gladstone, that while concurring in Resolution 84, this House regrets that the government in the proposed construction of the Inner Beltway, their policy has created uncertainty and hardships for those affected by land and property freezes.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make one or two brief remarks in regard to the problem basically in southern Manitoba and in the build-up of Metro Winnipeg in regards to the Inner Beltway proposal. There's been a paper for quite some time in around the city and the ill effects that it has.

It seems first of all that southern Manitoba is just blanked out as far as road construction or maintenance is concerned, other than in one or two areas such as the La Salle area, that the balance of the province is really and truly forgot. The Beltway, be it famous or infamous, has created a lot of problems for those that live near the area and own property. Metro they come along and they put a freeze on development construction building permits. It's a wipeout, you can't get a building permit. Your own land is there, all you do you have to pay taxes on it, you get your yearly tax bill and you pay it. If you don't after two years it's sold and a speculator will pick it up and he'll hang on to it.

I'm not making reference Sir, now while I speak, I'm not making reference to those that are speculators and own 15 or 20 acres of land, I'm speaking of those that own one house and possibly one or two hundred feet alongside of it which is quite a normal thing to see through particularly the Charleswood area and through the Sturgeon Creek area St. James-Assiniboia, you'll find this quite prevalent, that people own one or two hundred feet because it's a depth area, there's side streets, avenues could have been cut through and they can't go to the municipality and ask for this because if they do, the Municipal Board will not okay the by-law that's necessary to go through that these people better the properties and go ahead and develop it. In some of the areas these people own this land and there's local improvements that aren't stalled, such as happens in Charleswood, and they're paying on a yearly basis to amortize this debt over 20 years, they're paying in some cases 90 to 100 dollars. Some of these people have paid for the past seven years, some of them have paid for two or three years, but this debt in the first instance which was in the neighbourhood of \$1,000 and they didn't have the money, they are paying 90 to 100 dollars and the end result will be close to \$2,000 as a debt before the debt is paid out. Now as they pay this from year to year and the freeze was put on two years ago, they find themselves in a position as they go to develop it that Metro says No, and the department that I make reference to now put the squeeze on expropriation proceedings approximately two years ago to the very day that we're discussing this now. So I think that owing to the fact that taxes are climbing in these areas as they do everywhere else, and the people's rights are certainly being infringed upon where they can't sell the property, they can't develop it, and I speak of people that have lived in one home that is deteriorated now, they wish to move on to a piece of property alongside of it and get themselves into a new house along with the monies they would

(MR. MOUG cont'd.) realize from selling several of the lots that are available to development.

The Minister has said from time to time that an idiot can build highways; and we on this side agree; we've had it proven to us. But beltways is another thing. Apparently that section, that area he's still stumped on and I think with a little practice we could probably encourage him to go ahead with the Beltway and let these people out of the trap that they are presently in.

I notice, Sir, in yesterday's paper that there was a Dr. Morison had resigned as Chairman of the Health Services Commission and there's been a member added, Mr. Crofford. Apparently, Sir, he has quite an experience in building roads in Saskatchewan from the information I can gather. He's a roadbuilder. And we know, we're well aware after our two years experience in the Legislature here with this government, that we have to get our experience and expertise from Saskatchewan. I think if we can make some deal with the Minister of Health and Social Development to transfer this man from one department to the other that possibly we could get some work done on the Beltway.

There's one item today in today's Free Press - I'll quote from today's Free Press, Sir: "A motion to have the hat passed to collect money in aid of paying a \$1,000 fine imposed on Highways Minister Joe Borowski was turned down by an overwhelming majority Tuesday at the meeting of delegates of the Winnipeg Industrial Labour Council." He goes on to say "only a few hands went up in favour of hat collection . . ."

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: I fail to see the relevance to the motion before us of the present point that is being referred to the Speaker and I would like to indicate that I feel that it is not relevant.

MR. SPEAKER: I would concur with the Honourable Minister, I was trying to determine the relevancy of the remark. The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: Sir, I think that I only have one or two words left to say here on what I'm quoting and I think the Minister will understand what I'm getting to. It said "Only a few hands went up in favour of hat collection after hearing Morris Gillam, Cinema Projections Union - Cinema Projections Union. Now if this Minister is not putting on a show in the Province of Manitoba, what Minister is?"

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The honourable member is putting words into this Chamber with inference which I'm sure he doesn't want to be attributed to him. I think he should be a little more cautious in what he is saying. The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for correcting me, because certainly I wouldn't want to put words into this Chamber that would degrade any person who is representing that good constituency that I represent, but I sure have to say that this man that we have looks after everything in the province possible except highways in southern Manitoba. As I mentioned, apart from that one piece of road in La Salle which is a nice piece of road - six and one quarter miles to get two ministers home from the Legislature. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

HON. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Minister of Public Works and Highways) (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I had absolutely no intention of rising but that last remark cannot go unchallenged. He is resorting to the same type of technique that was used by the Member from Morris and this is in his constituency. You know I'm not proud of my MLA but I happen to live in the constituency of Morris, and it's in his constituency and he was the one that raised it last year. I thought I corrected it, that the contracts for the road had been brought up to a certain standard ready for blacktopping when we had come into office. The previous government had built the road to a decent standard and there's a lot of money spent on it and if we didn't put the - it's not blacktopping it's simply an oil or asphalt surface treatment which right now is in pretty bad condition. If the Member for Charleswood would care to go out and drive on it he'd find out that it's not a very good road. At that time I was accused of building that road because I lived in La Salle. The fact of the matter is that we started building that road about eight months before I bought a house. The Member for Charleswood knows that and the Member for Morris, and if they're so desperate and poverty stricken for some arguments or something to throw against us maybe they could descend to a lower level and come up with something you know, that would suit them better, than to bring in this type of stuff into the House and try and make

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd.) out like this government - and any government that would do that deserves to get kicked out and deserves to get chastised. That it's worse than being corrupt, a Minister is going to build roads up to his doorway. And this has not been done, this is not been done.

But I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you what happened under the previous administration where snowplows went to certain party faithfuls and plowed driveways, where they put chemicals in front of their driveways, where there was contracts given out to the party faithfuls - Dauphin is the best example I can give. Mr. Speaker, they're complaining about me not answering their questions. The fact is they were so scared that I would talk about Dauphin - I had every intention of talking about Dauphin and the land scandal of the Beltway that they very cleverly moved a motion, and I didn't protest, they moved a motion, they didn't want to hear the answer, they didn't want to hear the answers, they moved a motion to pass the Estimates and then they sit back piously and they say, what a terrible person, what a terrible government, they won't even answer our questions. They didn't want the answers. Now they're saying, we want you to answer A, B, C and D. I can tell them right now they're not going to get through the back door with that which they refused to take through the front door. They had ample opportunity to ask these questions and more - I'm sure they had more questions and it's obvious by listening to them today, they have more questions, and they were going to be answered but I have to report for the department. I wanted to get my report over with and then deal with the questions. I think that's reasonable. They obviously weren't interested. Now they're getting up, knowing full well that there is no way that I can go through the procedure and answer all the questions. They know that I can't bring all the things that I've had in front of me here. I had the staff sitting three days wasting valuable time - (Interjection) - no listening to you, Valuable time which was wasted because I couldn't get the answers to them, they were sitting up there prepared to get the answers if I didn't have them, supply me with the answers to answer any question that you wanted answered. I wasn't given that opportunity.

As a matter of fact, looking at the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, and the technique that they've been employing I suspect that we're going to have to pass a Human Rights Act for the government members. You know, that's the party that was saying, let's get a - what was it? - a constitution or a Bill of Rights or something to protect the people. And who was the first one that wanted to cut off debate on this side? I wanted to speak on pornography, I was almost prevented by the Member for Riel, a former Minister of Education. The Member for Osborne wanted to speak on something, they tried to cut him off. Three backbenchers they attempted to cut off when speaking on a particular subject. It seems that now that we're on this side we don't have certain rights. They're the ones that are always getting up there and telling us what great champions they are of the Indians, of the farmers, of the old people. They want to do everything for them. They want to protect everybody's rights except our right to speak. How many times have they prevented or tried to prevent members from this side to get involved in a dialogue and to answer questions. I'm not an old hand at the Legislature, I can't speak from experience, but I've been reading the Hansard for many years, for many years. Quite familiar with the debate that went on when Mr. Roblin was Premier and Mr. Weir was Premier. I don't ever recall the Liberals or the New Democrats resorting to that kind of below the belt techniques that the Conservatives are resorting today. And then they got the gall, the obscene gall to get up here and say that we're arrogant. You know, right now arrogance would be an act of mercy to end this charade that we've had going on here. But to be arrogant requires something that I suggest to you this government doesn't have. If there's anybody arrogant in this House, it's the members on that side.

I'd like to deal just for a moment before I sit down, because I have no intention of reopening the whole Estimates which would take me several hours to deal with, but I'd like to deal with - the Member for Charleswood talked about the freeze on the Beltway; and I notice that during Estimates there was one member I believe from the Conservative Party that thought it was important enough to raise a question. They all talked about roads and it's only right that they should because this is a highways department and roads are important. But I think just one of them thought it was important enough to talk about the Belt. And now he gets up and he makes a big issue out of it about the Beltway and the terrible injustice to the people. Well who was responsible for this injustice in the first place? It certainly wasn't me. It wasn't the members of the front bench here. The Conservative Government decided that they're going to change the transportation system in Winnipeg. You know I think every government

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd.) should have some kind of a plan to deal with transportation because it's becoming critical, it's becoming so critical almost like fertilizer and pesticide. We've got to deal with it. If we don't, it going to overwhelm us in a few years. So they come up, or Metro come up with a study which they publicly took the posture well, it's not too bad but we don't feel that we can accept it yet. In the meantime, they were buying - I used the words "under the table" before, that may not be the proper word, but the fact is that they were on the Q.T. buying land, \$3 million worth so far on the Beltway and putting it to the side; we come into office and naturally we had to deal with the problem. It would have been terribly irresponsible of us to say yes - that Beltway scheme that's worth three-quarters of a billion dollars, the one that Metro was proposing, and that was '68 figures I believe. And we understand now - the whole thing, yes three-quarter of a billion dollars, that included rapid transit, land acquisition all there was to it, the whole package if accepted was three-quarters of a billion spread over 25 years with a cost probably over \$2 billion.

I wonder what the Opposition would have said had we suggested, you know, we'll accept it. We'll accept this scheme that I'm convinced would in the end break Manitoba. Because even Ontario, rich Ontario, couldn't afford to spend, what was it? - \$84 million on the Spadina Expressway. . . . How could we turn around and accept that kind of a scheme? So we said we want to study it. We did study it, you know. As Ministers individually and the department we looked at it. In the meantime we said we won't spend any money. Metro had the option and still has to buy any land they want, use their money. The freeze is not on that. The freeze is on our 50 percent participation, financial participation and as a matter of fact, Metro I believe had gone ahead and bought one or two properties, properties which since the urban departments come into effect were approved by the Minister and have been cost-shared. But in the meantime, we have said to the people we know it's a terrible injustice to be sitting with land for three years and if you want to expand like the Dutchman Nursery there. They couldn't sell it, they couldn't expand, they couldn't improve because they couldn't get a permit. I think that's terrible. The businessman that spent a lifetime there building up his business and he says well I want to spend \$30,000 to improve my nursery and Metro said I'm sorry we can't give you the permit because that's where the Beltway is coming. They won't buy it from him. I think that's terrible. But why are you blaming me, why are you blaming the government? We didn't bring this thing about. We inherited it and I think it's responsible of us to look at it and we have brought in people into a committee called PAC, people that I think the Opposition will agree are the cream of the crop in this community - not mercenaries brought in from the outside - that are sitting in in this group and studying the whole transportation question and they will bring in a report by the end of the year and at that time the government will look at it and by that time we will have, hopefully, the uni-city election over with; we can sit down with the new government and say well, which scheme do you want. The quarter million dollar, the half million, the three-quarters of a million or the billion dollar scheme. Take your pick. At that time when the decision is made then the person will be able to sell his land to us and Metro or the new government or he'll be able to expand or he will build his high rise apartments as some of them claim they want to do. That it seems to me that that is not an unreasonable position for us to take. I've said this so many times that I had hoped that somehow the message had got across to the Opposition and I hope that after today it does. That there's a three year injustice that these people have been suffering under; we are saying that they'll have to suffer that injustice for another six months. And at that time a decision will be made and whatever it is, it will lift the cloud once and for all.

Mr. Chairman, I simply want to close by saying to the Opposition, if they want to criticise for something I've done wrong, of course they have every right to do so; but I don't think it's fair and it's proper for them to bring in something that's not true or something that's irrelevant. He mentions about reading something from the Free Press. Look, I can't help if somebody is collecting money for me and somebody says yes or somebody says no. I got money coming in from all over the country being sent in. I didn't ask for it, it's coming in and I don't know why the member wants to bring it in here to try and embarrass me, as if you know, I'm doing something terrible about it. — (Interjection) — You're on my side? Well you can send a dollar over then I'll believe you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris,

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, the Minister as usual followed a rather torturous trail and covered a wide variety of subjects in dealing with the specific item that is before the House.

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd.) He finally got around to dealing with the question of the Beltway after he had given us one of his lectures on morality, after he had delivered of himself another speech on pornography, the one that he claims he was unable to get in some time ago, and a number of other things that were irrelevant insofar as the motion was concerned. However, since the Minister has taken quite a bit of latitude in dealing with this particular motion, I should like to also deal with some of the matters that he raised, and particularly the question of time consumed during the consideration of the Estimates and his inability to be permitted the opportunity to answer questions. What the Minister said just a moment ago and he knows to be not true, the fact that he was not given an opportunity to answer questions. The very fact is, Sir, that the Minister said that he was not going to answer any questions in this House and took up two hours and a half of the time of the House reading an irrelevant speech into the record which had nothing to do with the Department of Highways and anything under his administration.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister on a point of order?

MR. BOROWSKI: Yes, I rise on a point of order. I have no objection to the member's speaking, but again I think the rules of the House are that you cannot impute dishonest motives. He's saying that I would not answer questions; that simply is not true. I said I would answer them after I had completed my remarks and he knows that very well and I would ask him not to say the things that are not true. I would like to thank the Member for Charleswood for the ten-dollar donation.

MR. SPEAKER: On the same point of order? The Honourable Minister Without Portfolio,

HON. RUSSELL DOERN (Minister Without Portfolio) (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, we have heard this debate several times from both sides of the House. I think there is a rule on repetition and I hope that this is not going to be an opportunity to reopen and rehash arguments that have been put several times in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: I'm not rehashing anything, I'm simply dealing with the comments that were made by the Minister, comments that I interpret as being untrue, and I want to correct the record. The fact was that the Minister did take up close to three hours in delivering of himself an initial statement. He knows that in the 80 hours that are used for the consideration of estimates in this House that is an inordinately large amount of time to be taken up for giving an initial statement, when the purpose of the estimates is to give the members of this House an opportunity to question the Minister on his conduct of the affairs of that department. He knew also that we were anxious to try and give some consideration to each of the departments of government. He speaks as though his was the only department of government and that we had unlimited time to deal with it; and that is not the case, Sir. His statement to the effect that we were the ones that prevented him from dealing with the questions that were asked is not true, because we did ask questions and when he had an opportunity to reply, he refused to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Just a brief comment, Mr. Speaker, relative to the debate that's been going on. The Minister of Transportation certainly once again doesn't need me to defend him, but during the estimates the Minister was addressing himself to reports more under Public Works than he was under Highways, so that perhaps there was some confusion still hanging on, but I'd just like to make one comment about this Beltway argument - two points: There's a lot of pressure by people who have property in the area that it was suggested the beltway may have been built and also the Arlington Street overpass, and as one of the members of the downtown area, I for one am not too sure that we have enough information to expend the amount of money that would be required to build the type of transportation facility that is suggested by the Winnipeg Area of Transportation survey.

It has been mentioned, based on the figures that were available when the report was submitted, they were talking about somewhere in the neighbourhood of seven hundred millions of dollars, while reviews to date show that they're talking about perhaps \$1.2 billion and perhaps in the year 1991 in terms of two billions of dollars, and this amount of money would only increase the transportation facility for an additional population for a quarter of a million people. In other words, the present day population in the Metro area is somewhere around 500,000 and they extrapolate these figures to the year 1991, to suggest that we would have

(MR. BOYCE cont'd.) three-quarters of a million people. So for the additional quarter of a million people they are asking for an expenditure of perhaps two billions of dollars, which is a very very heavy capital investment for a province of this size. There are many other forces that are . . . work, as they realized in Ontario recently — there was reference made to it already about the Spadina freeway, they're scrapping it after wasting 50 millions of dollars, and may perhaps in future be a good landing space for Martians or something.

But specifically addressing myself to the Arlington Street overpass, I don't know how many people are familiar with what they're talking about as far as this spaghetti works that they want to superimpose in this particular area. There is at the present time a real rationalization study being carried out by the various levels of government and I'm not privy to the decisions which are being made, but I do know that for years the CPR has had an option on land in Rosser and there was an indication that perhaps they would be moving some of their facilities out there. There is also pressure on the rail lines to adopt the common carrier type of facility where there would only be one marshalling yard in each major area and perhaps this could develop into an expansion of the Symington Yards rather than the utilization of the Rosser area. But I'm not speaking for the position of the government or the Minister of Transportation, it's just my personal view on this particular matter as one of the members of Winnipeg, that I have not had it demonstrated to me to my satisfaction that the bridge, the investment of \$14 million for the bridge itself and the approach network which would up this by another 16 million, I am informed, so for a total investment of 30 millions of dollars to build an overpass which in the next few years may overpass nothing, so that we would be in a similar position to what they are in Toronto, having to scrap the Spadina freeway. When the Metro Council makes a decision to spend, I think it's 450,000 if I'm — is it \$450,000 to bring the old Arlington Street bridge up to a safe standard in the interim I think is a wise investment, but until such time as we have a report from the Provincial Advisory Committee on Transportation, I for one would not be inclined to vote for any money to get the beltway system moving again or the Arlington Street Bridge overpass, the concept implemented.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution 85.

MR. CLERK: (Resolutions 85, 86 and 87 were read and passed)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR (Virden): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rock Lake, while concurring in Resolution No. 88, this House regrets that the inferior road maintenance called for by this government has resulted in rapid deterioration of certain of our main highways and provincial roads, thereby causing great inconvenience to our motoring public and wasting of large amounts of taxpayers' money.

MR. SPEAKER: I should like to say before I read this resolution that in the past it has been the custom to have these typed and to have more than one, which would make it a convenience for the Chair as well as for the Clerk and the other parties.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MCGREGOR: Mr. Speaker, I humbly apologize for not having copies. I assure you if it had been my writing you wouldn't have understood it. However, it was someone else's writing and I thought it was almost as good as a typewriter.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to the Minister and some of the problems that I, as the Member from Charleswood mentioned, south in Manitoba, and I would speak mainly of southwestern Manitoba that I know best, as I have a car out there that I a year ago didn't have. I got in behind the wheel on the 22nd of July, I've got 37,000 miles on it, all in Manitoba on the roads, so I think I do know a little bit of the roads, mainly in my constituency I might say. But the other day the Honourable Minister, Mr. Speaker, referred to some blame being thrown to the bureaucrats and he accepted full blame that he was running the show and I think this is very encouraging on his part; he as one on the other side is recognized in many circles as the real Premier of this province. I would have to say that he's not showing that same leadership and demanding that same authority to the Treasury Bench, because I think I have the map here, of 1957, which I would say is the Liberal map — roads were built for many years through the Liberals — or weren't being built — and here is the '71 map, so I would take credit as a Conservative map, and to look at the map one can't help but be a little bit proud of being a Conservative in a lot of those years. But also in the Minister's remarks a few minutes ago, of favoritism when they were in power, well I can assure you, Mr. Speaker,

(MR. MCGREGOR cont'd.) I wasn't shown too much favoritism and something you really know why in those days, but however that was something that I probably helped create and with inexperience. But I'm a lot less favorable today by the looks of my blue paper here — when it came through it was rather shocking — I hoped and hoped and yet I was reasonably prepared — I did see a bridge and approaches and so help me, Mr. Speaker, I had a lot of thinking and I did go over that little gully and I guess that's the only one that I can recognize in that particular area that is considered a break of any type. However, I do appreciate whatever that amount is, and now to get the roads like this, Forbes bridge, they built the bridge and then they built the roads and maybe that's what I'm looking forward to, but I would pick other parts of my constituency probably for building roads.

And speaking of the Treasury, I think the resolution was pretty self-explanatory I know the Minister and I discussed this and he realizes it, but surely these roads, some of these grades have been built for quite a number of years, good grades, but many more years of beating without a hardtop there's going to be the whole construction has to go into them and it will cost many millions of dollars.

I had some concern when the Honourable Member for Minnedosa came out with a new program — he was then the Minister of Highways, taking over some 4,000 miles off the municipal hands, and I deeply had a concern, what is this going to cost the taxpayers — roads are built and then we all have to contribute because it's municipal. I think it's catching up with this administration and I think it would have caught up with us had we been left in power, because it is a big thing and it's something that — I'm speaking mainly of my constituency and I'm sure I could express this at least of 20 or or 25 constituents in that general area — and I'm not speaking of the unorganized or the northern constituencies that are all, the Reeves and council people are deeply concerned.

I'm also, as you know, associated with Highway 83 and I know there's some work on the north end of it and I have reported to our international boys to the south that this is and they appreciate it, but this isn't as much as we would like to see. But the two main concerns is another north-south highway on the west side of the province 41; it was being rarely thought of when I believe the honourable member, Frank Bell from McAulay at that time who pursued this particular town and John Thompson, so it was through many Ministers and I hope — several years ago I went to McAulay and I said, if we don't get a hardtop I not only don't expect you to vote for me, I don't want you to vote for me. By the Lord Harry we had that snap election in '69 and I felt like eating my words but I stayed with it and it came out all right, but there was, prior to that election called, there was seven, 10.7 miles of blacktop that I guess I would have to say was on the paper, was on the same paper and maybe that saved my cotton picking political career. But it is the maintenance of these roads, and I know it's a huge expense, but I do feel, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister's budget has got to be increased somewhere along, even if it means tramping on some other ministers because we build — (Interjection) — Well, I'm not that close to you boys. Well, I'll tell you on the side, I'll cut a few things out. If I coulda chopped a few noses . . . Because this is going to cost us and let's face it, the southern part of the province was what made the north what it is — it took us going in there and I spent several years in the north and it's nice to see these great roads, these great expensive roads, but at the expense of the southern people and this is where they are still accommodating an awful lot of tourists each and every year and it's still our biggest industry and to a great extent we are neglecting the southern force and it's certainly my area and while I'm fortunate I have some good blacktop, I can think of 21 and No. 1 that are in good condition — they were built, Mr. Speaker, even though I look at the Minister, they're built in the good old Conservative days, so I daresay they're on solid foundation as our Party is, even though there's those who want to question it. — (Interjection) — Well, I'll try to prove it — I try to prove it in my constituent, one at a time, but it is the maintenance, Sir, that it's a real, real concern because it's gone back, it's going back and unless there's a bigger budget for the Minister, Mr. Speaker, there isn't really that much hope — and I'll just name those who are in real trouble, 41, 24, 259 and that's a question you've heard me say how many times — I don't know, many times — that little six miles between good NDP territory and good NDP territory. Now, surely the Minister kept — I didn't hear, Mr. Speaker, that interjection, but maybe — however, it is the six miles west side of Manitoba into Saskatchewan. We have a much better base, it will always be a much better highway, but, Mr. Speaker, we desperately need that six miles because that is an insult to people leaving the province and a shocker to those who are coming into the province. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Resolutions

MR. CLERK: (Resolutions Nos. 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93 were read and passed) Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$7,438,000 for Tourism and Recreation and Cultural Affairs.

Resolution 94 to 101 ---

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak on Resolution 95.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member proceed.

MR. GIRARD: Mr. Speaker, yesterday, or a few days ago, I spoke briefly on the resolution dealing with the Minister of Health and Social Development department and during that time I emphasized that I thought that we should be spending our money a little more wisely. I didn't suggest that what we should do is spend a little more money. Even if we spent the same amount as we are spending today in the total budget, I'm suggesting that it could be reallocated in a very favourable way for Manitobans. And my suggestion means that we would divert some money that is now spent in the Health and Social Development field into the Tourism area. I wonder what is being done in the Department of Tourism and I regret that the Minister is not here to answer some of these questions.

I'm wondering what the Minister is doing with regard to the so-called "master plan" that he has indicated to some people about. We have in the Tourism Department some idea of a master plan. The master plan means that we are going to place now privately-owned camping grounds under publicly controlled or publicly-owned administration. I'd like some clarification in that matter if clarification is available.

I'd like to know, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Tourism has given some attention to the development of snowmobile trails because snowmobiles are here to stay. There are going to be increasing numbers, they're going to be coming from the United States but we're doing nothing about it in spite of petitions being granted to the Minister with regard to this kind of development.

I'm suggesting that parts of Manitoba are crying for development in Tourism and it's a natural resource that we are not exploiting. I'd like to signal out, if I can, that the Constituency of Emerson in particular is very potential tourism area that is virtually untapped with the exception of the St. Malo development which occurred a few years ago. For the edification of members who have not seen Manitoba, I'd like to suggest that St. Malo has the best provincial camping ground of any in the province, one of the most attractive beaches in the province and in terms of proximity to Winnipeg, one of the most delightful spots in the province considering tourism and I'd like to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that the credit, in part at least, should go to the Member of Emerson who was then the MP for the area and was able to convince the Federal Government to dam the river in order to provide this kind of resource. I am sorry to note that some of our members are not aware of the existence of that area. I suggest the Buffalo Bay area is one of the most potential areas in Manitoba, not so much in the sense of commercial as it is in the sense of recreation. I think that Buffalo Bay once developed would make Falcon Lake look small. I'd suggest that the Roseau River is a very potential area in tourism. It could be very well developed and people of Manitoba as well as tourists from the outside are looking for this kind of development.

What I feel sorry about is not only that Manitoba is not being developed but what I feel more sorry about is to see the kind of dollars that are spent in the Health and Social Development field when we could - when we could avoid this kind of expenditure by providing development in the area of tourism and recreation. I'm suggesting that if we could transfer \$10 million - and it's a figure that could be increased - if we transferred \$10 million from the Department of Health and Social Welfare and transferred that to the Minister of Tourism, who must not have been there when the pie was passed around, this would double - more than double - the budget of Tourism. This would enable him not only to maintain, which I suggest is not being done now, to maintain the facilities that do exist and to develop facilities in Manitoba that are crying for development.

You know, we are suggesting that the people of Manitoba want the welfare, but what they really want is not that. They want employment. And Tourism is probably the most potential area to provide employment in Manitoba. We're not thinking of factories, we're thinking of occupations that will be to the benefit of the inhabitants of Manitoba as well as to the benefit of

(MR. GIRARD cont'd.) those who are already in business and who like to see people visiting the province.

I'd like to suggest that the COMEF Report, the TED Report, the Advisory Board to the Industry and Commerce Department, have all made this kind of suggestion to deaf ears. In fact, in spite of those recommendations, we've got a decrease in the amount of money allocated to the Minister of Tourism. I think that's unreasonable and really contrary to the trend. We were told last night that the reason why we're bringing in Bill 36 was that we already spent a million dollars in terms of reports, you know, studying the reorganization of urban government, and we had to do this because we had this number of studies done. It's not nonsense - it was said last night by your leader, Sir. And yet, we've had recommendations and reports that suggest emphatically and clearly that tourism needs development in Manitoba. So what do we do, we reduce the amount given that department.

If I was in a position to move a motion which would take \$10 million away from the Health and Social Development portfolio and place it in the portfolio of the Recreation and Tourism Minister, I would do it, Mr. Speaker, and I would do it with the help, I hope, of the Minister of Tourism, should he be here.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to on this ground move, while concurring in Resolution 95, the House regrets that the government through its Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs policies, has failed to provide for proper maintenance of existing recreational facilities and for the development of new natural recreation areas in Manitoba. I apologize, Mr. Speaker, for not having more copies. I tried but it was after five.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable Member for Emerson, seconded by . . .

MR. GIRARD: Seconded by the Honourable Member from Roblin.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hour being 5:30, the House is now adjourned until 8:00 p.m. tonight.