

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Friday, May 31, 1974.

Opening Prayer by Mr. Deputy Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 80 students of Grade VIII standing of the Mayville Portland Junior High School of North Dakota. These students are under the direction of Mr. Holman.

On behalf of all honourable members I bid you welcome to the Legislature.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports; Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Questions. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture and I would sincerely hope that he would attempt to answer it.

--(Interjection)-- Well, I say it, because I've asked the question so often over the past two months . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Question please.

MR. ENNS: But in view of a possible disruption with respect to the livestock marketing in general, can the Minister give us any indication as to what the situation currently is within the Hog Marketing Industry, the hog industry generally, and its potential marketings; has there any alleviation of the restrictions placed on the marketing of hogs in this last little while?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac Du Bonnet): Well, Mr. Speaker, the member for Lakeside knows perhaps more about that question than I do and otherwise he would not be putting the question, Mr. Speaker. Because the honourable member, Mr. Speaker, knows that that is a question that can be put by anyone to the Chairman of the Hog Marketing Board and that the hog producers themselves, the hog producers themselves . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside on a point of order.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, it's precisely because of that kind of an answer that I asked the question in the manner and way . . . The Minister knows full well that I can't ask that question in this Chamber to the Chairman of the Manitoba Hog Marketing Board. I have to ask that to a member of the Treasury Bench who represents that Board. And who in fact appointed that same person. Now if the Minister of Agriculture chooses not to answer . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Does the member have a point of order?

MR. ENNS: . . . chooses not to answer for the Hog Marketing Board then let him say so. But don't accuse me of asking a question of the wrong person.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a point of order?

--(Interjection)-- The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: The Honourable Member for Lakeside suggested to the House that I had appointed the Chairman of the Hog Marketing Board which is not correct. That individual has been elected, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. I. H. ASPER (Leader of the Liberal Party) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Attorney-General I direct my question to the First Minister. It relates to the undertaking by the Attorney-General to investigate the allegations or suggestions of land speculation by members of the staff of Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. Can the First Minister indicate whether the Attorney-General has received the results of the investigation - has he got a report?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable the First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier of Manitoba) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I notice that the Attorney-General is about to be in his place and I might for his edification, since he's in earshot, indicate that the request from the Honourable the Member for Wolseley

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . is whether or not the report has been received as yet from those public servants within the department that were requested to investigate the matter of alleged land speculation on the part of certain members of staff of one of the departments or agencies.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable the Attorney-General.

HON. HOWARD PAWLEY (Attorney-General) (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, a report has been submitted. The Honourable the Minister of Health and Social Development will reply in respect to same as we make it available to the department. I believe there were one or two questions that were being clarified in respect to the report but the Minister of Health and Social Development would be able better to answer insofar as the filing of the report itself, in respect to MHRC.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, if I may then redirect the question to the Minister of Health and Social Development.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Health and Social Development) (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure whether he was about to ask the question or the question's been asked. I wasn't in the House. Perhaps the . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. My question to the Minister of Health is related to the reply just given by the Attorney-General in which he indicated that the report relative to the investigation on land dealings in the MHRC had been given to the Minister. Could he indicate whether he has received the report, perused it, and has he satisfied himself that there is or is not any other action to be taken?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I can't answer a question with regard to legalities. Naturally that isn't within my sphere of operation nor is it my responsibility. Insofar as the MHRC is concerned and the actions by employees, I am looking at the report that I've received to determine apart from any legalities whether the extent to which staff of the MHRC or of any department generally might be involved in dealings which, although legally and technically are quite proper, whether that kind of activity should be permitted within the department; and I'm looking at that aspect of it.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: To the same Minister then, Mr. Speaker. Can we have some undertaking from the Minister that he will either table the report or make a statement to the House within a matter of days, or at least certainly before the session is completed, to resolve the charges or allegations that were levied against members of his department?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. MILLER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, certainly I can undertake prior to the dissolution of this session to make known to the House what policy I will attempt to establish vis-a-vis employees of the MHRC and my department generally.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Of the same Minister. Is the Minister indicating that he will not make public the report that was requested and undertaken I think by the Attorney-General?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. MILLER: No, the report was requested by me from the Attorney-General's Department when these allegations arose. I asked the Attorney-General to look into it. He has now given me a report which I haven't fully completed reading or studying, and whether that's a report that should be made public or not I'm not sure. I'll have to really check on where I stand with that sort of thing. It was a report that I requested after I heard of the allegations; and my initial reading of it is that there is no criminal action or legal action that might flow from that, but I'm a layman and I shouldn't really pass an opinion on that.

My only concern as Minister is that within the department and within the Housing Renewal Corporation that there should be no shadow at all on anyone in their dealings with the public so far as their role as government employees are concerned.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct a question to the Honourable the First Minister and I appreciate that he may well choose to accept the question as notice as

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. ENNS cont'd). . .I have not given him any advance notice of the question. But my question, Sir, to him is, would he undertake to give us some kind of a progress report with respect to the construction on the major Hydro developments. I'm referring specifically to the kind of work that is currently under way at Long Spruce, the situation on Lake Winnipeg regulation and the Churchill Diversion. I recognize that's asking a lot but it would be appreciated I think by members opposite if in the next few days we could have some kind of report on that matter.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would certainly welcome the invitation of the honourable member to do just that. There is some doubt in my mind as to just when the appropriate occasion would be to make such a report, but I will have such a report prepared and if not verbally given, then perhaps circulated in some fashion.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, it has to do with the matter of the shipment of quotas of hogs which seems to be the adoption of the Commission these days. Mr. Speaker, I asked the Minister last Monday I believe it was, and again on Wednesday I reiterated it, and I asked the Honourable Minister if he would advise the House as to whether or not the Co-op have preferential treatment over private shippers in the matter of bringing hogs into the City of Winnipeg.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I did have an opportunity to pose that question to the chairman who was unaware of anything of that nature. But further, Mr. Speaker, I should like to advise the Member for Swan River that he has as much access to people making policy in that respect as I have.

MR. BILTON: I'm going to ask the First Minister if he would inform the House as to what is happening in the marketing of hogs these days. We have tried to get the answers from the Minister of Agriculture and surely, surely the First Minister will tell the hog producers of Manitoba what is going on.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I don't fault, nor is it in my province to fault any honourable member for seeking information. Still, the Honourable Member for Swan River should be among the last to be unclear as to the correct reporting relationship that exists. The Minister of Agriculture relative to the operations of the Manitoba Hog Marketing Board is in the role of a Minister reporting for; that board is a producer-elected board, it makes its policy decisions, the Minister reports on their conduct of affairs and activities.

MR. BILTON: To the First Minister. Is the First Minister aware of the situation in the Swan River Valley where the hog producers are crying out for the answers, and they're losing money by retaining their hogs which the Hog Marketing Commission are refusing to accept.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, a question of that kind with respect to seeking information only, not policy attitudes on the part of the government, is certainly in order. The Minister of Agriculture, I'm sure, has undertaken to seek the information and to relay it to honourable members opposite. The Honourable Member for Swan River expresses a concern, and it may well be a genuine concern, with respect to problems of hog shipments at this point in time. The Honourable Member for Swan River should also be aware that the elected members - by the producers - of the Manitoba Hog Marketing Board are also concerned about the differential in price for hogs as between eastern and western Canadian markets. And I believe that that is something which has been preoccupying their minds for some time.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: A second supplementary question. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: To the First Minister. I appreciate his opinion at this moment, but I'm speaking on behalf of the hog producers of Manitoba and I'm speaking to him, the position that he holds, and ask him to give the answers that the Minister of Agriculture will not give us and hasn't given to us for three weeks.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I should like to remind members opposite who have put those two or three questions on a daily basis, that when the Act was put on the books in 1949,

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. USKIW cont'd) . . .there were powers provided within the Act by way of regulation for all boards established thereto. And therefore once those powers are conveyed to a board and in particular, Mr. Speaker, if it's an elected board, the control really lies outside of this Chamber unless you want to amend those powers or the Act itself. And in that connection, Mr. Chairman, in that connection members opposite may have a point. But they have no right, Mr. Chairman, to stand here and question the operations of bodies that don't have to relate to this House.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: I do believe really that I have occasion to raise a matter of House privilege. And the House privilege is really occasioned by the First Minister's chastisement of the former Speaker of this House, correct as it was, that he should be among the first to recognize who one should address questions to and what the order of those questions is. But, Sir, the House privilege is that that procedure has been thwarted and, Sir, nobody knows it better than the Honourable Minister who used to ask me about every carrot that was sold by the Marketing Board or not sold by the Marketing Board at the time of 1967 and '66. But that's beside the point. The question is, legitimate questions are being asked of the Minister that is answering for the affairs of the Department of Agriculture. Hogs are a major portion of the Department of Agriculture. And, Sir, I respect the right of the Minister to sit in his chair and not answer any questions; that, Sir, is his privilege. But I do, Sir, raise on a matter of House privilege when it is suggested to us that somehow the members of the Opposition - whether it is the Member for Swan River, whether it's the Member from Portage la Prairie who has asked the same question about hogs being sold somewhere else, or myself, continuously over the past several months have been put in the position of being out of order or being out of place for asking questions about matters that concern a great number of our constituencies.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL A. PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, if I may, I doubt very much, Sir, whether the Honourable Member for Lakeside had any point of House privilege. What has transpired, at least during my presence in this House, regarding questions related to the Hog Marketing Board have been properly --(Interjection)-- I'm speaking on the point of House privilege. --(Interjection)-- which you made. You know, Mr. Speaker, my very vociferous friend from Lakeside ranted and raved a few moments ago about privileges of the House. I too am a member of this House and have privileges, and all I am suggesting to you, Sir, is that the answers given by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture have been answers in accordance with the rules of the House and my honourable friend from Lakeside has not got a privilege pertaining to the members of this House.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN(Morris): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture, and ask him if it is not a fact that the Hog Marketing Board was not one that was requested by the hog producers of this province but in fact was one that was imposed on the hog producers of this province by the Minister himself and therefore has the responsibility to answer for it.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I should like to remind the Member for Morris who was not here long enough to remember, that is that the Conservative Party established the first Hog Marketing Commission in 1965, Mr. Speaker, without the permission of the hog producers of this province. Mr. Speaker, they promised the producers a vote which was never carried out, Mr. Speaker, for reasons that they best know. So let them not allude to the fact that that is something new. We have had that with us for almost ten years.

Now I should like to tell my honourable friend that he should read the Natural Products Marketing Act under which all boards function, and he should know that once you have given powers to an agency, that unless they contravene those powers that one cannot bring them to question on any corporate management decisions that they chose to make. That is strictly within their own jurisdiction. So unless members opposite want to change the Natural Products Marketing Act or attempt to change by way of Order-in-Council the regulations under which those boards function, they have no question before the House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. JORGENSEN: I direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture. Is it not a fact that notwithstanding the powers of the Manitoba Marketing Act which authorizes the setting up

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) . . . of marketing boards, that the Minister in this instance set up the Hog Marketing Board against the express wishes of the hog producers of this province, and therefore has the responsibility --(Interjection)-- Well my God, how do I know? I was at the meeting that rejected the imposition of the Hog Marketing Board.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I would ask all members to refrain from asking questions that are couched in an argumentative manner. It just gives rise to arguments and that is not the purpose of the question period. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw attention to the fact that the kind of answers that members opposite are asking if complied with would require a violation of The Companies Act.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River, on a point of order?

MR. BILTON: Referring to your earlier remarks, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that the Minister is creating an argument that's going to provoke a greater argument in this House and he should refrain from doing it.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. I would draw your attention, Sir, to Citation 171 of Beauchesne which is incorporated here into our rules and forms, but in any case Beauchesne 171 (1), that a question oral or written must not seek for purposes of argumentation information on matters of past history. And that, Sir, is a matter of past history.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture. Does the Minister know the price difference between the recent sales of hogs in the United States and hogs sold in Manitoba; and also does he know the general terms of the trade agreement with Japan with respect to hogs? Does he know this himself?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't be in a position to know any of those matters without, Mr. Speaker, inquiring into the arrangements that have been entered into. And the question that the honourable member is putting, if provided, Mr. Speaker, without the decision of the Board would be a violation under The Companies Act, and they know it, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, another question to the same Minister. Will the Minister keep his word which he gave several days ago that he would take as notice, and obtain the information and supply it to this House before the session ends with respect to the differential in price between hogs sold in the United States and hogs sold in Manitoba?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I should correct my honourable friend because I indicated to the House that I would give the House the kind of information which they are entitled to and not beyond that, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: I direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture, and ask him if he feels that the price differential between the prices of hogs in Winnipeg and Toronto, which is approximately \$4.00 or so, in any way compensates the farmers for the loss of over \$20.00 a hog as a result of his imposition of the embargo on the delivery of those hogs?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. The Member for Morris alleges that it was my imposition and that the Hog Marketing Board is being dictated to by the Province of Manitoba. And that is not correct, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, on Orders of the Day if there are more questions.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have an indication that there are more questions. The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation, and ask him if he can explain to the House the make-up, the background and the purpose of the Manitoba Citizens' Campaign.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs) (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, although the direct relationship to the Department is not that close I'll take the question as notice.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM (Rupertsland): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Consumer Affairs I direct my question to the First Minister. What can the government do about the corporate ripoff in Norway House where the Shell Oil Company has directed their bulk oil agent to increase the price of gasoline from 62 cents to 71 cents, an increase of nine cents, even though all the gasoline in bulk storage at Norway House was delivered over the winter road system and should not be subject to the new increases in the prices of gasoline. This increased price has now been in effect for about a week.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of facets to this which I think deserve some elaboration. I might indicate to the Honourable the Member for Rupertsland that the price increase that was authorized by Shell Oil amounted to 8.8 cents across Western Canada west of the Borden line. The 8.8 cents is entirely in conformity with the telegram of authorization sent to all of the oil refiners and right up to the distributor level from the Federal Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources.

I might add further that the amount of increase that has been carried out by Shell, namely 8.8 cents, at all outlets is .4 cents less than that ordered by Imperial Oil; and that while I agree with the Honourable Member for Rupertsland that there is some room for argumentation as to whether the 8.8 cents should be applicable to a petroleum product that has been brought into inventory during the winter, on the other side of the coin however is the fact that Shell Oil did for six weeks defer and therefore absorb the cost of increased wellhead prices without increasing the price to the consumer until the 15th of May. So that there is some complication to this, Mr. Speaker, or at least some considerable detail.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, I regret I haven't given the Minister prior knowledge of this but may I direct my question to the First Minister. Mr. Premier, is the ministry aware that the dike in the Bracken area just outside The Pas on the Saskatchewan River has broken?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge of that just at the moment. The Minister of Mines and Resources may. In any case there is a meeting scheduled with representatives of Water Resources at 4:30 this afternoon.

MR. BILTON: A further question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder when the Honourable the Minister of Northern Affairs was made aware of this break? I realize that the First Minister may not be able to answer that question but I would ask him to keep that thought in mind, and to remind him that the farmers in that area are quite upset about this break.

MR. SCHREYER: . . . exactly so, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Attorney-General relating to the answer he gave earlier about the investigation into conflict of interest in the MHRC. If he is the appropriate Minister could he indicate whether it is still the government's intention to introduce at this session the legislation dealing with conflict of interest, disclosure of investments by public officials and/or civil servants?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I have marshalled together material from a number of jurisdictions with respect to recent or current legislation on conflict of interest and disclosure and it is my hope that this can be brought to this House this session in bill form. But in any case, Sir, it would be brought together and referred to an inter-sessional Standing Committee

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . of this House, and I am quite confident that the second alternative we'll be able to meet any deadlines on that.

MR. ASPER: Could the First Minister indicate whether it's the government's present intention to include in such conflict of interest and disclosure legislation civil service of bodies other than the province and elected officials other than provincial elected officials including city councillors, school boards and their own staffs. --(Interjection)--

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, that's a matter of policy. That is a matter of policy to be revealed in due course.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Public Works, who infrequently has the opportunity to reply to questions in this House, and ask him if he feels there is any relationship between Bill 81 and the number of automobiles that have been stolen on the Legislative Parking grounds within the last while; and if there is any significance between the bill and the fact that it's only official opposition member's automobiles that are being stolen. (Laughter)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

HON. RUSSELL J. DOERN (Minister of Public Works) (Elmwood): Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it is unfortunate indeed --(Interjection)-- that two vehicles in the last few weeks owned by the official opposition have been stolen on our grounds.

A MEMBER: Did they leave their keys . . .

MR. DOERN: . . . And I know that in one instance it was because the keys were left in the vehicle. I haven't spoken to the second member to admonish him if that was true in his case as well. I can only say that it is a coincidence, and that we are taking some steps to increase the size of our security forces to, in particular, observe the cars of members of the official opposition and all members in the House.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Member for Swan River, I can confirm that at a point 14 miles west of The Pas and the Carrot River there has been a break in the dike, and these are substantial dikes, Sir. There has been a break in the dike and there is indeed serious flooding in the Carrot River valley. All precautions are being taken. Resources are being moved there even now as I speak; water resources, highway engineers and emergency measures organization, --(Interjection)-- And similarly with respect to the White-mouth River four miles north of the Trans-Canada, personnel are moving to the scene.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTIONS

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, by leave I'd like to make some substitutions on the Economic Development Committee and to tender my resignation as Chairman; Boyce for Shafransky, Turnbull for Patterson. This is on the Economic Development Committee. My resignation is not in any way based on any political considerations. (Laughter) It is based on the fact that I have a very important engagement.

ORAL QUESTIONS CONT'D

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: (Agreed.) The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the First Minister can advise in the absence of the Health Minister how many bills we can expect on Votes and Proceedings yet?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Not very many, I'm happy to say, Mr. Speaker. There is for example on Notices of Motion today reference to three bills. But really, Sir, I think the Honourable Member for Riel would agree they are not significant bills; while they're desirable, but not major, making certain changes to the teachers and civil service superannuation; and then one has to do with the relief of a certain family, deceased.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: I wonder if the First Minister could advise whether "not very many" means more than 10, or less than 10.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Riel has some good sense of intuition. It is about 10.

COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTION

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, I neglected to mention one other substitution on the Economic Development Committee, and that is Dillen for Osland on the Economic Development Committee.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Agreed. The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

STATEMENT - STOLEN VEHICLES

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could be allowed a brief statement on vehicles, in view of what's been happening?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Agreed.

MR. DOERN: I would simply ask the cooperation of all members, in view of the fact that we have had two stolen vehicles in the past two weeks, and we are doing whatever we can; in both these instances I now learn that the members left their cars unlocked with the keys on the floor. I simply ask everybody to lock their vehicles and attempt to not encourage people to make off with their cars.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - GOVERNMENT BILLS - SECOND READING

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Acting House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would kindly call Second Readings, starting with Bill No. 67 standing in the name of the Honourable the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

BILL NO. 67

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. HON. IAN TURNBULL (Minister of Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services) (Osborne) presented Bill No. 67, an Act to Amend the Public Printing Act, for second reading. MOTION presented.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Speaker, although this bill has been distributed for some days now, and although it is a relatively routine matter I expect that members of the Opposition would like a brief explanation of some of its provisions.

Mr. Speaker, the most significant change, I suppose, that members opposite would be interested in is the change which will enable an estimates' provision to be made for those members of the Queen's Printer's staff that are engaged in what we call in-House, a brokerage function.

Mr. Speaker, up until now the members of the Queen's Printer's staff have been paid for out of moneys that come from funds that are recovered for the work that the Queen's Printer does for other line departments. The only salary that has appeared in the Estimates Book has been that of the Queen's Printer himself, and it does happen to be a "him". If my estimates had been discussed, I could have gone into this in more detail, pointing out that we are taking out four salaried positions from the open leger account which is the self-recovering account that has been maintained by the Queen's Printer, and putting these positions into the Estimates Book so that they can be debated during estimates' review. That, Mr. Speaker, is the major change I think in the bill, and it was of course, as I say, to go along with changes that were made in the estimates of my department.

Another alteration we're making in the bill, Mr. Speaker, if I may speak to it in general, is to remove some of the routine work from the office of the Queen's Printer. Some of this work, Sir, does not result in any savings to the government, savings that the Queen's Printer is able to obtain come from buying in bulk - I'm sure members opposite are aware of that - buying paper in bulk, printing orders in bulk, and of course doing printing in the House.

The accounting procedure that has been followed in the past required that any purchases of books and magazines that were made by agencies of the government had to go through the office of the Queen's Printer, and that entailed considerable duplicate accounting work, when in fact the Queen's Printer could not effect any savings for the government. Consequently, we are in this Act removing the requirement that all of those purchases of periodicals, newspapers, books, etc. would be taken out of the Queen's Printer's hands and he will no longer have to approve them. I think that that will result in the reduction in some routine work, a speed-up in the work

BILL 67

(MR. TURNBULL cont'd) of the Queen's Printer as a result, and it would not result in any increase in costs to the government.

The other changes, Mr. Speaker, are indeed very routine. We are changing the Act, the name of the Act rather, to the name by which it is customarily referred to and we are deleting all references in the Act to Provincial Secretary and putting instead reference to the Minister responsible for the Public Printing Act. Those four alterations, Sir, are in short what this bill is all about. I do hope that I have answered any questions that the members of the opposition might have, and hope that this Act can be approved speedily.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID BLAKE (Minnedosa): I beg to move, seconded by the honourable member from St. James that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL 69

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Bill No. 69. The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

MR. TURNBULL presented Bill 69, an Act to amend the Embalmers and Funeral Directors Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Speaker, as I'm almost dead on my feet with flu today, it's perhaps an appropriate day for me to discuss changes to the Embalmers and Funeral Directors Act. In any case, Sir, I note members opposite are asking for a brief explanation.

Mr. Speaker, the amendments that are contained in this Act again are - part of them anyway - are relatively routine. Some years ago responsibility for the Embalmers and Funeral Directors Act was transferred from the Department of Health and Social Development to the Department of Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services. When the transfer of responsibility was made, Mr. Speaker, changes in the Embalmers and Funeral Directors Act were not made which would show that responsibility lay with my Ministry and not with the Ministry of Health. Consequently, to make the transfer fully effective, Mr. Speaker, we are amending this statute, the Embalmers and Funeral Directors Act, to delete references to the Minister of Health and references to the Deputy Minister of Health in this same Act. In other words, Sir, it cleans up some of the wording and makes the changes appropriate.

Another provision of the bill, Sir, which perhaps is not quite as routine, is an alteration to make effective the licensing fee that was levied in the past by regulation. This Act as I recall, Mr. Speaker, was originally passed in 1967, and under it regulations were introduced to require that anyone engaged in the business of a funeral director and operating a funeral home be charged \$100 as the license fee. Now in 1969, the authority for that regulation under the Act was challenged, and consequently as there was no clear statutory authority in the Act, consequently the levying of the fee of \$100 was discontinued. Now the Embalmers and Funeral Directors Act does provide for a Board of Administration, and the function of that board is to carry on various examining and other activities relative to the work of Embalmers and Funeral Directors, and we, I would like anyway, to see this board continue functioning. It's a board on which representatives of industry sit, as well as other people, lay people, and I think it is an effective mechanism if it can be funded properly. And consequently, I am introducing this amendment to the Act to provide clear authority under the Act for the levying of the \$100 fee for the operation of the funeral business. And as I say, the authority that I'm introducing now is really in conformity with the authority that was contained in a regulation under the act as it was originally drafted. I think, Mr. Speaker, that that explains the general, and I think likely the most important change in the Embalmers and Funeral Directors Act. There is another provision which will remove the members of the Board of Administration from any damages that they may be charged with as a result of action taken on behalf of themselves as members of the Board of Administration.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that that deals adequately with this Act, and I look forward to of course any debate on it, especially with regard to the operation and funding of the Board of Administration, which as I had said involves members of the public as well as members of the industry in the regulation of the industry. And I have now, Mr. Speaker, under way activities

BILL 69

(MR. TURNBULL cont'd) by sub committees of this board which will look at examining and licensing requirements, and hopefully at the next session providing this amendment we have before us now passes, I will be able to introduce more extensive amendments to this Act which will result in greater protection for the public.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BOB BANMAN (La Verendrye): I move, seconded by the Member from Sturgeon Creek that debate be adjourned.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Agreed? (Agreed) The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure all of the Members in the House will wishfully hope that the references my honourable colleague made to Embalmers and Morticians Act will not be applicable to him and that we hope he get's over the flu. I wonder now, Mr. Speaker, whether you would kindly call Bill No. 64. I understand that the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition was speaking prior to the lunch hour adjournment, and I understand he's prepared to continue.

BILL 64

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Bill No. 64. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C. (Leader of the Official Opposition) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, before we adjourned at the noon hour, I indicated that the information available to me indicated that the loans of chartered banks in the province exceeded deposits by \$205 million; and that one of the suggestions for introducing this bill, or one of the assertions, was the fact that savings are invested in the Manitoba economy, not shifted elsewhere. These are part of several assertions, Mr. Speaker, that I do not believe can be proven as a fact by the honourable members and I would hope that they would be in a position to furnish information to us because I think that would give us an intelligent way of being able to satisfy and deal with this issue.

The second thing, I refer to the Minister of Finance's statement in the House when he says that, talking about treasury branches, "it could ensure that adequate funds are available to Manitobans at competitive rates, especially in rural and northern communities which have traditionally been hardest hit by the tight money policies of the chartered banks. And it can infuse a degree of competitiveness into the banking system which is now practically non-existent."

Well, Mr. Speaker, the credit unions have offered management services at cost at each point in the province where the Provincial Government has declared a need and that offer by the credit unions has not been accepted and not been taken up by the government. I think, Mr. Speaker, one can discern and perceive the purpose of the government from the remarks of the Honourable Minister of Finance when he talked about the profits of the banks and points out that the reason the credit unions are intending to go into the banking business, or hope to go into the banking business, on the basis of profit as it was explained to him.

Mr. Speaker, I must now try and put this bill in a perspective that must be judged or understood when we deal with this bill, the Mining Tax Bill, the Northern Affairs Bill and other pieces of legislation that come before us. Because, Mr. Speaker, we do have a basis to be able to perceive what the government's intentions truly are. And this comes from the Planning and Priorities document which was published, albeit involuntarily, and which was supposed to be the basis for the "Guidelines for the Seventies". Because, Mr. Speaker, if you peruse the document -- and that document has been tabled in the House and reference has been made to it before, and there's some like the Honourable Member from Morris who will refer to it as the NDP Manifesto -- but if we examine that document we find that so much of what they predicted as what should be government policy is coming true; and they talked about treasury banks and they talked about the Credit Union Movement; and as a matter of fact, they talked about the credit union movement that would not be, you know, consistent with the kind of approach that the Honourable Minister of Tourism suggested was the approach of their government in his belief with respect to the credit union movement of which he was a part; and this document which is referred to as the NDP Manifesto contains many parts that I believe in the remaining days of this session will be referred to over and over and over again. Because as I suggest when we deal with the various bills we can relate the theory for the production of the bill on the basis of the general guidelines supported, that the government should become a

BILL 64

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) regulator of the economic activity and the controller of the direction of development, with many very obvious directions.

On Page 5 of the document that I have in front of me - which is a copy of the document, the original document I believe was tabled in the House, or a photostat of it - the proposals were grouped into four categories: first was the reform of financial institutions, and the treasury branch system is one measure of that reform; the use of provincial Crown corporations and the creation of a local form of Crown corporation, which is contained in the Northern Affairs Act and we'll be dealing with that fairly soon, and the strengthening extension of the Co-operative movement. Of course that's not being done, and I think that's one fear that those who I've spoken to within the credit union movement are concerned about when they examine the Treasury Branch legislation and the fear they have of the kind of competition that will be offered by the government.

It goes on further to state, and I quote "The public sector can and should be used to change the nature and structure of production in Manitoba, to encourage a systematic re-distribution of real income through the direct production of goods and services and this is a valuable complement to the re-distribution of money income via the tax system."

In the proposals in the Planning and Priorities document there is a bit of a difference from what we have before us because their proposal was the Manitoba Development Corporation would operate the publicly owned financial intermediaries along the lines of the Alberta treasury branch; that it would accept deposits, make loans both to the public and private sector and perform a variety of services to the public, and the collection of utility and telephone bills, sale of fish and game permits and handle a large portion of the government financial business. When the Honourable Member from Pembina suggested to the Honourable Minister of Finance that maybe the treasury branches would be the sole source or the only way which people would be able to pay their utility bills and the Honourable Minister of Finance said, well maybe that will be a good idea, I suggest now that the honourable member, the Minister of Finance was well aware of that suggestion - it's contained in his own documentation.

Mr. Speaker, in commenting on the Credit Union the Planning and Priorities document says "the government will strengthen those financial institutions that lie within its jurisdiction so as to provide additional competition in the personal and mortgage lending fields. This is particularly applicable to the credit union movement. At present credit unions are primarily a rural phenomenon with a fairly shaky financial base. Of necessity they must be conservative in their lending policies."

This is the government Planning Secretariat who produced a document that was seen, consented to and proceeded with after one initial draft by a sub-committee of Cabinet. Mr. Speaker, when I suggest that there are fears by the credit union movement as to the actual intent of the government and when I produce a document which says "Credit Unions are primarily a rural phenomenon with a fairly shaky financial base, of necessity they must be conservative in their lending policies" and one accepts that their deposits have increased by 33 percent or 34 percent this year, 33 percent the year before, 25 percent the year before that, and that they have deposits of \$400 million, one then can suggest that the fears of some have some reason and some justification and basis for being. Because, Mr. Speaker, this document contains a program which is now being followed through, albeit the Manitoba Development Corporation is not going to be as far as we know, the agent for the treasury branch but I guess it could happen under the Act, and for good reason - the Manitoba Development Corporation is now in the hole and I don't think the public would be satisfied to have the treasury branch operation operated by them -- but the treasury branch that's being proposed, Mr. Speaker, follows along the same lines and the same kind of language that's contained within this manifesto comes, you know, in the language of the Minister of Finance in his presentation.

Mr. Speaker, I've already indicated the reasons for the entry into the treasury branch field in Alberta and the reasons for entry today are very different, and that brings us to a point of trying to determine realistically what are the reasons? Are they intending to essentially take over the credit unions, and they'll answer "No", but I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there are some within their Planning Secretariat who would answer "Yes" --(Interjection)-- Yes but they are the ones who are influencing government policy, oh yes, very much so --(Interjection) --well you should know. But this documentation - there is very little of what's contained in this document that is not being introduced one way or another in government policy, and we'll

BILL 64

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) prove that. We'll prove that in the bills that are coming here. In almost every case you're following through exactly with the pattern; not with the three volume "Guidelines for the Seventies" which was a PR document prepared for the election, but with this Planning Secretariat document which really is your economic thrust and your financial thrust.

Mr. Speaker, it may be that the treasury branch is needed because the government wants to be in a position to be able to draw money in to finance their bankrupt operations and the continual drain of those bankrupt operations. It could also be that the intention of the government would be to go into the treasury branch field because they want to make a profit, but I don't think anybody could be serious about that or seriously entertain that they really think they're going to make a profit. They may want to enter the treasury branch field immediately or give the introduction of it because they want to kill the western bank proposed by the credit unions, notwithstanding their protestations that that isn't so. Because I've already referred to the document which indicates, Mr. Speaker, insofar as the credit unions are concerned that the fear of the treasury branch and the unknown with respect to it will affect directly their ability to be able to proceed with this situation.

Mr. Speaker, they want control of the financial institutions in the province. There is an alternative to the proposals of treasury branch, Mr. Speaker, and it's not as if the government could not have addressed itself to that. They could have offered incentives to the credit unions to proceed not only with the banks but to proceed in a way to strengthen and encourage their participation and they would not have to go into the business. And that could be applauded from this side for the simple reason that it would recognize the position of the credit unions and at the same time would recognize that government should not enter into those areas that it really has no business in entering, and where, you know, proven costs in the past, high costs, will have to be borne which will make the potential for a margin of profit less or almost non-existent, and which will force government to commence the hidden subsidization that exists with Autopac, and exists and will exist, Mr. Speaker, in this particular matter if it proceeds.

Mr. Speaker, the Act that's proposed would allow the government to be able to proceed by regulation by Cabinet order without any control being exercised over them. Unlike the credit unions or the banks there will be no one supervising what they're going to be doing. Nor are they going to be answerable to anybody; nor will they be answerable to the Provincial Auditor even though there is a section put in there. And I'm going to deal with that matter in one second.

Mr. Speaker who's going to appoint the staff? It would appear that the staff will be appointed by Cabinet, based on the wording that we now have. They are in a position, Mr. Speaker, to put unlimited amounts of money --(Interjection)-- that's right. Well you know the problem with the First Minister, and we've already had this in a couple of situations, is that I don't think he read the contents of the bill, nor does he understand the significance of the bill. --(Interjection)-- Well he doesn't agree with me. We'll deal with that if we ever get to clause by clause. That I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it will be appointed by Cabinet, and it can be appointed by Cabinet. --(Interjection)-- Well it's not nonsense. It's not written as the Alberta Act is concerned and in many respects this is a direct copy of the Alberta Act, but conveniently there are some sections that are different, and I suggest to you that the interpretation can be levelled that they would be appointed by Cabinet. They are not civil servants, yet the Alberta Act has them subject to the public service.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know how we can eliminate the patronage that will be exercised by the people opposite but that's something that has to be built in as a protection, no matter what happens. They simply are given the power, Mr. Speaker, to make, you know, to be able to make regulations to do what they want to do.

Mr. Speaker, as far as I know, Mr. Turner did present in March of 1974 amendments to the Bank Act which were consistent with the statements that were made at the Western Economic Opportunities Conference. Those amendments were not passed, the bill was not passed, we have a federal election; but the intent of the government proceeding I think was expressed then as it was expressed in Calgary. So that the ability of the government to be able to become involved in a provincial bank, to be able to go into a provincial bank, Mr. Speaker, appears at least to be open at this point, if not closed as far as I can see. And, Mr. Speaker, when the government says, you know, the bank is not proceeding, they're saying that in the face of the

BILL 64

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) statements made by the Minister of Finance, the action taken in March, and I would think, the probability that the provincial bank, the regulations or the enactment or the changes will probably occur. I don't know what Mr. Stanfield's position will be, and that will be an interesting thing for me to find. But I would say this much, I know what the western members who were present at the Western Economic Opportunities Conference were --(Interjection)--

Mr. Speaker, there is no way that the government can suggest that the reason they had to bring in this legislation is because the possibility of a provincial bank is now over. That possibility exists, the likelihood it will proceed, but the only difference with that, Mr. Speaker, is that in the case of a provincial bank the government will only own 25 percent, it will have to reduce it to 10 percent, where in the case of the treasury branch the government will control it all. And so, Mr. Speaker, it's hogwash on the part of the government to suggest that the reason they're proceeding now with permissive legislation which they'll consider is only because the possibility of a bank may not come through. --(Interjection)-- You did, you did, yes you did. --(Interjection)-- Oh yes you did.

"The honourable members may be aware that during - this is the Minister of Finance; "The honourable members must be aware that during July of last year at the Western Economic Opportunities Conference the Western Premiers jointly and unanimously recommended the Federal Government be urged to amend the Bank Act so as to allow the provincial governments to own voting equity in chartered banks and to exempt provincial governments from the legislative restrictions which limits ownership by the individual shareholders to 10 percent of the total outstanding share capital of any bank.

"Well to date there have not been any amendments to the Bank Act - period. But there was an undertaking by the Prime Minister and by the Minister of Finance that there would be amendments made to the Bank Act. This undertaking was not one that satisfied the provincial premiers but nevertheless it was a step in the direction which the premiers had indicated was desirable, and we look forward to considering provincial action resultant upon the passing of any amendments. However, as I say, there have been no amendments."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the fact --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, I guess with reference to that I do not have the full documentation of the Honourable Minister because I do not have a Hansard, this was taken from a transcript. --(Interjection)-- No, not all of it, unfortunately. But I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I think I can and I will establish the position, and I think I can and I will establish the position, --(Interjection)-- well I'll draw an inference and I think I can establish the position that in both his remarks and in the remarks of the Premier made with reference to the Government entering into a treasury branch system, the suggestion was that because the government was not proceeding with respect to a bank and because of the probability that the banking legislation would not come through, it was necessary to go into the treasury branch as the alternative, or as a means to be able to enter into this field. And I think I'm correct in this respect and I think I can prove this, but --(Interjection)-- Well it wasn't exhausted but I'm suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that the problem we have is that the Government always intended to go into the treasury branch system, that in effect the provincial bank system does not offer what they really want, which is basic control; 25 percent reduction to 10 percent is not sufficient. Well I must say --(Interjection)-- But I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I think you can infer that from the remarks that the honourable member has suggested, both in his own remarks and in the statements that were made as well.

The Honourable Minister of Finance states, and I quote: "The branches in each of the two provinces I mention operate somewhat differently, and we have yet to study the detailed differences to determine the role which our treasury branches would follow." Well, Mr. Speaker, the Ontario savings plan cost in operation \$8,213,000, the Alberta plan cost \$16 million.

A MEMBER: Eight million dollars.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes. The difference is almost 100 percent, Mr. Speaker, and you know, it's rather ridiculous to have the Government present a bill of which there is a difference of \$8 million in operation between one province and another, and not be in a position to explain how they're going to operate here and account for the difference that exists there.

The Honourable Minister of Finance states, "The treasury branches would be financial institutions which would be designed specifically to meet the particular needs of Manitobans."

BILL 64

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) Well, I wonder if the Government has information, and if they have I'd like to see him produce it in the House, which will prove the needs of Manitobans are not being met. And what are these needs, and how are they going to be met by the Government? And how will Bill 64 meet these needs? Not two or three lines, not the pious statements of the Honourable Minister of Tourism that, you know, because we're going to handle it it's going to be all right, or the statement that they're going to accept deposits paying interest, etc. How, and in what way, and in detail, does the Government intend to persuade the people of this province that it's in their interest that treasury branches are going to operate because the needs are going to be met. Mr. Speaker, you know, we're being asked to pass this and the Government feels no obligation whatsoever to suggest this, to introduce this, to prove its case.

A MEMBER: Jake Froese would have supported it.

MR. SPIVAK: "No branch will be open unless it is visibly apparent there will be a service and it would be worthwhile to do it." How is it going to be determined as to whether it will be visibly apparent and that it will be a service and worthwhile to do it? And what criteria is going to apply? Has the Government indicated that? Does anyone really believe that there's any meaning to that? You know, what kind of discretion is going to be exercised in this respect? Where is it going to go? There's a difference between the operations as we suggested between Ontario and Alberta, and if we're going to follow the Ontario system then we'll be in the urban areas. And now I want to talk about the First Minister because I think the one area that I want to quarrel with him now is the whole question of accountability. Mr. Speaker, now I want to talk about the question of accountability, now I want to talk about the question of a hidden subsidy, now I'm going to talk about how the Government will fuff this up as they are fuffing some of the other operations up to hide exactly what they're doing, and I'm going to indicate this, Mr. Speaker, by referring to the role of the Provincial Auditor in his explanation in his report. And I do this, Sir, because there is a section - and I'm not going to deal with the section per se - in this Act, dealing with the Provincial Auditor's report. And, Mr. Speaker, if there's one thing, one thing that in the clauses that will have to be altered before it could possibly be acceptable under any conditions, it will be the manner in which the Provincial Auditor will report.

Now, in his report this year he says, and I quote, on Page 18: "Concern has been expressed" - Mr. Speaker, I'd like the First Minister to listen to the words of his own Provincial Auditor: "Concern has been expressed that our audit reports on financial statements of Government agencies do not normally certify the statements to be in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles, as is customarily being done in industry. It should be understood that there are significant differences in operations between the public and private sectors. In comparison with private corporations, Government agencies are generally not organized for profit but providing service at cost. They are not subject to income taxation. Their surpluses are not available for distribution. Bankruptcy considerations are not readily applicable; and there are other similar differences.

"Because of these factors, accounting treatment for such matters as fixed assets, organization expenses, is not necessarily consistent with that of the private sector but must be based on reasoning and materiality considerations to satisfy the needs of the public sector. Since there are no codified generally accepted accounting principles for the public sector in this regard, we do not as a rule use this phrase in our audit certificates. We follow the practice that, subject to specific legislative direction, " - Subject to specific legislative direction. And we're going to talk about accountability. We're going to talk about the accountability which will have that legislative direction, so when you're going to compete you'll compete fairly. So when the records are presented they are presented accurately. So when the information is supplied we can make the comparisons with the other financial institutions whose business you are intending to compete with, and to the credit unions whose business I think you are directly going to affect.

"And we follow the practice subject to legislative direction, and the . . . and the operating results must be presented in a manner which reflects clearly, in our judgment, the interests of the taxpayer and the general public. We are not the only office that normally does not use the . . . in accordance with the generally accepted accounting principles and an auditor's certificate", and he refers to the Auditor-General of Canada.

Well, it's a good statement, but you know, Mr. Speaker, it's very important to

BILL 64

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) understand it, because when I look at the Auto Insurance Report and try to make a comparison between that report and private industry, I can't. When I have a certificate which basically states that the audit that's been commenced shows that the information supplied is in accordance with the records of the Corporation, then my concern is, that's fine, but I want to know the next stage as to the degree of protection and the ability to be able to meet the needs or the particular obligation that that Corporation has. And the Provincial Auditor's position is, and I think I can say this very clearly, that because Government is behind it, because unlike a private corporation it does not have to make a profit, and because unlike a private corporation if it's a loss it won't go bankrupt because the Government will back it up, he does not have to certify it in the same way.

A MEMBER: With tax dollars.

MR. SPIVAK: But I'm suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that the question of accountability, which has got to be the main issue between the Government and ourselves, will be no more highlighted than in the proposals that are put forward, because the position expressed in this Act with respect to the way in which the Provincial Auditor will certify, is not satisfactory at all. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, there is a significant change between the Alberta Act, and that's interesting, Mr. Speaker, and I don't want to get involved in the details of the Act, but to indicate to you that the Alberta Act provides that the Provincial Auditor can audit the treasury branches as he considers necessary, in addition to once a year. Our Act provides that he shall do it once a year and at such other times as the Minister may direct. Not as he deems necessary, but as the Minister may direct. And when we talk about accountability, I suggest to you that that particular clause and the whole effort that would have to be undertaken, would be to protect, as I suggest, Mr. Speaker, the degree of hidden subsidization that can and will probably become a part of the Government's position.

Mr. Speaker, we have in our province a very strong and a rapidly growing co-operative society. In truth, we have a Co-operative Credit Federation made up of most individual credit unions across the province. Their growth rate has been phenomenal and I've made reference already --(Interjection)-- I will, and I'm glad the First Minister will accept that. I hope he'll accept something else that we may do in a few moments as well.

Their growth rate has been phenomenal. I've indicated the percentages of 25 percent in 1970 and 1971, and 33 percent and 34 percent. It seems to me that this is the kind of thing in Manitoba that the old CCF Party dreamed of and worked for. Now we're being compelled in this bill to make a potential blunder and to be participants in a crime. It would be both ironical and tragic if the credit unions and co-operatives of Manitoba were to be the victims of either an unintended blunder or a calculated assault on their integrity by a Government still claiming philosophical allegiance to the ideals of the Commonwealth Co-operative Federation. And yet, Mr. Speaker, if this bill passes without fundamental amendment, this tragedy will inevitably be enacted in Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, this need not happen. And we will be offering the Government sort of our full and sincere co-operation to ensure that it does not happen. Having already invited themselves into the Northlands Bank toward the achievement of which credit unions and co-operatives for some years have been working so devotedly to achieve, the Government through this will allow themselves to compete and to compete unfairly with every credit union in this province, and it will be the squeeze of a giant pincer movement.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether the credit unions have any hope of surviving except as another branch of government. The Government's intent, whatever that may be, is less important than the fact that under this bill the arbitrary power would be there to compete on just such a baseline.

Mr. Speaker, I've indicated our concern about the basic nature in Government savings plan such as treasury branches. This danger is even greater for the co-operative credit unions than for other financial institutions like chartered banks because, Mr. Speaker, both because of the difference in size, the financial strength, and their limits within a single political jurisdiction. I've indicated before that the danger lies in government-absorbed costs, which is the hidden subsidization of government, often in superfluous ways, costs which should properly be assessed against the savings plan. As an example, Mr. Speaker, I offer for the record the same example chosen by the government itself, which is the treasury savings office in Alberta.

My data from the Official Government of Alberta Publications on the Treasury Branch of

BILL 64

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) May 31, 1974 states, and I quote: "Prior to March" - and I'm quoting from the Alberta Treasury Savings Office document - "Prior to March 31st, 1970, expenditures for the operation of the treasury branches were charged to the General Revenue Fund of the province." Mr. Speaker, I want to restate this position because the honourable members have been referring to the Conservative Government in Alberta. "Prior to March 31st, 1970, expenditures for the operation of the treasury branches were charged to the General Revenue of the province." I wonder if the Minister of Finance is prepared to accept this statement and agree with it. Prior to March 31, in Alberta the expenditures of the operation of the treasury branches were charged to the General Revenue of the province. In other words, they were paid by the taxpayers of the province. "With the exception of an amount of \$481,000 representing consumer bonuses for the months of February 1941 to April 1945 inclusive, and the required provision for losses regarding loans and advances. The former may be financed by contingent liabilities while the latter has been provided from revenues of the treasury branches under the authority of the Ministerial Order dated March 31, 1960. Prior employee benefits were paid by the Province of Alberta."

I want to make the point again, Mr. Speaker, that the Alberta treasury branches were paid for insofar as their costs were concerned by the provincial government's General Treasury Fund, General Revenue Fund. And in effect the degree of subsidization that I talked about existed, and the hidden subsidy that I talked about was there. --(Interjection)-- That's, Mr. Speaker, for years the Alberta Government assumed costs . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, will the honourable member permit a question?

MR. SPIVAK: No, at the end, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well you wanted me to agree with something you said.

MR. SPIVAK: Well what I want the Honourable Minister to say, and what he should have said when he said, "I've made a study of the Ontario and Alberta operations and I'm prepared now to deal with the difference and to tell you how to operate," was to indicate that the expenses of the treasury boards were borne by the taxpayers of the province. And when you do that, Mr. Speaker, then you can see the degree in which they can compete. The Alberta Government assumed costs which properly belonged to the treasury savings branches.

A MEMBER: But it's not for current . . .

MR. SPIVAK: No, Mr. Speaker, agreed. Prior to March 31, 1970. How many years were they in operation? How many years did the Social Credit -- and the Honourable the First Minister can figure that out. In those years their general expenses were charged to the Province and the taxpayers supported it. In addition, other and more discreetly hidden subsidies were involved in allocating costs between Treasury offices and other Government operations when sharing space with other Government departments. Under this bill, Mr. Speaker, as it stands, virtually unlimited cross subsidization of this kind would be possible and would tend to become more the norm. And if the Honourable First Minister says that we're going to be able to change the accounting clause in this bill, then we would want to change the clause to prevent any cross subsidization whatsoever.

Can anyone deny that this would constitute the most unfair and difficult type of competition for the credit unions? And I wonder, Mr. Speaker, why you cannot now understand why credit unions are alarmed. Does it come as a surprise that any who have through their lives identified with the ideals embodied in the People's Bank and Credit Union Co-operatives, in short with the basic philosophies of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation, should ask whose gospel it is that these latter day prophets of a People's Party are the ones who are now preaching what is gospel?

Mr. Speaker, it is no longer the People's Party, but it is a Government Party riddled with vested interest as everyone in Manitoba knows. Who is there, Mr. Speaker, who can distinguish between arbitrary government and between tyranny? This is an arbitrary and unfair bill. It must be withdrawn or amended fundamentally, in keeping with philosophy and tradition which most of us in this House, regardless of party, at least profess.

Now, Mr. Speaker, all of this is bad enough and certainly it is sad enough, that when one reads the opening paragraphs of the 1973 Annual Report that I referred to already in this House, in the section dealing with the Banking Committees, one cannot help but wonder if we're not dealing with an unconscionable act of bad faith on the part of Ed Schreyer and the New Democratic Party Government. The Report states, "We are confident that if we are successful in

BILL 64

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) chartering a bank, the province will review its approach regarding treasury branches." Well, Mr. Speaker, the credit unions are now realistically in the final stages of their application being considered and of entering into the banking business. And now, Mr. Speaker, they have a bill which is only enabling, which is only permissive, which is only going to allow them to consider and to plan and to study and have a task force to go into the treasury branch business - conveniently now brought forward, conveniently brought forward, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we have not in this Legislature, received an explanation, a justification or review worthy of the name. Mr. Speaker, we believe that at one stroke this bill could provide the opportunity for the government to replace the co-operative financial services of the credit union with a government financial service. Mr. Speaker, who is there among us who would voluntarily borrow money from the godfathers of Manitoba? You know, Mr. Speaker. . .

MR. CHERNIACK: That's so weak to use that double meaning.

MR. SPIVAK: No, I'm taken back, Mr. Speaker, to the report of Manfred Kiel dealing with the Communities Economic Development Fund in analysing their approach with respect to financial matters, when he basically stated for the government - hired by the government, hired by the General Manager of the Communities Economic Development Fund - that the approach of the company and the approach of the fund was one of that of a godfather. All one has to do is listen to the sincerity of motivation expressed by the individuals involved, who essentially took a private company and basically directed what should happen, because they thought it was in the interest of everyone concerned; because they basically felt that they knew better than the individual who owned the company as to how and what way they should proceed. And one understands in that one financial transaction, what will happen in the whole variety of other transactions that will be involved.

Mr. Speaker, there is no reason why we in this Legislature at this particular time should be persuaded by any argument advanced by the government. They have not proven need; they in fact have created alarm. There is a bank, a western Canadian Bank, in the process of being organized, that may very well be presented by their action. The Federal Government did introduce legislation, and so far as I know at this point, they cannot say that they will not be given the opportunity to have a provincial bank and to be able therefore to compete. The real reason, Mr. Speaker, and the reason that should be presented, and the reason which the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources did present - and for that we have to at least give credit for that to him - was that the reason we want this is the same reason that we wanted auto insurance, because we want to be able to control the premiums and have the money and have the investment.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it didn't work out exactly the way the Minister of Finance said it would. The \$30 million somehow or other . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: What did I say?

MR. SPIVAK: I'm sorry, the Minister of Mines and Resources. I'm sorry. --(Interjection)--Well, Mr. Speaker - well, you know, if the Minister of Finance will acknowledge that I can make a mistake, that I may have made a mistake, I acknowledge that, I acknowledge that he makes a mistake - and if he won't--(Interjection)--well, I make mistakes and so does he make mistakes. I'm sorry. I said that at least the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources had been honest, which is very different I think than the Minister of Finance in his presentation - and I say that directly to him, because at least the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources acknowledged the reasons that he wants to enter into this business, is to get hold of the money. That's what he said. He wants that cash flow. The Minister of Finance didn't. As a matter of fact, if you will examine it, it's true that what the Minister of Finance is suggesting - all one can do is infer, because he didn't say anything, and I must admit, Mr. Speaker, that the inferences can be several and I guess can be interpreted in different ways. But the fact is, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources at least presented his position. And, Mr. Speaker, one looks at the NDP manifesto and the documentation and one recognizes the intent and the purpose, and you put it together with some of the legislation we have here and the pattern becomes very clear and becomes very obvious.

Mr. Speaker, I would believe - well I would even accept some of the remarks that the Honourable Minister of Tourism had suggested in his presentation today. I believe that there was a mandate given to the people opposite, but that mandate was to deal with the social

BILL 64

(SPIVAK cont'd) problems in Manitoba and to be able to deal with the question of reform. And, Mr. Speaker, auto insurance wasn't a reform, as a matter of fact auto insurance has been a disaster. The amount of Crown corporations that the government's been involved are not reforms, they've been disasters; and I predict, Mr. Speaker, that if they ever get into treasury branches, that won't be a reform, it'll be another disaster - and I don't think that the people of Manitoba want you to go into these disasters.

Mr. Speaker, we have a problem on this side. Our problem in opposition is to criticize. We have a problem - our problem is to criticize, to offer a constructive alternative if we disagree, but we have another problem with respect to this particular matter and so many others. We have to stop you from hurting yourself. We have to help you from yourself. You have a propensity to try and go into the business area and to try and make up for the frustrations and for the inadequacies that so many of you feel. And we have to help you out, Mr. Speaker. And I think, you know, I've practised law and the Honourable Minister of Finance has practised law as well, and I've been in the position where people have come to me with a proposal and another proposal - having gone bankrupt the first time, having gone bankrupt the second time, having gone bankrupt the third time, and that basically you have to say to them, "Now, you stop going into business, the best thing you could do is get a job and put in a hard day's work." Well, Mr. Speaker, when we examined the track record of the government, we have to say to you that we on this side have another job. We have to act as your psychiatrist and tell you that you're crazy for going into business.

Mr. Speaker, the reason that this is appealing is obvious to you; the reason it's a concern for us is obvious as well. Now, where do we see the management capability that is going to handle this one? You know, how much will it really cost the people of Manitoba? Where, Mr. Speaker, where are we going to find it? You see, the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources says, "We can go and hire management." By God that's what we can do." And they did, they hired Mr. Ault. We don't even know how much they paid him, we don't even know what his contract was, we don't know how much they paid him off. And we also know, Mr. Speaker, that we've got two operations that are still losing money in which he's been involved. Mr. Speaker, we approach this with a fundamental distrust at the ability of the New Democratic Party to handle financial matters, and this has been proven time and time again. We approach this matter with a fundamental distrust of the motives of the government, because there really is no consensus even among them, and that's already been apparent by the presentation and the remarks that have been presented; and if there is a consensus, then we say they've been dishonest in the presentation that they've made and therefore we have serious doubts as to their purpose.

We approach this with a serious concern for the politicising that has taken place in relation to the way in which they've handled themselves in certain matters. And one has to examine the Communities Economic Development Fund and its record - we'll be on that tonight - to recognize and to understand the implications of what can happen if a government does become the godfather in loans to communities and in loans and involvement with businesses in areas, particularly when it is a reflection of the government. Now it's all good and well to say that the honourable members do not have that intention, but the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that there is nothing in the Act that we have before us that would protect it. We do not - and we say this to the honourable members opposite - we do not have the kind of accountability from the government in the handling of the affairs that it is responsible for and in the Crown corporations that will provide us with the kind of information, and the public to understand fully the implications of their actions and of their financial conduct. And we say, Mr. Speaker, that there is nothing in this Act that will provide us with what we believe is a minimum kind of protection to ensure that that accountability takes place.

And so, Mr. Speaker, recognizing that there is in fact an alternative to what the government is proposing - and I'm going to state that right now - recognizing that there is a credit union movement, who feel both that they've been betrayed and are in jeopardy as a result of the action itself, it is impossible, Mr. Speaker, to support this bill. The alternative, Mr. Speaker, is to strengthen the credit unions. The alternative, Mr. Speaker, is to provide the incentive for the credit unions. The alternative is to encourage them into the bank for western Canada so that they can provide the services, and to take the managerial services they've offered and to allow them to go into those communities in which there is no services provided

BILL 64

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) or no competitive services, and in this way work within the private sector so that there can be an advancement of a cause which they - prior to their election as the government - were so committed. And we suggest, Mr. Speaker, to the members opposite that they reconsider their position; and we suggest as well, that the argument advanced by the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources - and I've got this one right - in which he suggested that the credit unions are children which you're putting in front of a battle, is false; that the credit union movement is involved; that in effect they will be affected; that they are going to be betrayed, and realistically you're going to destroy something that would have been worthwhile for Manitoba and for western Canada, and that was the development and creation of a bank owned and operated by the Credit Union Movement.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J. R. (BUD) BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, when you enter a dialogue or a debate, I think it's reasonable that you assume that the people who involve themselves know the rules that pertain to the particular discussion. We are talking about a bank bill. Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't pretend to be an authority on finance; in fact, in my own personal world I'm probably one of the worst. But nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Tourism and Recreation pointed out this morning that one of the reasons that we're involved in this particular process is because of a 100 years of abuse by the financial institutions of the country, and it prompted me to go to the library, and I'll try and give some continuity to my presentation, but I haven't had that much opportunity to do some research.

It is interesting to note that the Leader of the Liberal Party's debate, in his usual attempt to sit on a fence, he came down on both sides of it. And the Minister of Mines and Resources pointed out how ludicrous his argument was if you carry it through to its logical conclusion. But the Progressive Conservative Party as presented to the House by their Leader - really they should get rid of the Progressive part of it, because if you will look back to the debates in the House of Commons relative to the Bank Act in 1934, you will find that the Progressives put forth the better position than the Leader of the Progressive Conservatives did at the present time.

But, Mr. Speaker, just for a brief moment to go back generally, it's interesting to note such things as one of the Rothschilds said at one time, that he really didn't care what political party was in control of a country as long as he controlled their economics. And a very good example of this was in Napoleon's waxing and waning; in the period of waxing prior to his defeat at Waterloo, it was interesting to note that he was financed by the City Bank of London to the tune of five million pounds. In other words, the people of England's financial resources were being mustered to finance Napoleon and at the same time the English taxpayers were raising armies to defeat Napoleon at Waterloo.

Mr. Speaker, it's probably one of the most propitious moments that a socialist government could introduce such a measure into a House in Canada, this being the 100th anniversary of the birth of Woodsworth. And Woodsworth, of course, was the--(Interjection)--Woodsworth, of course - you know, he stands head and shoulders above any man in this House--(Interjection)-- well if you want to go into - you know, if you give me leave I could talk all afternoon on that one. In 1921, when he first was elected to the House of Commons, one of the first things that he started to do was to work toward a better means of having the people's savings directed to their social benefit. And it was primarily through the efforts of this one individual, that in the 1928-1929 that the House of Commons initiated a committee, it was called the McLellan Committee. And it's interesting to note in Hansard in the House of Commons, the report of the McLellan Committee was being considered - and when you talk about credit unions, all of a sudden the big defenders of the credit unions - it is interesting to note that even at that time Woodsworth chided them, and he said, I'm quoting from page 2721 of the Journals of 1928: "Well undoubtedly the attention of the committee was centered upon a suggestion of the Central Bank."--(Interjection)--You know, Mr. Speaker, this is one of the rankest stupidities that I have ever seen demonstrated by the other side. "Get up to date," they say. How in the hell did we get here? By following such narrow, dogmatic - you talk about dogma, if I say that water flows downhill, Mr. Speaker, they'd say, "That's dogma," That's fact. If I say, "Smoke rises," because I say it from this side, it's dogma. These people over here, Mr. Speaker, are so Conservative - and I say that with the biggest "C" that I can draw, because they're thinking is in a vortex and they're drowning in it - and this whole session has just demonstrated this drowning in it. "Get up to date," they say.

BILL 64

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside on a point of order.

MR. ENNS: While I recognize some sensitivity on the part of the speaker with respect to the remark that was made having to do with his dealing in past history, I want to assure the honourable speaker that I have no objection to dealing with past history, I think it's very germane to certain debates. I raise the question only that very often the First Minister of this House indicated to us by rising on a point of order, suggesting that any subject matter dealing with past history was indeed out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance on the same point of order.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (Minister of Finance) (St. Johns): The Honourable Member is now using an argument which was presented when he was trying to ask a question and dealing with history. He knows this is not the case. One should reprimand him for raising gratuitous and fatuous points of order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. There's no point of order before the House. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the non-point of order. Because one of the other "c's" I had drawn in my mind is "Bud be calm." And this gives me an opportunity. I shouldn't react that way and usually it's not the Member for Minnedosa, it's usually the Member for Morris that gets that burr under my saddle, and the Member for Lakeside also.

But if I may go back to history just for a moment. I'll bring you up to 1974 in a few moments. Just bear with me. But he said - Woodsworth - in referring to a consideration of this report, "While undoubtedly the attention of the Committee was centred upon the suggestion of a central bank of issue and re-discount, at the same time there were other suggestions made, such as the establishment of small local banks and the possibility of setting up co-operative credit societies." And he was one of the first, of course, of the initiators of co-operative thinking in the country, and of course credit unions got started first in Quebec, as most people are aware.

But, Mr. Speaker, the thrust of this thing was that this McLellan Committee come up with this report in 1933 which led to the establishment of the Bank of Canada Act. And reading from this Report, this Report of the Royal Commission on Banking and Currency in Canada, it's interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, who were the Commissioners on this at this particular time. The Commission consisted of Lord McMillan, an eminent British jurist who had been Chairman of the British McMillan Commission; Sir Charles Addis of British International Banker repute; Sir Thomas White, Canadian Minister of Finance during the First World War; J. E. Brownlee, then Premier of Alberta; Beaudry Lemon, General Manager of the Bank Canadienne Nationale. And the majority report was three to two, only three to two that they should even establish a Bank of Canada. But in this report they said, "In such a time of difficulty, experiment is justifiable. Unfortunately there is no laboratory in which such experiments can first be tried. They can only be tried upon the lives and fortunes of human beings, and if they fail they may be productive of untold misery."

Now that's 1933 that that report was written.--(Interjection)--No it hasn't. No it hasn't. It is interesting to note, if honourable members would bother to go back and read some of these debates that took place in 1934.

Mr. Speaker, may I digress just for a moment to share an experience of my own. I was at a meeting, Parliamentary Association meeting in Ottawa, that the Member for Morris was with me, and we were talking on a particular issue and one of the Conservative members, a Conservative member of the House was sitting next to me and he started to laugh, and he said, "I'm going to send you a speech." And he sent me a speech of the British House of Commons in 1634, and if you changed a couple of words in it, boy, I sounded like the worst rat in . . .

But what I'm getting at, what is history for? What are these records for? To gather dust? This is what really shocked me, and the only reason that I'm entering this debate at all, because as I say I'm no authority on finance, but I know a little bit about history and I assume that the people in this room went through the same educational system that I did, the difficulties of 1929, the Home Bank in Manitoba. I'm sure that the member over there--but does the Member for Minnedosa, who is now nodding his head, know that the Government of Canada at the day treated the Home Bank of Manitoba entirely different than they did the banks in Montreal. The banks of Montreal, the Minister of Finance allowed them to be taken over by the Bank of Montreal. The banks in Montreal, the individual banks, were going broke. The

BILL 64

(MR. BOYCE cont'd) Minister of Finance let the Bank of Montreal take them over but the Home Bank here in Manitoba, Pffft. It's entirely different.

But anyway, Mr. Speaker, back to my point. The McLellan Report. All the debates in the House of Commons, all these debates that these people are making over here, the reactionary debates against change, the reactionary debates against progress of any kind, and still the banks haven't corrected the social ills. But what did they suggest in this Bank Act? That Rabid Red--remember him? R. B. Bennett, Red Bennett. They introduced a bill in the House and he wanted--the thrust of this report is that a bank should be a public-owned institution. But, Mr. Chairman, we know what happened to R. B. Bennett. You know, any progressive, any progressive that we have sent East from the West, whether it be R. B. Bennett or John Diefenbaker, we know what happens to him when he gets down there. The knives come out - chk-k-k. They laughed Bennett, they laughed Bennett . . .

A MEMBER: How will Roblin make out?

MR. BOYCE: I'm sorry for the Hansard people. I don't know how you spell chk-k-k. Maybe I should do a Victor Borge routine here.

But R. B. Bennett, you know, they laughed him out of--you know, Bennett Buggies and all the rest of the stuff. They really laughed him out of Ottawa. Diefenbaker, who was a Progressive, a Degressive - not a Conservative but a Progressive Conservative. What did they do to him down East? Once again out came the knives, chk-k-k.--(Interjection)--Oh you want me to dig out Woodsworth's debates on this and why they finally instigated it. All right.

But to get back to this Bank Act. The public ownership, you see, so who did they put to represent the public? "The main features of the resulting Act provided the shares of the bank would be owned by private individuals who would elect the Directors, who in turn would appoint the managing officers, subject to the approval of the Government. The first set of officers, however, was appointed directly by the Government." That sounds like a Hog Marketing Commission or something. Sounds like a Hog Marketing Commission.

"Immediately after the Act was passed, the organization of the bank began. G. F. Towers of the Royal Bank was appointed Governor; J. A. Osborne of the Bank of England, Deputy-Governor;" and so on. But who found these people for them? It says, "The share capital of \$5 million was over-subscribed by the public and under the informal but effective leadership of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, the shareholders selected a geographical diversified group of directors under the direction of the Chamber of Commerce that instrumentality of, "you know, representing the public at large, " was used. " But we go through this, Mr. Speaker, and we find out finally that, "In 1936, the government" - you remember there was a change of government between '34 and '36 - "in 1936, the government" - you remember there was a to insist on its position of public ownership, and somewhat later arrangements were made to buy out the shareholders and take over the ownership of the bank. The Bank of Canada is now owned by the government. " But Mr. Speaker . . .

A MEMBER: That was socialism.

MR. BOYCE: Socialism. Socialism. Some of these fellows that they put down there But in these debates - the member says that, you know, reading history, the Leader of the Opposition says, you know, why do we have to introduce this bill? Who has demonstrated the need for this bill? A hundred years, as the Minister pointed out this morning, we have needed this bill. A fellow speaking in the debates of 1929, in February, on page 143 of Hansard, a fellow by the name of Mr. John Evans from Rosetown, a Progressive - you know, not a rabid Red or something - but he talks about: "Government control of banks in Canada has been a farce, just the false hope of the depositor. It has been no security to those who put their money into these institutions, " - that of course has been corrected - "But the responsibility for the trail of tragedies across the Dominion can be traced to the action of the Department of Finance regarding the Home Bank. " This would make interesting reading, you know, how the Province of Manitoba got shafted, really shafted on this thing.

A MEMBER: Tell us.

MR. BOYCE: Well no. That's another debate - and I'm not as I say - well I just spent about half an hour getting some of these thoughts together - but the Leader of the Opposition said that there was no reason, you know, for bringing this bill in. When the Minister of Mines and Resources said the other day that one of the reasons why he had supported Autopac was so that the people in Manitoba would have some control over that capital which was sitting there,

BILL 64

(MR. BOYCE cont'd) I was asking the Minister of Autopac the other day how his cash flow was. "Fine," he says, "cash flow's good." I said, "What have you got?" "Oh," he said, "we've got seven million in hospital debentures," something like this. So when people come up and they take the one little thing they say that the balance shows for an operating period that there is a deficit, and they hang that before the public and that's all they show them; they don't talk about cash flows or the amounts of deposits and all the rest of it, they don't put the total picture before them. The manager, the great financial wizard of the House from Minnedosa, now over there shaking his head, I would suggest the balance sheet makes just as much sense to me as it does to him. --(Interjection)--Well, I don't know. I betcha I know--(Interjection)--Certainly I know what a loss is.--(Interjection)--No, no I'm sorry, I went insolvent but I didn't go bankrupt.

A MEMBER: Same thing.

MR. BOYCE: It isn't the same thing. I paid my creditors off 100 cents on the dollar, that's the difference.

But, Mr. Speaker, the financial wizard from Minnedosa says that he knows what a loss is. So do I know what a loss is. But here again shows the fallaciousness of the arguments of the opposition, because their thrust is such that they would rather, the taxpayers in Canada through their instrumentality of Government, take their tax money and give it to private enterprise so that they don't show a loss. Now when we talk about development, let's talk about, you know, right here, right at home in Manitoba. In Winnipeg we had some very powerful people financially. We had Eatons, we had Sheas, we had Riedle's, we had a whole flock of these people that controlled their own corporations. They had enough stock to say whether they were going to declare a dividend or not. These people had at least a social conscience, at least a social conscience. When the Leader of the Opposition said a few moments ago, you know, that we know best that type of paternalism; he still wants to tell the people that things have changed. When Timothy Eaton the old, the Red, Timothy Eaton - I disagree with some of his policies, but nevertheless to these fellows in the front bench over here especially he was a rabid Red because he came up with half pay for people if they got sick. He built houses for his employees. But the corporations now as they have removed themselves from Manitoba, they don't act with any social conscience whatsoever, and they shouldn't because they're not so structured.

If I have stock in a company - and I hear the Minister of Finance and other people talk about the number of shares of stock that they have - I have so few that it wouldn't make any difference whether I lost them or I didn't, yet I like to see them make a profit, and there's nothing the matter with that. If I have stock in some company, I like it to go up, I like a dividend. And, you know, I'd rather have 400 percent increase than a 300 percent loss. You're just like anybody else. But, Mr. Speaker, what we have done over the last years, is we have put burdens on this type of a structure which they're not designed to meet. And the Liberals, both the Liberals and Conservatives would have us meet this problem by giving private corporations money so that they don't show a loss. Mr. Speaker, if I have \$100,000, which I'll probably never have in cash capital - but if I had \$100,000 and I took it to a person and I said, "Here's my \$100,000, invest it for me." If I took it to the Member for Minnedosa and said, "Invest this for me," what would he do? If he saw an area that he could make 10 percent or an area that he could make eight percent, what would he do? Any fool can answer that, he'd put it where he could get me 10 percent, because if he didn't I'd come back at the end of the year and he'd say, "Well Bud, I only made you eight percent because there was a little plant down there in Morden that was going to close down, you know, because the corporation over there could make more money, and I thought well gee, I'll put the \$100,000 in there to buy that plant, and you saved all those people's jobs down there but you only got eight percent." I'd say, "You silly ass." I'd take it from him and I'd give it to somebody else that would make me ten percent. So, I'm sorry, it's simple - well I'm sorry the Leader of the Liberal Party wasn't in the House, I dismissed your argument with one sentence. You can read it tomorrow perhaps.

The Leader of the Opposition in his presentation said that government is going to become involved in this financial institution known as a Treasury Branch, which is the only thing we can do constitutionally, and we're going to lose money. And what does he drag up? He drags up all those corporations which, you know, if they were in the private hands the government, that government would have given them money. They wouldn't have showed a loss. Even under the Manitoba Development Corporation - or the MDF, I think, it was MDF they called it - these

BILL 64

(MR. BOYCE cont'd) companies wouldn't have showed a loss, they'd give them some more money and it would be under some grants. But, no, this government has insisted that the people should know how much it's costing us for this type of development. We have to know what kind. You know, people are much more sophisticated than the Opposition gives them credit for. Well, they probably read financial reports with the Reader's Digest type of knowledge that I have, but nevertheless they have a fair idea of what's going on. The Leader of the Opposition gives them credit for absolutely no intelligence whatsoever. They know with the CFI thing that this government probably would have, you know, built a plant up there also. I doubt very much if we would have got sucked in with Sindona. I say Sindona because it's my impression that this man is involved in many ways. He was Celanese in Sicily; he was involved in CFI here in Manitoba I would suggest; he was involved with Libby, McNeill and Libby, the first time that Libby, McNeill and Libby never paid a dividend was two years after Sindona was brought into the company. And I hear that the First National Bank - a bank - lost \$39 million. And what do they - they find out that Sindona was involved in there. But the great entrepreneurs, the great entrepreneurs over here, they're so successful in gathering people together, expertise together to manage the government's affairs; they have some fellow, Rex Grose - and the Leader of the Opposition at the present time - and a fellow by the name of Kasser, and what was the other one? Reiser. Well I think that they got sucked into this. They say we're --(Interjection)--You're giving me time to find my place.--(Interjection)--No, no, we're up in the - oh, you get too close and the needle goes through the lard into the pork and he squealed over there but--(Interjection)--oh no, that's another day.

Mr. Speaker, just while I'm gathering my thoughts together here momentarily, if anybody's really interested in the home bank situation I suggest that you read May 1, 1933, Page 4467 of Hansard; it gives you a fairly good description of it; it's Woodsworth's speech on it.

But the Leader of the Opposition in trying to present a picture that, you know, that government management is totally inefficient, you know, with Autopac, so they lost on the books for a particular period of time, moneys.--(Interjection)--Hahahahaha. Well I would like to point out to the Leader of the Opposition that one of the things that I get from the business community about the Drummer Boy, what makes him so angry is, if we're going to get shafted for all this amount of money, you know, why couldn't he give us that opportunity? Why did he have to go over to Switzerland to get people to give our money to? Why didn't he make us the same offer, so that we could have made all this money on turnkey operations? Why didn't you make Abitibi the same deal? Why didn't you make Crown Zellerbach the same deal? Why didn't you make, you know, some local Winnipeg operator the same deal, with all the intelligence that they try to project to the public that they're the experts?

But, Mr. Speaker, for the honourable gentleman opposite to try and make his case that the government as an operative business is totally inefficient, is so ludicrous that, you know, people shouldn't even listen to it any more, because if you want to look at what has been done with these particular corporations that are at the present time in some difficulty, as far as a strict balance, economic consideration, is concerned, yes, they're not making money on strict economic terms. But this is exactly what we're talking about, is how do we take in balance, profit and social needs, how do we do it? And who's going to do it? The only people that can possibly do it are the politicians and the society, whether it be this government or any other government, because it is the society itself which has to judge. It is the people in the community that have to judge; well we can only go so far. Our capital has to realize so much of a profit, so that we can only take into consideration a certain percentage of social needs at any particular time. I would hazard the opinion that the decision to keep the Morden Fine Foods open - who would close it down? Who would close down Saunders? Would the Leader of the Opposition close down Saunders? I doubt it. I doubt it. Any one of these corporations which they scream about, even the Lord Selkirk, they wouldn't close it down, because even if these things are about breaking even they are still socially needed jobs within the community. They wouldn't close them down and we, as a government of course, have to accept the buffeting of the Opposition, and the people themselves finally judge whether we were right or wrong, and this is a better instrumentality than a group of people I suggest that were selected by the Canadian Chamber of Commerce.

When the Leader of the Opposition says, where are you going to get the managers? You know, I'm sorry I missed the debate because I was really looking forward to it. The Minister

BILL 64

(MR. BOYCE cont'd) responsible for the MDC who has started the Exploration Company, who did he hire? Did he run around and find a bunch of card-carrying socialists? I suggest not. I read the transcripts, and especially one answer of a fellow by the name of Koffman relative to a question of the Leader of the Liberal Party, the fellow says, "I don't know." He says, "You've got a bunch of lawyers around here," he says, "I'm a geologist, I can't see any farther into the ground than you can." And here are gut operators, people who know the business, who did they hire? Some chap Lazarenko, a gentleman by the name of Lazarenko. I heard him, fisherman, business operator, a force within the community. I don't think he's - he doesn't sound like a socialist to me. These are the people that he hired to operate that company, operators. And in reading some of these debates, you know, I would ask my colleagues, I would sincerely ask my colleagues to consider when they set up these treasury branches, that they get James Coyne to come.

Mr. Speaker, you know this Conservative bunch over here, the Conservative bunch - at least the Liberal Leader when he was making his argument tried to come up with some different thrusts. You know, he split himself on his fence, but nevertheless he tried. But the Conservatives are so locked in, locked into their thinking that they can't see anything and it's - I thought the Member for Fort Garry was going to make his jackboots speech once more.

But a personal acquaintance of mine, who's a bank manager - and, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make the case. Mr. Speaker, over the years the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce has treated me, well it used to be the Imperial Bank and now it's the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce, and I put in that plug for them because I have been treated fairly by these people; I have been helped by these people; my problems have been worked out with these people - and really at the moment I'm in hock to them - but one of the managers of this, one of the branch managers of this particular bank that I deal with - a terrific man - he retired and after he retired I said, "Who do you think that we would hire?" You know, he was talking about financing and things like this; and I said, "People such as yourself." I said, "I can't even manage my own affairs; we'd hire you."

It just so happened that in the CFI investigation I had heard that they needed somebody to follow some of these darn invoices, the way they twisted in here and twisted out there, or something, so I suggested that this chap who I knew was a fantastic guy on detail. He used to drive me nuts, but he was terrific in following things through. So the fellow went to work for them. I think it was six weeks one time, and followed some stuff through - the gentleman's name is unimportant. I don't believe in mentioning civil servants' names in this House. The fellow did a fantastic job. I don't think we've made a socialist out of him yet. But nevertheless, these are the people that would be hired to run a bank. Tommy Douglas said, it's a heck of a lot easier to make a socialist out of an engineer than an engineer out of a socialist.

But, Mr. Speaker, I was so provoked by the Leader of the Opposition's totally inadequate opposition to this bill, with absolutely no depth, no research, no nothing, and I can't help but once again express my own personal frustration with this total session. I don't know what they're doing with their few dollars that we got together for the different caucuses - or is it cauci? - caucuses to do some research. But if this is a demonstration of the research that has been done for the honourable gentleman, I say he's been gypped, because the research that he, their whole group comes in here with, is yesterday's newspaper.

The people of Manitoba deserve better. There are some apprehensive areas of government control of banking institutions. You know, I get so tempted that I'd like to slip the guy a note so he could make these cases. But to come down and come into this House and say No. 1 - his total argument, his total argument was: No. 1, that the case had not been made for the sum control, not total control, sum control of the financial resources of the province, by the people of the province. A 100 years of history has demonstrated that the private financial institutions whose sole purpose is to make a profit, cannot handle the deal.

His second point was that the government, anything that they handle they lose money, and he alludes to those organizations which were taken over because we're stuck with them, or a few others that perhaps from strict economic terms should not have been entered into, but nevertheless in judgment, and judgment can err, in judgment it was decided that because of the balance between economic realities, social need, that we will venture into those, and some of those are in financial difficulty, but he keeps forgetting to mention the ones that succeed, and there are some of those.

BILL 64

(MR. BOYCE cont'd)

You know, for a Conservative I have never heard once the Member for Winnipeg South Centre say, that the Manitoba Telephone System was a totally inefficient operation. I have never heard him say, a Conservative--(Interjection)--he's got nothing - it's got nothing to do with it; it's got all to do with it. And from his seat the Leader of the Opposition, you know - it manifests his lack of understanding that he says, what has it got to do with it? It's got all to do with it. It's got all to do with it. Mr. Speaker, the people of Manitoba deserve better.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First off I would like to say that this is an issue which is of vital concern to the credit unions in my area. I've received telegrams from the different credit unions in the area, and it's also an issue I think that is of concern to very many Manitobans. I believe that this bill, Bill 64, The Treasury Branches Act, is an attempt by this government to get their foot into the door of the credit unions in Manitoba. I feel that the implications of this bill will put a halt and probably curtail the expansion and future of the Manitoba Credit Union Society. I know that the members opposite have their eyes on that \$400 million the credit unions now have in deposit, and I realize it's awfully tempting to them to grab hold of that. I would just like to reiterate again what my leader said, I think the government has not determined that there is a distinct need for treasury branches in Manitoba. I speak from personal experience from the area that I represent. I think the credit unions and the banks are providing good services to the customers at the present time. The other question is, how much subsidy is the taxpayer of Manitoba going to be saddled with if this bill is implemented and goes ahead in full gear?

The Credit Unions of Manitoba have gradually grown through the years and have managed to build up sound business practices and a solid base for doing their business. What concerns me, and concerns my constituency, is the direction that this government is taking in respect to legislation such as this. I'm sure the NDP members across the way are, after the implementation, if they're going to go ahead with this bill, will go ahead and try to establish treasury branches in small towns such as Ste. Anne and Steinbach, Niverville and La Broquerie. Once there they will advise the residents of the area that now that they are there, they are going to now become the exclusive agents for collecting hydro bills, telephone bills, gas bills; they are going to sell Autopac; they are going to sell fire insurance; they are going to sell life insurance; they are going to sell the game and fish licenses . . .

A MEMBER: Lotteries.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, this issue is of growing concern to the people in my constituency, and I think to many people in Manitoba. This government is becoming more and more involved in our lives, and is not only trying to control our cash flow but it's trying to direct it, and in this bill it's even going to try and use it.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a step by the socialist members opposite to grab more control away from the private individuals in the Province of Manitoba, and I move, seconded by the Member for Brandon West, that Bill No. 64 entitled The Treasury Branches Act be not now read a second time, but be read six months hence.

MOTION presented.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. James, that debate be adjourned. If there's someone wishes to speak.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. KEN DILLEN (Thompson): . . . permit a question. I understand that he has received telegrams from credit unions in his area and I would like to ask him if along with those telegrams if he has also received the minutes of the Board of Directors' meetings of the Societies in his area showing where the Board of Directors have passed a resolution authorizing the sending of that telegram.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, both telegrams that I have, or all three telegrams that I have received, two from the local credit unions are signed by the Managers, and the other one is signed, comes from the Co-operative Credit Society of Manitoba and it's signed by the Secretary of the Board, Mr. B. Martin.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

BILL 64

MR. BLAKE: . . . that debate be adjourned Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Member for St. James.

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

MR. PAWLEY: I wonder if the Honourable Member for La Verendrye would submit to a further question. I wonder if he would be able to indicate whether he as a member of a credit union received notice of any meeting which was called of credit union members in order to discuss the contents of the telegrams he referred to.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, that I think the Attorney-General knows, would be physically impossible because we've just had the bill before us. But I would like to say that as a member of the credit union, and one of the reasons I am in the credit union is because of the proper management and direction that they have been given by the Managers, and that I would say that the Manager has the authority and authorization from the board to send this telegram.

A MEMBER: Oh. Are you sure? You are positive.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: If the questions are all over, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. James, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance) (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, proceed with Bill 73 instead of the next one, and then down the line.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Bill No. 73, the Building and Mobile Homes Act (Stand). Stands in the name of the Member for Sturgeon Creek.

Bill No. 75 (Stand). Bill No. 77 (Stand). Bill No. 82 (Stand).

Bill No. 69--(Interjection)--No that was introduced this afternoon.

BILL NO. 84

Bill No. 84. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY presented Bill No. 84, the Statute Law Amendments Act, (1974), for second reading. (Recommended by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor)

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that notes have been distributed to all members of the House in respect to the Statute Law Amendment Act (1974). I believe they were distributed today, and the notes are self-explanatory, and possibly in the interests of saving time I could just leave the notes with members and as members respond they could speak or ask questions relating to those notes, and I would attempt to answer in my concluding remarks rather than review the material that has been distributed.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Brandon West, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I believe we've now dealt with the Bills, the Third Readings - have we dealt with the Third Readings, Mr. Speaker?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well we can deal with them tomorrow. I suggest you move to Concurrences, Mr. Speaker.

CONCURRENCE

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I wonder if the Clerk could come up here please.

I ask the honourable members' pardon here because I can't seem to find the list of Resolutions, but anyway Resolution 109 to 117 inclusive. The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, if I can be of some assistance to you I believe that I have remaining about ten minutes.

I'd like to pick up where I left off in regard to attempting to answer some of the questions posed of me by members of the House, and included in the answers of questions, I'd like to bring my own contribution to this Concurrence motion.

CONCURRENCE

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd)

I was discussing, Mr. Speaker, the number of visitors who used our park system in the past year and, as I related to the honourable members, actually the number of people in 1973 rose in the period of 12 months by more than 17 percent in 1973. On this account we are recommending substantial increases in various sections of the Parks Branch Estimates and by saying that, Mr. Speaker, I answer the question, one of the questions, posed of me by the Member for Roblin in regard to additional full-time and part-time civil servants. You know, we just can't keep on adding services without some manpower, and without additional capital expenditure and current expenditure. So there is additional capital expenditure included, as related by the Minister of Finance, and equally additional funds within the Estimates of the Department of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs because of the desire of people of Manitoba to improve their own services.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY McKENZIE (Roblin): Are these employees, are they laid off during the winter months that work in the park, or how does the Minister and the department handle those people?

MR. TOUPIN: I haven't got the breakdown before me now but the bulk of the part-time staff that we have in the Department of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs are seasonal employees and would be laid off in the winter. There's a lot of students that are involved in some of the extra duties that are actually implicated in the summer months.

Looking, Mr. Speaker, to the immediate future in this department indications are that this is not likely to be the end of the capital expansion required throughout our park system. In the past year 4,370,000 persons made up the total park attendance with 126,000 camping permits sold. That is quite an increase over the previous years. This figure for the first time included 150 - and I would like the honourable members to take note of this - included for the first time 150 winter camping permits so, you know, it's becoming a winter sport, and I believe that's good. And that was in the Birds Hill Provincial Park.

An important new focus within the branch's current capital development program is on history and archeology research. Increased future activity in this field will see eventual restoration of such historically important site - and unfortunately the member for this area is not in - at Fort Ellice in St. Lazare and Fort Dufferin near Emerson - I believe the Honourable Member for Emerson is in the House in his seat - and Fort Beau . . . (?) at Grand Rapids. Definite plans for Fort Beau . . . reconstruction are already in hand.

The department is continuing its archeological research on the Churchill-Nelson River system - and the member for the area would be quite happy to learn of this - with particular emphasis on South Indian Lake, and in the vicinity of Pine Foresight(?) in Spruce Woods Provincial Park.

Another related branch program is aimed at the preservation of key buildings of historical or architectural importance throughout the province. And I made reference to a few of these that we had in mind in the province in regard to old buildings that citizens of this province would like to preserve for years to come.

Even with this extensive spending on provincial park improvement and expansion, the government finds it almost impossible to meet the growing recreational needs of the public in all parts of the province. We'd need more money, and obviously our budget that we have before us is an increase but still not large enough to meet all the requirements. So the honourable members from both sides of the House should understand, or attempt to understand, that sometimes yes, we're able to say we will go ahead with your requirements, we'll be in partnership with you to a certain extent, but in other areas, we'll have to wait two or three years. We just can't accept everything. And this is why that sometimes honourable members from both sides of the House may get a letter indicating that a project that was applied for is accepted, but in another case it is refused, or if it's not totally refused it's held for a period of time, because of financial restrictions, and because of lack of staff man years in certain areas.

A lot of the programs that we have that we're presently looking at, we're looking at cost-sharing plans whereby the government can offer assistance to municipalities for development of regional recreational parks to serve local needs. And that is a new emphasis that we have in the department. These projects would be shared on the 50/50 basis with municipalities.

During 1974 a pilot project for this program is planned with \$70,000 for assistance grants

CONCURRENCE

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) and service costs set aside for this purpose.

The Parks Branch has completed a number of major and minor projects throughout the province during the past year which will be ready for use when the season opens, and as the honourable members know opened on the 17th of May 1974.

These include development of a fully modern 70 unit campground at the new recreation area of Stevenson Field Reservoir; development and improvement of five wayside parks in the western region, being Pine Creek, Treherne, McCreary, Pipestone and Minnedosa; construction of a pavilion building at Spruce Woods Provincial Park; construction of a new footbridge and other improvements to the public beach at Nutimik, Nutimik Lake in the Whiteshell Provincial Park; complete renovations of the Manipogo(?) Park recreation area, including a boat channel, docks and 75 unit campground.

Some projects which are not yet completed will become operational during the 1974 season. These include a fully modern campground of 45 units at the Manitoba-Ontario border; a 25 unit campground and day use area at Bird Lake; a fully modern 181 unit campground at Nutimik Lake; a fully modern campground of 150 units at Trys(?) Lake in Duck Mountain Provincial Park--the honourable member for the area was posing that question, the Member for Roblin. I don't know if he heard that, anyway he'll read it in Hansard. A 135 unit campground at Paint Lake Recreation area in the north. A new major group youth area in Birds Hill Park. An overflow campground of 120 units at Falcon Lake. Opening of the first nine holes of the Hecla Provincial Park being eventually an 18-hole golf course. There will be a theatre and interpretive program at Birds Hill, Grand Beach, Falcon and Big Whiteshell Lakes.

Other projects scheduled as part of this expansion program includes repair and replacement of public docks on the Winnipeg River, Falcon Lake, West Hawk Lake, Brereton Lake, Big Whiteshell Lake, Moose Lake and White Lake. Completion of Adam Lake recreational facilities in the Turtle Mountain Provincial Park including campsites, roads, landscaping and other facilities. Landscaping of existing campground area at Lynch Point recreation area. Initial development of a 40 unit campground facility at Leaf Rapids including access road, boat launching and docking facility.

There's other projects and because of a lack of time I'll skip over them. We include at Turtle Mountain, Spruce Woods, Grass River, Duck Mountain, Asessippi, Grand Beach and Whiteshell Provincial Parks along with these such other major development projects as the Red River Floodway, Grindstone Recreation Area and Hecla Provincial Park have required planning and engineering emphasis. We plan to continue this emphasis through 1974 and are requesting the allocation of funds to maintain this accelerated pace.

Our program, Mr. Speaker, of issuing free park entrance to Manitobans who have reached age 65 and a few below 65 was very well received last year, and as the honourable members well know we've proceeded with the same policy for 1974. We have plans to streamline this service to make it more accessible to our senior citizens in Manitoba. I'm pleased to announce that 3,000 senior citizens received permits in 1973.

We also instituted a program of free camping at Birds Hill Park to families who are on full social assistance. While the result was small we intend to repeat it again in 1974. It is our belief that low income families will make good use of this service.

Another of new programs receiving close attention over the past couple of years is our interpretive park naturalist program. This program is designated to acquaint Manitobans with the various elements of the park system.

The southern half of the province is divided roughly, Mr. Speaker, as members will well know, roughly in half with the western region extending west from the Red River to the Saskatchewan border with headquarters in Brandon. A sub-regional office will be located in Dauphin, with district offices in Swan River, Asessippi, Turtle Mountain, Carberry and Portage la Prairie. The eastern region comprises all of that area east of the Red River to the Ontario border and north to the 53rd parallel including the Interlake and Lake Winnipeg. Regional headquarters remain at Birds Hill with a sub-regional office at Rennie. District offices are now located at Riverton, Hecla, Winnipeg Beach, Grand Beach, Seven Sisters, West Hawk and Falcon Lake. Combined with these changes we are using these offices to co-ordinate services of the other branches of the Department to make all departmental services more easily accessible to the public.

Mr. Speaker, because of a lack of time on this Concurrence Motion and because we did

CONCURRENCE

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) not get to the Estimates of the Department of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs during the consideration of the Estimates, I would be certainly available to any member of the House to attempt to answer questions pertaining to their presentation or during the question period until the end of the session, and during the year between sessions if there is any question pertaining to our facilities, any help that the Department of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs can provide to all members of the House we will be more than pleased to do so.

I think that we've attempted by means of the office of the Minister and any office that we have in the province to be of some assistance, not only to MLA's but the people that they represent, and we intend to continue with this policy, to be as accessible as possible and to answer questions when we can and when policies that now exist within this Department are brought forward to us, and we intend to review them and if need be amend policies and bring new policies to meet new needs and all in all to try to bring new services to people that are brought up to the times of today. We intend to plan jointly with all those involved in the parks, in culture, in recreation by listening a lot and then by taking action that will certainly bring this department not only to the heights of today but bring it to answer the needs of tomorrow. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Resolutions 109-117. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition has already spoken I believe on this Concurrence Motion according to the data that I have here before me. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to make a few comments at this time, particularly in regard to the availability of campgrounds and trailer parks that we do have in Manitoba. For the past three or four years I have been a camper and a puller of a trailer and it has proceeded to worsen for the past three years. Anybody who happens to work five days a week and cannot leave until Friday night, that in all likelihood one will be out of luck in attaining any camping facilities for a camper or a trailer and I would hope that the Minister would do everything within his power to make the availability of campgrounds, particularly for the camper type of vehicle and trailers, that lots be made available relatively close to Winnipeg--and when I say relatively close I'm talking about a 100 mile radius--because at the present time those people who are on a four-day week, and I believe the majority of them are actually civil servants, have priority to these particular lots, leaving almost nothing available for people who work on a five day week and who want to enjoy outdoors and our summers the same as everyone of us do. I believe that it's an important area of concern for a number of people because as we know the trailer industry is one of the fastest expanding industries in Manitoba and we are putting the trailers on the road and the campers on the road and people are buying them and finding that they have nowhere to take them unless they can leave and are fortunate enough to be able to leave on a Thursday night. I would hope that the Honourable Minister would look at the north eastern part of our province, or on the east side of Lake Winnipeg, because I know that there are lakes that are available for such facilities and if roadways and such can be put into these lakes that we will start to satisfy the need that now exists and has existed for a number of years.

I would like to also comment on the quality of maintenance of our parks, particularly the trailer camps that I have experienced in the past few years as a camper, and I am somewhat disappointed in the quality of maintenance of some of our parks. In particular I can recall last year that I stayed at the Toniata Camp in Falcon Lake and there was much to be desired in the quality of cleanliness of that particular campground, in particular the washroom facilities, and I think this as a camper becomes very important to the parents and the people who take and make use of these facilities and I would hope that there would be a closer supervision and authority of making sure that these type of facilities are kept properly and clean, because there's nothing more disappointing as a tourist to go into a campground and find that the facilities are dirty, they are not being maintained, and one gets a bad outlook on Manitoba.

I can say that as I have had the experience of travelling in the Ontario parks one of the years, last year as a matter of fact, and when you compare the two departments, the Ontario Parks and the Manitoba Parks, that we are lacking in something. I don't know whether it's the pride of the maintenance person in our parks or what, but I can tell you that the Ontario parks that I had the opportunity to stay in last year were kept much cleaner and much nicer than the ones that I attended in Manitoba. I hope the Minister would look into that particular area

CONCURRENCE

(MR. MINAKER cont'd) because I think it's very important if we want to create a good image for Manitoba with the visiting tourists; and in particular as I say I would hope they would check into the Toniata Beach park campground because to my experience that was the worst kept one that I've ever run across in four years' time and I hope that they would look into that matter.

The other thing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on is that there are two forces working at the present time with regard to the use of recreational lands. There is the environmentalists who believe that the nice lakes and trees and forests that we have should be completely preserved, more or less untouched by human hands; then on the other part there are people who would like to see our present generation also enjoying these natural areas that we have in our province and I would hope that the Department would take the attitude that the present generation should be able to enjoy this nature that we have, that presently is unavailable by vehicle other than possibly by canoeing and portaging and so on. I believe that people who camp and use automobiles to pull in their campers or their tents or trailers appreciate nature and have learned to preserve it, that the majority of the people that I know and have met in my years of camping like to preserve the nature. I can't see why we can't preserve the lakes and the forests for our future generations and still enjoy them today, and because of the demands that our people are placing on the present services that are available, I would hope the Minister of Tourism could get together with the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and work something out so that we can start to enjoy these lakes that at the present time are not available and are relatively close to Winnipeg, so that they can be enjoyed by our people of our present generation and still preserved for future generation use as well.

I think it becomes important that they are relatively close to our urban areas, not only Winnipeg but our other urban areas, because of the energy crisis that we presently have particularly in the gas and oil field, and the cost of gas these days, that it becomes a very important factor if one can reach a recreational spot in a relatively short distance; and further, because of the shortage of land or cottages, more and more of us, and more and more Manitobans are enjoying our outdoors by the use of trailers, and as I said earlier, placing a higher and higher demand on existing facilities and I would hope that the Honourable Minister would set as one of his major priorities in his department the opening up of new lakes and campgrounds for the campers who utilize either the tent, the camper or the trailer and we would make a concerted effort, the government would, in making these services available in the immediate future or in the not too distant future. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW (Flin Flon): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have been waiting for five years to say just what I'm going to say today. It's a problem--the Minister's said that he would answer all questions and I hope he'll give us some answers on this one. I have tried to get answers from the staff, the civil servants and they're going to get them but this was five years ago, I haven't got them yet. But this problem, Mr. Speaker, pertains to a lodge at Bakers Narrows. The Member for Minnedosa knows it well. It's situated on Lake Athapap on an inlet there . . .

A MEMBER: Which lake is that?

MR. BARROW: Athapapuskw. It's a lake, Mr. Speaker, that has the clearest water of any lake in northern Manitoba. Here's where they get the big trout, 40 lb. trout, 42 lb. trout, it's a beautiful spot. The Conservative Government built a Lodge there at Bakers Narrows and I think the idea was good, it was a nice place, a good location but it never worked for some reason. But anyway they had a beer parlour in the basement, coffee and sandwiches, lunches, groceries and so on, gas pumps, and first of all the sewers plugged and the beer parlour was out. In the winter time they closed it down, they had a developer in there, and I think it is the same chap that ran Wendigo, who had big ideas at that time. What he was going to do was build 30 motel units, he was going to install a swimming pool, a marina and he was going to cater to American tourists. Well, Mr. Speaker, we have seven lodges in that area that can handle all the tourists. He was going to cater to the champagne crowd, and three meetings we had at Flin Flon and this was a big subject. They don't want this. We got nothing against tourists but there's too many lodges, too much competition and we don't need it. What they want - they're not a champagne crowd in Flin Flon, Mr. Speaker, more the beer people and they want a place where they can buy groceries, pick up some gas, have a sandwich,

CONCURRENCE

(MR. BARROW cont'd) coffee, meet their friends and maybe serve beer, that's all they want. And five years ago I met with the then Minister of Tourism and he promised to do something in that line. But they have done nothing, they have neither developed it nor have they got rid of it--(Interjection)--You're with me eh?

A MEMBER: We've got a new Minister now, we've got a new Minister now.

MR. BARROW: What has happened - some civil servant, I won't name the guy, he has great ideas about this place, and you ask him anything - he sits in Winnipeg and he tells us in Flin Flon what we want, you know. Well the Flin Flon people want that thing as I said, Mr. Speaker, and I'm going to suggest to the Minister to turn that place over to the town for one dollar, get it off our back; that I hope this time that I will get an answer on this one way or the other. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the Honourable Member from Flin Flon a question? If the Department of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs decided to consider your alternative and turned it over to the town, would you indicate what the town could do with it that would actually involve the people like you'd like to see them involved?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I've talked to the Mayor on different occasions, the Council. They would take it over and they would run it as a year-round operation. Any profit would go back into the town.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could obtain leave to introduce a bill for first reading, and I would like to indicate the reasons to the House why I'm asking for this leave. Due to my greenness in respect to rules of the proceedings I concurred with the distribution of the Liquor Control Act, Bill No. 3, and I gather that the bill ought not to be distributed before it receives first reading, so that I would like to give it first reading in view of this inadvertence on my part. Mr. Speaker, then I would beg to move, seconded . . .

INTRODUCTION OF BILL NO. 88

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. Does the Honourable Minister have leave?[?]
(Agreed) The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY introduced Bill No. 88, an Act to Amend the Liquor Act (3).

CONCURRENCE Cont'd

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Resolutions 109 to 117. The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just have one or two points that I wanted to make in Concurrence and when the Minister takes all the comments down to answer later on maybe he can take one or two comments of mine.

I would like to just follow up some of the comments that the Member for Flin Flon made. I'm well aware of the situation that he refers to and when the Minister replies I'd be interested in seeing . . .

A MEMBER: . . . can't reply.

MR. BLAKE: You were going to give them to him privately? I'd be interested in getting the answers also because I know there has been one or two private offers made to purchase that particular lodge or whatever they might call it now that have met with no success whatsoever and it's being operated by some local people. As I say, I spend most of my summer holidays . . . and I'm quite familiar with that particular operation.

A MEMBER: Part of the champagne crowd, eh?

MR. BLAKE: And also very much familiar with the people of Flin Flon and they're not all beer drinkers, I assure that, Mr. Speaker.

I would like the Minister to use the efforts of his good offices and see what might be done to bring into being the roadside park that was promised to the Minnedosa area during the by-election in 1970 by the Minister of Highways. That's a perennial question with me and he kept referring me to the previous Minister of Tourism and now I'm trying to get some answers from the new one. The Tourish Branch tell me that it's just a matter of cutting an approach off of the highway and the highways people will not allow them to cut an approach off a curve or a hill.

CONCURRENCE

(MR. BLAKE cont'd) Now you can't get into the valley anywhere without being on a curve or a hill, but the previous administration and the highways people tell me that provision was made when the by-pass was built ten years ago that the access is there and it's just a matter of putting the roadside park in. And I would just like the Minister to keep that in mind when he is looking at some of the aspects for the future park sites in Manitoba.

I would also just mention in passing before 5:30, I know that his department has had an ongoing program of - I suppose you'd call it educating the people involved in the tourist trade, the service industries that are directly involved with the tourist trade on upgrading our services and the various manners and what not that go with it--and I could only emphasize that I spent a short time at a convention in North Dakota and I was extremely pleased with the politeness and the awareness of the people in the service industries, in the stores, and shops and in the hotels and the cafes, the awareness of them of the tourist dollar. It was pretty obvious I guess that many of us were tourists being conventioners but I don't think I was served by one clerk in a store or a restaurant anywhere that didn't have an extreme abundance of courtesy in serving and never failed to say "have a good day" or "have a nice day", and I want to say that this has a great impression on tourists. You come out of that particular building feeling quite good about the day, even though you might have been shafted for an extra buck for your breakfast or something. But you don't find that here and I hope that his department is following this particular program. It's the fact that I guess we're just not as geared up for it as they are down there and we're certainly not as geared as many other areas are. But I think that's extremely important because the tourist dollar is important to Manitoba there's no question about it and I would just like to hear what the plans are now; if they've been stepped up or if they are just merely carrying on the way they were before. Because I don't think the enthusiasm with our people serving the tourist trade is as great as it should be and it certainly isn't as great as it is with our neighbours just to the south. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Resolutions 109 to 117--passed.

The hour being 5:30, the House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning. (Saturday)