

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 p.m., Monday, June 7, 1976

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed, I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 24 students Grade 6 standing of the Hamiota Elementary School under the direction of Mrs. Linda Irwin. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

We have 110 students Grade 9 standing of the Spring Valley School under the direction of Mr. Collins from the constituency of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. On behalf of all the honourable members, I welcome you here this afternoon.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports. The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

TABLING OF REPORT

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs) (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table a report on the fire situation in the Whiteshell Provincial Park.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other Ministerial statements or Tabling of Reports? Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills. The Honourable House Leader.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. SIDNEY GREEN Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management)(Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether I'd be given leave to introduce a bill on first reading. It's one that is mentioned in Votes and Proceedings but it would not come up if I did not read it now.

MR. SPEAKER: Leave? (Agreed).

MR. GREEN (by leave) introduced Bill 93, an Act to amend The Prescriptions Drug Costs Assistance Act. (Recommended by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor).

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General also?

HON. HOWARD PAWLEY (Attorney-General)(Selkirk) (by leave) introduced Bill 94, and Act to amend The Queen's Bench Act (2). (Recommended by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor).

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BOB BANMAN (La Verendrye): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Minister of Highways and would ask him if the land acquisition for the proposed four-laning of No. 12 Highway between Steinbach and St. Anne is under way?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. PETER BURTNIAK (Minister of Highways)(Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I didn't quite get the question. Is it if the four-laning of No. 12 Highway is under way, did he say?

MR. BANMAN: For clarification, Mr. Speaker. I would like to know if the land acquisition has been started?

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Speaker, as our policy has been enunciated some few years ago that we acquire land for future developments in the City of Winnipeg, that is highway developments, as well as other parts of rural Manitoba. As far as No. 12 Highway is concerned, I don't know how soon we will be going into that construction if we are within the immediate future. Perhaps some time in the future we will be as traffic will warrant it. But here again I believe there has been some land purchased or acquired in and around that area of Steinbach as well as other parts of the province for certain

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. BURTONIAK cont'd). . . . improvements of our roads.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a question in regards to fishing licences and I don't believe the Minister is in his seat. I wonder if I could direct it to the acting Minister and ask: what is the deadline for remittances being received for licences that have been sold by agencies throughout the province?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'll take the question as notice but if the honourable member wants to get the question answered a little sooner I'm sure he could communicate with the Deputy Minister of Renewable Resources. I'll take the question as notice but I'm sure he can get a quicker answer if he just phones the office.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT BILLS - SECOND READING

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would want to proceed with the adjourned debates on second reading as they appear on Page 2 of the Order Paper.

BILL 59 - THE CO-OPERATIVES ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation, the Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I would like to express the greatest possible concern to the government for the way they've handled this piece of legislation coming in at this late date. It could have been a companion bill with The Corporations Act, we could have dealt with it in some great depth and give the legislation the study that it deserves. Mr. Speaker, people that are interested in the co-op movement have had copies of this bill distributed to them and I find that they haven't, except in very few cases, received it until this morning. Mr. Speaker, I tried to find out through some of my co-operative friends on the weekend - and they still hadn't received the legislation.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, in this bill and other legislation that we're dealing with at this time if we're actually being fair to the people of this province in pushing this legislation through with speed up on. I would hope that the day will come that the speedup motion will not be before us until the bills are all tabled before especially us in the opposition. It's becoming very very difficult for us as members to give it the scrutiny that it deserves, to give it the debate that it deserves and the meaningful study so that it comes out as good legislation.

But more important, Mr. Speaker, I think it's very important for the people of this province to understand what's taking place in this Legislature and we can't do it in one or two days. Especially not on a weekend. On this past weekend while I was on another committee I tried to get the advice of many people regarding this legislation and found that most of them had plans made for the weekend so it was very very difficult to get even the few comments that I'm able to offer regarding the legislation today. Mr. Speaker, this bill certainly is one that deserves the consideration of the Chamber. It is a reasonably good bill. Certainly there are aspects of it that will be considered in the committee stage. One thing maybe, Mr. Speaker, we should express our appreciation and gratitude of, before we deal with it, is what great things the co-operative movement has done in this province since its inception some many many years ago. Today it is a group of people some 200,000 strong. I guess there are approximately 400 credit unions and co-ops spread across this province and they have done a great service to the people of this province with this philosophy.

It's interesting, Mr. Speaker, how well and how able they have been to operate under Section 10 of The Companies Act over those years. This legislation will provide them with many new vehicles and things no doubt that they have been looking for. But even still with the limitations that were in the old Companies Act, the co-operatives have done well in this province.

BILL 59

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd)

Mr. Speaker, if there's any one concern I would like to express at this time it's the way that the government is using the co-operative movement in sort of using uneconomic co-operatives with government support, putting a co-op label on them and in the end the co-op movement has had some tarnish from this vehicle which this government has used on many occasions to historically get across a point that you can start a co-op, an uneconomic co-op I may say, Mr. Speaker, with government funding. Those that have failed, which are well documented in the Auditor's report, the tarnish and the image that took place in the management of those co-ops fell across the shoulders of the whole movement in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to note that as well in this legislation, that we are now being able to deal with some of the farm operating co-operatives which the Minister said in his opening remarks were the first. I would suspect if he checks the history of the co-operative movement he will find that there were or farm group co-ops way back when I got out of the Air Force in 1947. I believe the Matador Co-op north of Swift Current, Saskatchewan, was one of those. Four or five veterans went together and clubbed their assets, machinery etc., etc., and formed one of those types of co-operatives. As far as I know, Mr. Speaker, I think that it's possible that that co-op is not functioning any more at this particular time.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate the sentiments of the Minister when he said that this will be the first modern Co-operatives Act maybe of all the Provinces of Canada. I never did have access to the study that the Department or the Minister did some two years ago but I'm sure they have gained the benefit of the wisdom of other provinces of Canada plus possibly the input of corporations such as the Manitoba Pool Elevators, the CCSM, possibly the Saskatchewan Government and some of the other well-known co-operative movements that have functioned in this province and our neighbouring provinces. Many co-operatives and executives, Mr. Speaker, while keenly interested in this type of legislation still haven't seen it and I think that maybe we should have, as I said earlier in my remarks, had circulation of it at the same time as the Corporations Act and then we could have dealt with them as companion bills.

Mr. Speaker, there are many sections in this bill and there are many questions that are raised by the legislation. The time limit as I say that was imposed upon me has caused some concern. I'm wondering in the same section of the Act if the Minister in his reply can assure us that this will fill the gap of some of these many problems that the co-operative movements has had over the years.

The other one, Mr. Speaker, is that the credit unions, while not involved in the legislation it is my understanding that the CCSM itself, which is the central bank of the credit union, is classed as a co-operative and would be dealt with in this piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, it was certainly quite evident when The Corporations Act was introduced for second reading that this bill should have been the companion bill with it. We certainly, not only in the Chamber here but in Committee, could have compared the two because in many places they are dealing with common grounds. It would have been much easier for us in the opposition especially to compare the one bill with the other and see, in fact, if the co-operatives are being treated as a co-operative and the corporations on the other hand being dealt with.

Mr. Speaker, the bill also prepared the protection I think for the minority shareholders which the co-operative movement has been seeking for some time. It has certainly strengthened up the audit system and I'm not certain as yet, as I stand before the House today, that it in fact meets all the qualifications of the co-ops. There are still some that are not that sure that it will.

The receivership section is one that has been needed for some time. The section on liquidation, Mr. Speaker, again is an improvement where both the co-operatives and the corporations are spelled out as distinct and different and they can be dealt with in a different way by the legislation which protects and covers each of those two bodies, Mr. Speaker.

BILL 59

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd)

Mr. Speaker, while the intent of this Act has been spelled out by the Minister in his comments I hope that he can give me some assurance that the bill will provide all the protections that the co-operatives were asking for and the protection that the co-operatives asked for during the study and the fact that they are not going to find their hands tied on matters that have caused some anxiety in the past.

The incorporation of two or more co-ops or the formation of a new co-op, there seems to be some vagueness in the legislation. Apparently it is subject just to the okay of the Registrar only. The Minister, as I understand it, doesn't have any dealings with it at that level at all.

The other thing that's interesting in the legislation, Mr. Speaker, of course is the introduction of the proxy system and that no doubt will be dealt with when we arrive in committee re the bill.

The other thing, Mr. Speaker, that I found of interest is the by-law section is enshrined again in such a way as the deal or the contract between the co-op and its members will need the okay of the Registrar. I'm wondering again if the Minister maybe should not take a look and see if there would be some other way other than that or maybe that should be strengthened.

The other section, Mr. Speaker - and this is one that no doubt has been on the tips of the tongues of co-op directors - that surplus funds from a co-op can now be allocated under this legislation annually or on a sort of - how could I say it? On a formula that's related to their patronage to that particular co-op during the year.

The other section, Mr. Speaker, is the members leaving a co-operative now can be paid out through this vehicle as per the regulations.

Mr. Speaker, with those few comments I would hope that we can certainly make sure that the various co-operative groups across this province have knowledge that this bill is in here and that they will be invited to attend Law Amendments Committee that the bill can be dealt with by them. It's basically their legislation so I sincerely hope the Minister and the Fourth Estate or the press, that everybody that can will make certain that they know about it and they know that it's here and they can come to committee and give us the benefit of their wisdom.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): Mr. Speaker, following the remarks made by the Member for Roblin I just have a few brief comments that I would like to make in connection with the introduction of this legislation.

I start by saying that notwithstanding the claims of the government, that they are the friends of the co-op movement and that the introduction of reams of legislation some way, somehow is going to benefit the co-op movement, I say to the government that their sorry history in the management of co-ops, particularly in the north, has done a greater disservice to the co-op movement than anything else that possibly could have or has been done in the past.

I note that in the legislation the Registrar will have a considerable amount of authority in connection with this piece of legislation. I want to say to the government that the appointment of a Registrar then becomes very significant in the successful application of this piece of legislation. If the incompetence that was exhibited in the past is any indication then I would suggest to the government that they ensure that the appointment of that Registrar becomes of primary importance and that the person that is selected is one that first of all knows something about the co-op movement and its aims and its objectives and secondly is someone who is competent to manage and competent to act in the capacity of a Registrar. It would seem to me that government, if they are to prove - and they've got a lot of proving to do as far as we're concerned and as far as the co-op movement itself is concerned - if they want to prove that they are indeed the friends of the co-op then the appointment of a Registrar will be the guide by which they'll be measured.

I can tell them right now that if the people who were responsible for the mess that took place in the northern co-ops in the last couple of years are the ones that will be guiding the co-op movement in the next few years, then they're going to do themselves no

BILL 59

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd). . . . good. I suggest that one of the first tasks of the Minister is to appoint someone who has the competence and the ability to understand and to direct the co-op movement under this particular piece of legislation.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): No, Mr. Speaker, not quite that quickly, appreciating the fact that we do want to move legislation forward. Simply to support the arguments made by the Member for Morris and indeed others about what's happening to the co-operative movement in the Province of Manitoba, let me once again put on the record the fact that the kind of intervention that the present government is predisposed to move forward with has serious repercussions for the co-operative movement in the Province of Manitoba.

I've indicated on another debate and on another subject the difficulties that one of the largest co-operatives in the Province of Manitoba has with this government, with this government's intervention in the business that this co-op was involved with, namely in the business of processing of milk. I refer to Manco. We have before us, still for discussion, another bill dealing with the Milk Control Board, a revamped, reorganized bill, having to do with the milk industry.

But it only underlines the difficulties that the co-operative movement faces with a government that honestly believes that the whole concept of co-ops is in question. Because after all, Mr. Speaker, individual Ministers of this government from time to time have quarrelled with us when they rose and defended and spoke on a position as representing the people, that this government represents the people in that kind of all inclusive way, and none other than the Minister of Resources has been the favourite person to use that simile than perhaps anybody else in this House. We have tried from time to time to remind him, the Member for Morris, has from time to time reminded him, that he is the government and that there is a difference. At least certainly, Mr. Speaker, a difference in my concept of what individual people can do for themselves in this province and what I expect my government to do for those same people in this province.

And nowhere else, Mr. Speaker, perhaps is it more clearly defined than in the difficulty that this government finds itself, the Minister of Agriculture finds himself, than within the milk industry. Mr. Speaker, the whole concept of the co-op movement, the co-op group is a group of individuals be they producers, by they consumers, by they whatever, can get together and to the best of their ability manage their own affairs. And this was done some 20, 25, 30, 35 years ago when a group of milk producers in this province said that they would want to do that. And they organized themselves into the Manitoba Dairy and Poultry Corporative Association. Mr. Speaker, I'm not so sure at all that most members in this chamber realize the full impact of government intervention, much less the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation who has been known to speak to this same group of people from time to time, and reprimand them, I might add; I'm not too sure that too many people in this province are aware of the kind of consequences of this fundamental interference that is taking place by this government. Because in that particular industry, no longer is it possible for a group of dairy farmers to associate with each other and decide that they will not be part of the vicious capitalist world; they are going to support their own plant, they're going to produce their own product, they're going to market their product, and they're going to do it to the best of their ability. It's with a touch of irony, Mr. Speaker, that that was possible for the last hundred years under Conservative or Liberal government, but no longer is possible under the rule of this group of socialist bandits that we've got opposite. It's no longer possible. It's no longer possible, because the Honourable Minister of Agriculture's appointee decides where a dairy farmer will ship his milk to, where he can sell his milk to, and what he will get for it. The co-op doesn't decide that anymore, Mr. Speaker, the co-op doesn't decide that anymore.

And, Mr. Speaker, if that isn't a fundamental breakdown of co-op principles, then somebody within the co-operative movement has to tell me what the co-operative stands for. If a group of handpicked appointees by this government decides where a member, where a dairy producer can sell his milk to, for what price --(Interjection)-- well

BILL 59

(MR. ENNS cont'd) the Honourable Member for Thompson who likes to stand up and regale us from time to time about the powers of International Nickel, and what have you, and all the other corporate bums, that he has a great aversion to, then I want the Honourable Member for Thompson to look at his own Minister of Agriculture, because he's become, among other things, the biggest land baron in this country; he's become the biggest cattle baron in this country, and he is now telling the dairy producers where to sell their milk for and he's telling the consumers what to pay for that milk. --(Interjection)-- Well, Mr. Speaker, they say hear, hear, but the end result is written not by us, but it's written by other societies. The end result is that the primary producers, namely, the farmers will get less, and the consumers, the people that buy the milk, they'll get screwed. They're going to be paying more and more for a quart of milk than ever before. And I want this placed on the record, Mr. Speaker, as of now. When we left the dairy industry in their hands the primary producers, the dairy farmers, were getting among the highest paid for their product, and the consumers at the same time were enjoying the lowest priced milk right across the Dominion of Canada. Not another province in Canada do our consumers enjoy milk for the same price that we enjoyed in Manitoba. But it's changing, it's changing. You put a bunch of bureaucrats and a bunch of civil servants in the way and we'll all end up paying a lot more for our milk and the quality of the milk is going down. That, Mr. Speaker, is what you call equitable distribution of incomes. That's what you call socialism, Mr. Speaker, as it reflects on the dairy industry.

The tragedy, Mr. Speaker, is that in the meantime a co-op that has worked well over the last quarter of a century is being downgraded, is being brought to heel . . .

A MEMBER: Tore apart.

MR. ENNS: . . . and will not in fact be able to function in any meaningful way. There is not room, there is not room, Mr. Speaker, and that's the only point that I wish to make, there's not room for wilful government control over an industry and a private --(Interjection)-- Yes it is private, because a co-op is a group of private individuals deciding their own futures. There is not room for a private co-operative development at the same time. So this government having faced that choice has opted automatically, as we knew they would, for government control. But, Mr. Speaker, when they have so mired down the dairy industry, that when three or four years from now, we find ourselves with an industry that once was an efficient industry, one that we could be proud of, one that offered our consumers the lowest possible price for their products, at the same time that it offered the producers the highest possible price for their product, Mr. Speaker, I'll have no difficulty in measuring the effects of the policies of this government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID BLAKE (Minnedosa): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to say a word or two on the Bill 59, and I'm not going to repeat the history of the Co-op movement or the arguments that have been promoted by my colleagues on this side of the House but when I got the bill, Bill 59 with a 101 pages and 191 clauses, at this particular time in the Legislature when we're in speed-up, I was a bit surprised and I took a copy of the bill home this weekend and showed it to my co-op people that I was able to get in touch with at home, and they were just amazed with the size of it. They said, there's nothing that we can advise you on, or tell you at this stage of the game, because we haven't even time to look through it, you'll have to rely on what the people in Winnipeg, in our head office decide, maybe they'll have a little more time and a little more expertise to look at it. And, Mr. Speaker, I can only object to legislation of this magnitude coming in at this stage of the game. It's all right for the members opposite to say take all the time you like, we all know very well that when we get into speed-up, we're looking for the session to close very soon afterwards, and here we get six or seven more bills this morning. Now, if this government can't organize their affairs and get these bills in for study a little sooner than this, I think there's some readjusting they should do in whatever stage of their operation it is required to get the bills in for a little further consideration.

We all know very well when the amendments to The Municipal Act came in a year ago and the Minister was warned that there were going to be problems, that the municipal people didn't have time to look at the various clauses in this bill and make adjustments to it,

BILL 59

(MR. BLAKE cont'd). . . . it was passed with the assurance that everything was well and we found out very quickly that there were amendments coming in thick and fast and they'll still be coming in. But more serious than that, Mr. Speaker, I think some of the clauses contained in the changes to The Municipal Act were not really detected by the municipal people on time and certainly the bill didn't get enough study for all the clauses that were unsatisfactory to be detected on this side.

I'm afraid that some of these bills that are coming through now, as much as we may feel that Bill 59 is a companion bill to the Corporation Bill, I just want to go on record as saying that I don't think the consideration of a day or so, and then some small appearance in front of Law Amendments Committee to discuss this, are going to be sufficient to pick up some of the hookers that are bound to be contained in a bill of this size.

When we get into this stage of the Legislature I'm sure that the members opposite and responsible for drafting legislation such as this could do a better job. The Minister told us that this bill was over two years in being drafted and I think that's admirable. It's received careful consideration and it's received a lot of thought and if it's taken that long to draft it I see no reason why it has to be brought in in the dying hours of this Legislature and rammed through. I just wanted to register those objections, Mr. Speaker, because I think it's a shame when legislation of this much importance to the people of Manitoba has to be crammed through hastily at the end of the session.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture)(Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, I think it would be prudent for the members of the Legislature to hear some comments with respect to the dairy industry as alluded to by the Member for Lakeside because it again is obvious that the Member for Lakeside is using this opportunity as an attempt to continue to distort the present position of our dairy industry and in particular the co-operative structure within it and indeed the role of the producers. I don't think that it would be right for us to let that go unchallenged because he himself knows, Mr. Speaker, that what he has stated is not correct. If he doesn't know then he's lacking in his research.

I want to point out to the Member for Lakeside that long before he was the Minister of Agriculture in this province, in fact decades before he even thought of political life, I suspect probably at the time of his birth the dairy industry became a controlled utility industry in this province. That goes back to the 1930s, Mr. Speaker. So at that point in time it was established, firmly established, that milk would be a utility industry in this province.

The reasons were very logical. Under the free market system of that time we had an over-abundance of milk at some points in time wherein the prices went way down to the bottom and producers were going bankrupt. Consequently as a result of a number of bankruptcies the following year there was a shortage of milk supply so the consumers were very unhappy. So the government of that day decided that with a commodity like milk it just wasn't acceptable not to regulate in order to assure a reasonable return to producers and a reasonable price to consumers. That is something that was brought in in the 1930s, Mr. Speaker. So the Member for Lakeside should not try to imply that here in the 1970s we have the intrusions of government into the dairy industry.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the anomalies however did develop even when that system was adopted or since it was adopted in that the government of that day did not properly recognize the fact that there was a greater interest than that of simply supplying the consumers with milk. The greater interest was that there had to be some measure of assurance to all of the producers that they were treated equally, producers who produced for the fluid milk market as well as producers who produced for the industrial milk market.

But you know the governments of that day were not prepared to bring about that extra degree of assurance to the producers. So they agreed to allow the anomalies to develop and to expand where by the time that this government came into office we had some 500 or 600 fluid milk shippers and we had about 1,100 or 1,200 industrial milk shippers. Mr. Speaker, it was absolutely insane even for a Conservative - well not even - for a Conservative Government, Mr. Speaker, to indulge in the control of an industry which is against their philosophy to begin with, but then to allow that control to benefit only a handful

BILL 59

(MR. USKIW cont'd). . . . of the total handful of people within the industry. A third of all of the producers had all of the benefits of that control. I say benefits, Mr. Speaker. Government control was not had with respect to that one-third of our dairy producers, it was a windfall. In fact things were so good for one-third of our dairy producers that anyone who had a milk cow who had a fluid quota attached to it got four times as much for that cow in the marketplace as the farmer who didn't have a fluid milk quota. Therein lies the obvious anomaly, Mr. Speaker. The guarantee of the state which flowed to one-third of the milk producers resulted in massive windfalls in the form of fluid milk quota values. --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

MR. USKIW: The balance of the producers, Mr. Speaker, --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Would the Honourable Minister just give me a moment? I should like to suggest to the honourable member who is shouting a certain word that he kindly remove himself if he cannot contain his temper. --(Interjection)-- Order please. This place --(Interjection)-- I'm going to have to name the honourable member if he doesn't want to adhere to the parliamentary decorum. Thank you. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, it became obvious that every time we had a turnover in a particular farm enterprise involving a fluid milk quota that the cost of production in that transaction would immediately increase. Every time there was a turnover of that farm unit with a milk quota the cost of production to a new owner was higher than it was to the previous owner. Ultimately we got to the point where three or four years ago a cow with a milk quota was selling at about \$1,500 per cow, \$1,000 of which was the value of the marketing rights. But whose marketing rights were they, Mr. Speaker? They were marketing rights that were given by the Crown and the marketing rights that were given free of charge were then being marketed as between producers and all of these production costs had to ultimately be absorbed in the price of milk. There is no end to that, Mr. Speaker, had we not moved to bring an end to it.

Ultimately, Mr. Speaker, you could have envisaged, had we not intervened, that milk could be \$1.00 a quart simply because it would cost \$5,000 per cow to buy a cow with a milk quota protected by the state, Mr. Speaker. That was an absolute abuse of the authority of the state. So the producers of milk on both sides of the ledger, Mr. Speaker, both the fluid milk shippers and the industrial shippers agreed that there had to be an end in sight of that kind of thing. In fact, in other provinces of Canada they moved in the direction of bringing it to an end as well, less dramatically than here in this province. What they have adopted in other provinces is what they refer to as the gradual entry program.

In the Province of Ontario, for example, you will have a producer who happens to have 90 percent of his production under fluid quota rights which are negotiable and 10 percent of his milk goes into an industrial area. Then you will have the other, you'll have the opposite, where 90 percent of a producer's milk supply is channelled into the industrial area and only 10 percent into the fluid area. Therefore in that particular situation his average returns would be much lower than the example before. In which case it demonstrates, Mr. Speaker, fully that it was totally inequitable and it will take Ontario 20 or 30 years to level this off so that producers are receiving a relatively equal return on their production for 100 pounds of milk.

We had considered that idea in this province as well and opted, after due process of consultation with the Fluid Producers' Association and with the new Industrial Producers Association, after consultation we had all agreed that it would be desirable to scrap the old system and move into a pooled market for milk so that milk would be marketed and valued on the basis of its quality rather than on the basis of its end use. As a result of that, since two years ago, all producers have been paid to a penny the same price for milk delivered for the same quality of milk regardless of where the milk went to, even if it was dumped into a sewer as being a surplus commodity of the day or the week. All of the producers shared in the cost of that operation and got paid equally. So the Member for Lakeside is absolutely wrong when he suggests to the House that we have meddled in

BILL 59

(MR. USKIW cont'd). . . . the affairs of the dairy industry to the detriment of the dairy industry. --(Interjection)--

Then of course he went on to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that somehow this had a negative impact on the co-operative in question, namely Manco. You know I can't understand how the Member for Lakeside would come to that position because Manco is a processing organization or an organization of farmers who happen to own processing facilities, similar facilities to that of Modern Dairies or Silverwoods. They are entrepreneurs in a second field of endeavour. They are producers of raw milk but they are also individual investors in their co-op in the processing end of the same product. They operate two businesses and they are not precluded from expanding their position in the processing industry under any legislation or under any Act of the government.

As a matter of fact - and perhaps the Member for Lakeside is not aware or he has forgotten - but two years ago we passed a bill in this House which allowed milk sales, while delivered to any company - these were milk sales from a member of a co-operative - that those sales for purposes of patronage dividends would be computed into the accounts of the co-operatives as a sale to the co-operative so that the membership would remain intact on the basis of its participation. That bill was passed here two years ago because of the changes that were made in dairy policy and to accommodate the very problem of a much looser relationship as between the producers of Manco and the company itself. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member have a point of order?

POINT OF ORDER

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . To ask you just what piece of legislation are we debating in this House at the moment and how in the world can the remarks now being made by the Minister of Agriculture be possibly related to the bill that is before the House.

MR. SPEAKER: We are discussing The Co-operatives Act and the honourable member was discussing Manco which is a part of a co-operative. In that relationship I was allowing the debate to go forward in respect to milk. The Honourable First Minister on the same point of order.

MR. JORGENSEN: Along as . . . I had no objection. He's far away from that particular subject right now and that's the reason I rose on a point of order. If he's going to discuss the question of co-ops as related to this bill, even if it is Manco, then I have no objection to it. But that is not what the Minister was talking about.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): Well, Mr. Speaker, strictly speaking I find it difficult to take issue with the Honourable Member for Morris. I believe that the subject matter under discussion as between the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture and the Member for Lakeside could more properly take place under Bill 81 than Bill 59. So it is rather the dilemma of having to admit that it doesn't properly come under Bill 59 which is supposed to be what is under debate. But the Honourable Member for Lakeside having been allowed the latitude the Minister of Agriculture is responding to the same specific subject matter. I would like to think we could agree that it is really not the essence of Bill 59.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

BILL 59 Cont'd

MR. USKIW: Well, in any event, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Lakeside did allude to, at least his opinion, that somehow the changes in dairy policy brought about by this government in the last two years was somehow going to have a negative effect on Manco, the large co-operative processing company here in this province. I simply want to put on the record that they are no worse off than they were before.

BILL 59

(MR. USKIW cont'd)

As a matter of fact the government has indicated on a number of occasions its willingness to assist that particular co-operative. As a matter of fact for the benefit of members opposite the Government of Manitoba came to the rescue of that co-operative four or five years ago when they were found to be in very serious financial difficulty both in management, in trying to locate new management, and in trying to arrange their finances. The government of this province played a vital role in keeping that company afloat. So the Member for Lakeside should rest assured that we certainly do have the needs of Manco and the co-operative industry in this province in mind.

All that we were dealing with, with the restructuring of the dairy industry - while it may have had some side effects on all participants in the industry including Manco - we were essentially dealing with the needs of the producers. In which case we find very positive results where the producers who are delivering milk used for other than fluid milk consumption are now realizing a much better return than they ever did before. At one time three or four years ago the price of industrial milk was around \$5.50 a hundredweight and today those same producers are receiving roughly double that amount. So the Milk Marketing Board which was brought about through the wishes of producers on both sides of the ledger - although I have to admit that there were some producers of the old fluid milk group that did not wish to amalgamate - but they do have to admit that it has worked relatively well. Producers are realizing a reasonable return for their production.

Consumers in this province are still in the position of having the lowest priced milk product in Canada and that is not a thing to be ashamed about, Mr. Speaker. In fact I think the Producer Boards and the Milk Control Board, in setting the producer prices and the consumer prices, has done a great job in the last couple of years, a very significant job in the interest of both and it's our intent that that carry forward. But that should not imply that there should somehow be a negative effect on the Manco organization because they are able to expand today as they were able to yesterday. There is nothing in the law that prevents them from seeking higher rewards through greater participation in the industry; greater investment is open to them if they wish to go that route. There is nothing in this legislation or any Act of government that has precluded the Manco organization from moving forward. As a matter of fact we have assisted them in that direction. So I take issue with the Member for Lakeside who uses this particular bill as a pretext for his, again, misinformed contribution to this Assembly.

Continued next page. . . .

BILL 59

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, it was interesting to hear the comments from the Minister of Agriculture, speaking on co-operatives. And the fact that the Minister of Tourism and Recreation is the Minister who is introducing a bill on the Co-operatives Act I think has some significance when I say that - and the subject matter seems to be at hand here - the Manitoba Dairy and Poultry Co-operation - and there are many other co-ops in the Province of Manitoba that have been going on for many many years. But in listening to the debate here, Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to register my objections or complaint - maybe I should use that terminology rather than objections - complaints that when we're dealing with legislation of this kind, such as The Co-operatives Act and we have a number of other legislative Acts that we have to deal with between now and the time that this House prorogues, and I too, Mr. Speaker, am concerned because we have had not sufficient or do we have sufficient time to give those people who are interested in what is being legislated in this Chamber, nor that we maybe get sufficient evidence back from those people who are concerned, as to whether they are completely satisfied or otherwise. And my colleague from Roblin, who made the initial comments in regard to this bill, I agree with wholeheartedly, also my colleague from Minnedosa, and I want to reiterate my objection, Mr. Speaker, that the understanding I've always had that - and I know when we were government, Mr. Speaker, when the speed-up motion was brought in, and I'll stand to be corrected if I'm wrong, but if my memory serves me correctly, all bills that were brought into the House were given introduction and probably second reading before the speed-up motion was brought into effect. But with this government, Mr. Speaker, they bring in the speed-up motion, it's on the Order Paper, and then when the House Leader brings it in, hoping that the opposition would go along with it, and we were given the understanding by the House Leader that there be so many bills brought before us, only to find that there are about double that number, and this, of course, Mr. Speaker, I think is unfair to those of us in the opposition who have to deal with such matters as The Co-operatives Act.

And getting just briefly, Mr. Speaker, to the Manitoba Co-operative . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister state his matter of privilege?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, there is a maximum of one bill more than I indicated that there would be at any time in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, we can be technical if he says, if the House Leader says one bill more than what he indicated to us a week or so ago, I am not prepared now to argue that point. But, Mr. Speaker, the point I want to make is that normally when the government introduced the speed-up motion, all legislation has been brought before us and we have the opportunity of perusing it; we have the opportunity of allowing the people who are concerned throughout the country to have the opportunity to be able to know what is going to take place in this House.

But the Minister of Agriculture made a point and I would like to debate with him and find out whether he is right or I am right. And the way the dairy industry is operating right now, the Manitoba Milk Producers Marketing Board as far as the Manco is concerned, if they make a decision that a certain farmer "A" must deliver his milk to another point than he had been delivering to, and it's not within the realm of the Co-operative, Dairy and Poultry, they don't receive that milk, then his membership ceases to exist. And that, Mr. Speaker, was a contentious point that was made at their annual meeting, as I'm given to understand. And it was real confusion, Mr. Speaker. And I know, Mr. Speaker, there were a number of other issues that were of real concern. And I'm wondering if that's why the Minister of Agriculture wasn't the guest speaker at their annual meeting and so he chose to send the Minister of Tourism and Recreation to reprimand those people for not being more loyal to co-operatives than what they were. That's the tenor that I got from the speech made by the Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister state his matter of privilege.

BILL 59

MR. USKIW: The Member for Rock Lake stated that I had sent the Minister of Tourism and Co-operatives to speak to their annual meeting. I had not sent anyone, nor was I invited.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I'm glad I made that point because now I find out that the Minister of Agriculture was not even invited to attend. And so it becomes a lot more interesting to note that probably the Minister of Tourism and Recreation would probably have a greater influence. I don't know whether it's because the experience that the Minister of Tourism and Recreation has had in his own private life before he came into this Chamber, or what it was, but as far as I'm concerned, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that it's within the realm of any politician to go before any group of people, whether they be co-operatives, a co-operative organization, to tell them that that is the kind of life that they should live. It's sort of a philosophy with some people, Mr. Speaker.

And you know I'm reminded, Mr. Speaker, of the Premier that once ran the Province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Tommy Douglas, and there they dealt with co-operatives and I'm given to understand that that was a government that agreed with the co-operative philosophy. It's quite all right, there's nothing wrong with that. But, Mr. Speaker, I'm also given to understand that they used the co-operative movement to achieve their political goal. And, Mr. Speaker, where did it get the ex-premier of that province? And a book entitled "Douglas of Saskatchewan" was published and some of the things entitled in that book led to his downfall.

I'm wondering if the same thing, or the kind of history could repeat itself in the Province of Manitoba, because the Minister of Tourism and Recreation went before the Manitoba Dairy and Co-operative Poultry annual meeting, and as far as I'm concerned, Mr. Speaker, he didn't speak to them in the kind of a way that I would have liked to have heard him speak. He lectured to those people and reprimanded them for not taking a greater participation and doing more within that organization that they could have done. And he was angry because the political plum that the First Minister was trying to seek, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Minister of Agriculture, when they didn't get their Crocus Food plant in Selkirk.

And so, Mr. Speaker, when we talk about The Co-operatives Act, and my colleague from Roblin who made a statement to the effect that a kind of bill of that magnitude had sufficient importance, and we, I think, by saying so have greater respect for the co-operative movement than the government on that side of the House. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to make a few comments along this vein and to indicate to honourable gentlemen opposite that if they think they're the only ones that can understand the philosophy of people getting together and forming co-operatives, I want to say to them they are wrong, because I for one have been a member of a co-operative organization. I think they have their place, Mr. Speaker. But I also believe in live and let live. I think, Mr. Speaker, that's a very important attitude to take. I hear the comment from some honourable gentleman opposite, "it's dog eat dog." I don't go along with that, Mr. Speaker. I have greater faith in people to decide for themselves what they want to do. I think that's very important, Mr. Speaker.

But when the government takes within their philosophical realm of politics, and certain segments of society are the kind that they believe in, that they're going to support much more so than say other segments of society, I think, Mr. Speaker, that is wrong. When they talk about helping people, I think that people, whether they belong to co-operatives, or whether they believe in free enterprise or forming a private operation or a business of their own, should have equal consideration when it comes to dealing with government.

And so, Mr. Speaker, when we talk about our Co-operative Act that we have before us, I only wish that the government had brought it in considerably earlier so that I could have perused it more and made sure that what we're talking about here is something that the co-operative movement is going to be satisfied with in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

BILL 59

MR. KEN DILLEN (Thompson): Would the member submit to a question? Since you are about the fifth or sixth guy, or person, or member from that side of the House to rise in his place today and make reference to legislation that is being introduced in the dying days of the session and not given an opportunity or a sufficient opportunity to study it, would you consider a motion to rescind the speed-up motion so that we could give you all the time that you want?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, we can stand up and make motions to rescind as much as we like but the government is the government and they make the decisions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ROBERT G. WILSON (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, thank you. I rise on this Co-operatives Act mainly through a concern that I see happening where the co-ops are being used as sort of a . . . well, there were many co-ops before in existence that seemed to operate in a very efficient way and somehow or other since this government's taken hold, the entire co-operative picture has been given a bad name. And this really disturbs me because a lot of these things are clearly an out and out waste of money and reflect on the whole industry.

I spoke the first time in this House when the Minister of Agriculture's Estimates were up and I asked him to tell me how many successful dairy co-ops he had, and I went on to talk about the Stoney Plains Co-op, which nobody has ever been paid to this day, and they brought some fellow over here from England who was going to tell them how to run co-ops, and he got together six other people and . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Mines.

COMMITTEE TIMES

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I wonder if the honourable member would let me interrupt. It would seem to me that there is very little likelihood that we will be in committee this afternoon. So just for people who are waiting, I'm suggesting that we indicate that there will be no committee this afternoon, that we'll be meeting at eight o'clock and we won't meet in the House. We'll reserve the evening for Industrial Relations Committee. So that anybody who is waiting, to come back at eight o'clock, and the members won't have to come back to the House this evening.

I asked the honourable member to let me interrupt so that if anybody is waiting they won't have to be uncertain about what we're doing.

MR. SPEAKER: Is that procedure agreed to? (Agreed) The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

BILL 59 cont'd

MR. WILSON: Well, I was just really concerned because the entire co-operative image is getting a bad name and every time the Minister of Tourism stands up it's like he thought of the idea. And yet you can go back in time and I'd like the government on that side to take equal credit for all the bungling co-operative investments of the \$1.6 million that was loaned out to co-operatives, and I believe out of the 22 loans only four are good today - an entire waste. I talked about ones which never do appear, and I talked about Stoney Plains where they brought this Socialist over from England and he got together a bunch of people and they found out that the person they brought over from England didn't want to work. He's one of these great thinkers, one of these great people that was going to get six other people together, and the problem was the six other people soon found out that this great thinker brought over by the government was the lazy bum that didn't want to work. And this is the problem, that you cannot get people together on the co-operative idea unless you have certain rules of the game and certain responsibilities.

And this is why possibly the co-operative store that we have here in Winnipeg is so successful because responsible people are running it. But when you have government

BILL 59

(MR. WILSON cont'd) interfere and loan out 22 loans in a politicized manner and then come back as if nothing happened and say, we lost a million dollars, only four of the 22 loans are any good. You find out this one here, that the expert they brought over is . . . the co-operative has failed, and I ask the Minister of Agriculture, tell me how many co-operatives have been successful and I'm sure that he may get a paid of milk over the head one of these days if he doesn't run things a little better when it comes to wasting the taxpayer's money and infringing on successful operations, when it comes to dairy co-ops.

So I just wanted to voice my protest that this bill is going through without being properly researched; the entire concept is being grabbed by members opposite as if it's their idea, and I pointed out that many good co-ops were here and successful long before they started making huge politicized loans in order to justify setting up all these co-ops in different districts under the guise that it was their idea. It seems that socialism is equal distribution of misery and under this bill some of the things that have happened have been equal distribution of misery.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Education) (Burrows): Yes, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member state that there is provision within this bill that allows for government interference in the operation of co-operatives?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, I hadn't figured on taking part in this debate. It's been covering an awful lot of ground, it doesn't really refer to co-operatives. But I feel that co-operatives do do an awful lot of good. In our society we've got to realize that there are many great big corporations which have great monopolies. In fact they're international monopolies. And we know the co-operatives are one thing which we can use by ourselves which will counteract that effect. And it's a very good thing to have them there. They're a measuring stick as to how much other large corporations that have monopoly are taking advantage of the public. When you have a co-operative that is operating efficiently and not returning a large dividend, that means that it's brought some of the corporations into place close enough that they're not making such a big mark-up and making a big profit. If it wasn't for the fact that corporations at times have taken advantage of people we wouldn't have as many co-operatives, and it's mighty good that we're able to develop co-operatives when this happens, because in a co-operative (?) by the very nature of it, you have a few people with a great deal of financial control supplying goods to people for one sole purpose, and that is to make money for themselves. In a co-operative it's different, you have a group of people working together trying to make money for each other and distributing whatever moneys there is in accordance with the business to be done with that co-operation, which is a very different thing. I think that co-operatives are a very good thing to be in the country. This thing, one member, one vote, shows you regardless of how much business you do, you don't run the whole show. Distributing their earnings with relation to their purchases, I think that's very good.

I don't know as the group over there is as devoted to co-operatives as they pretend to be. I remember the NDP manifesto that was distributed here a number of years ago and it was stating what they would like to see in the form of treasury branches and in the form of farm supplies. The government was going into these things and it even went so far as to say - if I remember it - that in time it wouldn't be necessary to have these co-operatives or these credit unions because the government itself would be giving these services. Now that is not what the founders of the co-operative movement wanted in Manitoba or in Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. HENDERSON: What they wanted was a government that would give them the freedom to operate as a co-operative. There's a mighty difference when you get the people that are doing the purchasing doing the managing towards setting it up under the government Minister. I hope that you've learned your lesson in the other business that you've tried to run and have failed in and keep away from the co-operatives. All you need to do is to give them the right kind of a climate in which to operate under and they'll do a good job.

(MR. HENDERSON cont'd)

I'm very glad to see that there's things in this legislation that's going to protect the co-op name as such. We did have people using the co-op name to promote their own business when in actuality they weren't a co-operative at all. The people who join a co-operative and work under that look on the word co-operative and they cherish it. They will do business with anything that calls themselves a co-op because they believe it's established under the proper principle. I know we had several co-ops in Winnipeg which weren't co-ops at all and I know that this here Act is going to stop any such others from forming and that's a very good thing.

I myself am very much in favour of the Act and would like to see it go to committee. I'm sure that there's people there that will make representation if there's anything wrong with it but I think that it's a good Act and I'm hoping to see it improved on and put in.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism shall be closing debate. The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, as the Minister responsible for the Co-operative Development Department I would like to attempt to answer some of the questions before us. First of all, the intent of having a Co-operatives Act before us was mainly because we intended to separate co-operatives from The Companies Act, where the co-ops were given responsibility for so many years in the province of Manitoba. It was not possible to proceed with one or the other separately so we decided to proceed with the Companies Act and as soon as the Co-operative Act could be drawn up after consultation with as many people as possible, and mainly the federations involved, the centrals that were involved in the Province of Manitoba. It's impossible to attempt to discuss proposed or draft legislation with more than a quarter of a million people but at least myself and officials of the Department of Co-operative Development attempted to discuss with centrals and federations.

The Honourable Member from Roblin indicated that this Act came in too soon and yet in a sense it came in too late. So it's a bit difficult to read his comments. It came in too soon I guess as far as he's concerned because members of the House did not have time to review the legislation that had been drafted in rough form and discussed with different associations in the province. It comes in too late in the sense that the honourable member would have wanted the Act to be tabled in the House well before the speed up motion was before us. It wasn't possible to do that before we had confirmation of assent by most of the association involved in the co-operative movement in the Province of Manitoba. The Honourable Member for Roblin makes reference that there are probably 400 co-ops in the province, and the member is aware that that includes credit unions. Credit unions do not fall under this act as yet. Credit unions have had their own act for many years going back to, I believe, 1938. Co-operatives have been incorporated, have been in a sense regulated and promoted through The Companies Act.

The Honourable Member is leaving an impression that government is using the co-operative movement by making it possible for government funding of different co-operatives. Possibly, Mr. Speaker, we should spend a few moments on that thought of the honourable member for Roblin. What is best in the mind of the honourable member, that co-operatives that wanted to set themselves up as co-operatives in the north be left alone and not allowed to be set up as co-operatives, and continue to have people on welfare as we've had in so many cases. I can cite examples of percentages over the last seven years of literally thousands of people being on the welfare rolls. But because they wanted to set themselves up in a small private enterprise under the co-operative structure, the honourable member seems to want to leave the impression that we should not have allowed this. Furthermore we shouldn't have allowed ourselves to guarantee funding, by those given co-operatives, which we did. Guaranteed funding, the same as we've done for so many other private enterprises in the Province of Manitoba whether they be small businesses, farmers and so on.

I've indicated during the Estimates, Mr. Speaker, the comparison between nine co-operative fisheries in the Province of Manitoba as compared to nine small related business people, other related businesses and how these nine co-operatives would compare.

BILL 59

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) I, for one, am happy to see that the people have decided to get themselves together in the north under a co-operative structure. Yes, they've had difficulties in administrative matters because a lot of those people did not have the administrative capabilities that other people in the province have. It takes a bit of time, it takes errors, but they've attempted over the last few years to have control of their own affairs and to live with a bit more dignity in our society because they're involved in solving their own problems.

When the honourable member made reference to the farm machinery co-operative that was started not too long ago, just a few weeks ago in the province, it was indicated in the press release, Mr. Speaker, that that was the first. I'm informed that that was the first registered farm machinery co-operative in the province. As the honourable members knows, back in 1911 we had credit unions started in the Province of Manitoba but they were never registered. There were credit unions before we even had a government willing to set up a Registrar, an Act allowing for the incorporation and regulation of credit unions and/or co-operatives. That only came in 1938 when that was possible.

The honourable member seems to be left aside in the sense by not having had access to the study that's been conducted over the last two years pertaining to the Co-op Act that we have before us. I've been interested in governments, going back in the 1960s, and I can recall having meetings with previous Ministers of the previous government and wanting to have access to different studies that had been conducted to avail myself the opportunity to render a judgment. In many cases this was not even allowed after the legislation had passed pertaining to the government policy itself. What I'm really saying to the Honourable Member for Roblin is that it is quite difficult unless the honourable member would have been actively involved with a central co-operative in the Province of Manitoba to have access to such a study or a rough draft of the Act. But quite a few members of co-operatives did have access to that because they were actively involved and that was the same case in different studies that I was involved prior to 1969, where I was involved as a member of the study team or involved in the venture that the government was intending to legislate. I say again, Mr. Speaker, that it was completely impossible for the Department of Co-operative Development to canvass all co-operators in the Province of Manitoba, being well over 250,000. But centrals have been canvassed; the benefit of their knowledge was sought; several meetings were held between our officials, between the lawyer and the different centrals and I'm aware equally that our lawyer has equally had sessions with members with the opposition to attempt to relate to them what the Act really meant pertaining to the content as it compared to sections under The Companies Act. So we didn't really want to keep anything away from members of the opposition, certainly not. We wanted them to be well aware of what was intended within the sections before us.

The CCSM, the Co-operative Credit Society of Manitoba, is incorporated under The Companies Act and for that purpose they were certainly part of the process that is taking place now.

There is within the Act a protection for minority shareholders. The honourable member will be given chapter and verse during committee when that will be discussed. There is equally provision pertaining to all those that are wanting to use the co-op trade name itself. We do have some problems now of those that are considered to be near co-ops but aren't really falling within the philosophy or the tradition of the co-operative movement. The sections before us make it possible for a group of individuals to set up a co-operative with three members instead of seven. That's mainly for farmers that are wanting to get together and set up a co-operative. I believe it will be much easier now to be incorporated as a co-operative and get three or more farmers involved, like they have in Ste. Agathe, and be successful in managing their own affairs.

The proxy vote will be allowed as I indicated in my opening remarks, but only under certain conditions. It's impossible in some cases, depending on the co-operative sector that we're dealing with, to have it otherwise. That will be governed and regulated by the Registrar. I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, that we can have it both ways. We can't have the political process involved in direct administrative matters and

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) still say that we can't delegate to someone within the co-operative structure pertaining to registration and control.

I for one do not want the control as the Minister responsible for the Co-operative Department; I would rather delegate this in legislation to a Registrar as is done in all provinces apart from Ontario. The only other province in Canada, Mr. Speaker, that I am aware of where the incorporation of a co-operative is in right, is given to a group by right, is in the Province of Ontario. In all other provinces in Canada, including the Federal Legislation, there are certain conditions that had to be met and had to comply with those conditions as set down by the Registrar of Co-operatives, and that is the case within this bill.

The surplus funds are allocated based on a formula and as the honourable member indicates, according to the patronage of the individual members. There is equally a provision pertaining to members that are wanting to withdraw from the co-operative and either transfer to another co-operative or completely withdraw because they're moving from province or whatnot.

The Honourable Member for Morris made comments starting at 256 pertaining to government friends --(Interjection)--

MR. McKENZIE: . . . Just for clarification, Mr. Speaker. Did I hear the Minister say the CCSM is included in this, it's regulated by this Act?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, the Co-operative Credit Society is incorporated under the Companies Act, so by that fact they transfer to this Act.

If I read, Mr. Speaker, the comments of the Honourable Member for Morris correctly, he left the impression that we wanted to make it seem as if we were the friends of co-operatives in the Province of Manitoba - which I hope we are - and that we should actually feel sorry for the history of co-operatives in the north, pertaining especially to fishing co-operatives. For my part, Mr. Speaker, I don't feel sorry for that effort. I don't feel sorry mainly because the effort was based on the request from individuals that wanted to help themselves and wanted some assistance to do so. We reacted to that the same as we would react to a small group of business people wanting to help themselves in the north, and we did receive similar requests from groups in the north that were not incorporated under Section 10 of the Companies Act, but directly under other sections of the Companies Act; and they did receive financial assistance. Their record, as I indicated during my Estimates, were not worse in related businesses than the fishermen that were incorporated under The Co-ops Act.

So if we had to start it over again, Mr. Speaker, I'm saying that we would attempt to be of some assistance in a different fashion, possibly. We'd attempt to help those people train themselves better, pertaining to administrative capabilities. But in regard to financial assistance I hope that this government or any future government would go as far, if not further, pertaining to the financial assistance, especially in the line of guaranteeing loans, which was the case in most of the co-operative fisheries that we deal with during the Estimates.

The power of the Registrar is a power that has to be had if we follow the direction of all other provinces and the Federal Government pertaining to jurisdiction within the Act. We can't have it both ways. We can't have similar legislation as we see in Ontario and still keep the power, say, within the government itself by means of the Minister or Cabinet, and have the delegated power to the Registrar. I believe that the delegated power by legislation to the Registrar is good. The appointment of the Registrar seems to be doubted by the Honourable Member for Morris. Well, isn't that the case with any appointment that is made by any government? The success or the failure of any program within government circles or within private enterprise, or within the co-operative movement, depends on individuals. Now, hopefully the individual that is appointed to be the Registrar of this Act will be a person, first of all, that believes in the co-operative philosophy and that will be able to espouse the co-operative philosophy in the Province of Manitoba, that will be a good administrator, that will be a person able to relate and help people help themselves. That's the type of qualifications I'd like to see in the Registrar of the Co-operative Development Section of my department. Now if

BILL 59

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) that person happens to be a New Democrat, good and dandy, I'd prefer it. If he can't be a New Democrat, but if he happens to be a Conservative and can't espouse or endorse my philosophy we're going to have difficulty. But the first conditions that I set upon any person that works for any department that I have served over the years, has to have the basic intent of having the legislation regulations and policy work.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside spoke, which I was happy to sit down and listen as carefully as possible, but unfortunately the Honourable Member for Lakeside has the ability of speaking very well - not as well as the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, but pretty close - but he has a great fault though, he speaks well, he speaks with authority, but yet he can't listen. As soon as he hears something that he doesn't like, doesn't agree with, he has to get up and leave, take his bat and ball and go home.

MR. ENNS: Point of personal privilege.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside, would he state his point of privilege.

MR. ENNS: I'm often abused in this Chamber, but on this particular instance I want to remind the Honourable Minister that I was asked to leave by none other than the Speaker of this Chamber.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, to leave the record clear, I did not hear the Speaker call the honourable member's name. So he left by himself.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, once again on a matter of personal privilege, let me clarify my earlier point of privilege. I was given the option, the freedom of choice, you might say, and as a Conservative I exercised that, in deference to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. That is not a point of privilege in the right manner. The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Lakeside just proved what I said about him a few minutes ago. He's a good talker but a very poor listener. I wish he'd be able to sit down and really listen. He could learn like anybody else. I think we can all learn.

The intent, Mr. Speaker, as related by my colleague the Minister of Agriculture, and I wish to thank my colleague for having . . . plan on the record pertaining to Manco and related co-operatives, is the fact that the government is wanting to be of some assistance to Manco and other related farm co-operatives. The reason why, Mr. Speaker, that I decided to go to the Annual Meeting of Manco and be severe, as was interpreted by some of the members of the Board of Directors, was that I believe myself to be an active member in the co-operative movement; and I believe that I have a right to be critical with my colleague, like I do in caucus, like I do in Cabinet, and like I intend to do with friends.

I'm not the Tout-puissant as the Honourable Member for Lakeside likes to classify me. I don't attempt to indicate that I know everything pertaining to the co-operative movement. That's why, Mr. Speaker, that I attempt to sit down and listen when honourable members are speaking. But pertaining to Manco, pertaining to matters that I have had a bit of experience in, I don't mind saying to them: "Listen, let's look at ourselves. Yes, we've done a fair job over the past 10 or 12 years. But we're not God. We can do better. Let's look at ourselves and let's try and listen to advice that we receive and let's see if we can't forge ahead and become better as co-operatives." Now, if there are members within the co-operative movement that can't take it, well, like they say: "If the heat in the kitchen is too hot, you have to leave it." I don't believe in that myself, Mr. Speaker. I believe in being part of a change from within, not retiring and calling it quits like the Honourable Member for Lakeside decided to do when the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources ribbed him the wrong side, came red in the face, got up and left the House. I'd rather not see that. I think the honourable member, Mr. Speaker, should sit back and attempt to learn from his senior friends in this House. Not from me, but his senior friends.

BILL 59

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd)

The intent, Mr. Speaker, of co-operative members in this society is to work with legislation, with regulations and policies of the Department of Co-operative Development, enabling themselves to be of more assistance to other members who are wanting to become involved. 250,000 approximate members in the Province of Manitoba can easily grow within a few years with the help of the Member for Minnedosa to at least a half a million. I'm sure that the honourable member having indicated to me that we should have come in earlier, that we should have tabled the bill before the speed-up, but he didn't mention, Mr. Speaker, how many bills were tabled in this House after The Co-operatives Act. He didn't say a word about that. Why did he choose, Mr. Speaker, to single out the Co-operatives Act? There were so many bills that were tabled after The Co-operatives Act and yet he brings out saying, "Why did we get this bill at the eleventh hour?" --(Interjection)-- Yes, I have your remarks. I've taken your notes with my shorthand here.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Lakeside called us "socialist bandits." That's very strong words. How can we be classified, Mr. Speaker, as socialist bandits when all we attempted to do in the cases as reported by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, the co-operatives that we have seen over the last few years in the north, we haven't taken anything away from them; we've attempted to be of assistance either directly through loans guaranteed by the Loans Guarantee Board or make grants to them. How were we bandits to them?

We've allowed one community, Mr. Speaker, to lower the welfare rate from 85 to 42 percent. How can we be classified as "socialist bandits?" Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is certainly mixed up in his French dictionary. I wish he'd refer back to it.

The honourable member says there's no room, and here again I'm quoting the Honourable Member for Lakeside, Mr. Speaker. He says: "There's no room for government control in private enterprise like co-operatives." Now, again, we can't have it both ways. We're having legislation presented to us here that regulates - first of all allows co-operatives to be incorporated, allows them to be regulated, allows them to set their own policies, and yet we know that co-operatives among themselves will not be able to raise the necessary capital to launch into that many new endeavours, and yet the honourable member is saying: "No government control. No government assistance is needed with co-operatives." Well, Mr. Speaker, government assistance is given either directly or indirectly through agencies of the Crown because in most cases that I know of, especially in the Co-operative Development Department, they're requested. If you look at the MDC, if you look at the Farm Credit Corporation, if you look at the Loans Guarantee Board under the Co-operatives Development Department, I can't recall an instance where I, as the Minister responsible, had indicated to a Board of Directors: Listen, you should borrow \$200,000, or we should make you a grant for \$2,000; it's usually on a request. The same for small businesses, the same for members from all sides of the House, that do decide to borrow from any funds that are being made available by this level of the Crown. Yet the honourable member is advocating no control, no assistance by government. He can't have it both ways.

I made comments on the jewel laid before the House by the Honourable Member for Minnedosa, that he indicated that he wanted to see more time and expertise pertaining to the object of this bill. Well, again, Mr. Speaker, we tabled this bill before the House at the first moment that we had it printed. We'll take as much time as we need to enter into a dialogue with members of the House, to arrive at a consensus hopefully, and hopefully all members of the House will be able to support the provisions of Bill 59. So I don't see why we're having such a big fuss over having this bill tabled at a late stage of this session, as it seems to be considered by the Member for Minnedosa.

As I indicated a while ago, Mr. Speaker, most of the sections that we have in this bill were either contained directly in The Companies Act or were actually being done by co-operatives in the Province of Manitoba. We're making it possible now through legislation. The Honourable Member says from his seat, Mr. Speaker, "Why the rush?" Well, I indicated in my opening remarks that we are the last province in Canada to incorporate, to allow to have this type of legislation. That to me, Mr. Speaker, is not

BILL 59

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) necessarily the reason for the rush. One of the reasons why we waited was to be able to get what we consider to be the best from other provinces in Canada, including the Federal Government, and now produced in this House what I consider to be a good bill; which is considered by some to be the best bill in Canada pertaining to co-operatives.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member is talking about this bill taking two years, and so on. Well, how many other bills have been pregnant for two years and worked by government or other, say, agencies or individuals in the Province of Manitoba? Several bills that I know of, of the 90 odd bills that we have before us. Some bills that we've been discussing here have been discussed even when the Conservatives were in power a few years ago. So that's not new.

Again, I'd like to thank the Honourable Member, the Minister for Agriculture, for his comments on his involvement in co-operatives over the years. He was the Minister responsible for the Co-operative Development Department and he's responsible for a lot of the things that we've seen in Manitoba pertaining to co-operatives.

--(Interjection)-- No it isn't, there's more. Mr. Speaker, the honourable members would like me to sit down, but there was a lot of comment on the other side of the House and we just can't leave that without comment. Then I would be accused of not saying anything on their comments.

The Honourable Member for Rock Lake had quite a lengthy contribution - unfortunately he's not in the House now - but he indicated that he didn't want to speak but then so many other speakers got up that he wanted to lay before the House his remarks. He feels that we've used co-operatives in the Province of Manitoba for our political ends. Well again, the Honourable Member for Lakeside having made those comments I would understand but the Member for Rock Lake, and I know him to be a fairly good co-operator, I can't really understand because I've said this in the House before, Mr. Speaker, and I'll repeat it again: In the previous administration what was allowed by the co-operative movement pertaining to departments of government and agencies of government? What was allowed? Was it allowed, Mr. Speaker, for a sector of the co-operative movement to do some financial affairs with municipalities, school divisions? No. It was against sections of the Act, Mr. Speaker. Now because we've changed those sections in The Municipal Act and The Public Schools Act and The Manitoba Health Services Commission Act, the Liquor Control Commission regulations, we're accused of doing that for our political ends. Well, Mr. Speaker, this is completely ridiculous. We allow people to decide for themselves if they want to do their financial affairs with a bank, a trust company or a credit union or another co-operative sector of the co-operative movement, it can be co-op trust, and we're accused of using that for our political ends. Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't know of anything that we've done over the last seven years that has caused the co-operators, the approximately 250,000 co-operatives in the Province of Manitoba, to indicate to us that because we've made changes that actually favoured the co-operative movement, that we did it for our political ends, and yet we receive that accusation. Well, at the next election if need be, we'll make it clear to the people of Manitoba how it stood in 1969 pertaining to the provisions of The Credit Unions Act and Section 10 of the Companies Act.

The Honourable Member for Wolseley had equally some jewels to lay before us. --(Interjection)-- Jewels. He indicated that the co-operatives were being used by the government - he doesn't like co-operatives to be used and I have more faith in co-operators than the honourable member has. I don't know of that many co-operators that would be used by he and/or I. I believe that co-operatives in the Province of Manitoba will work with people that are sincere, and for that reason they've been able to grow over the last seven years to where they are today. The credit union sectors are larger now than they've ever been since they started in 1938. All other sectors of the co-operative movement have grown, not because - like the Honourable Member for Wolseley said - that we've used them. No, we've made it possible for them to grow and we've attempted to be of some assistance to them, not by controlling them but by making funds available either directly or by guaranteeing funds. Now if that's being used, Mr. Speaker, you tell it to the co-operators in the Province of Manitoba, don't tell it to me.

BILL 59

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd)

He feels, Mr. Speaker, that the co-operative movement has been given a bad name because of this government. Now again, if by allowing co-operatives to live and let live is giving it a bad name, I don't understand the comments made by the Honourable Member for Wolseley. Just because we told co-operators in the Province of Manitoba that they now can become partners with different levels of government, departments of government, municipalities, hospital districts, and so on, that that's giving them a bad name. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the honourable member has to go back to the two-day course in Saskatoon on co-operatives, or the week or six-week course at the University of Manitoba on co-operatives. Certainly there's a lack of understanding by the honourable member of what is meant when a co-operator is being used by anyone, including governments.

The honourable member makes reference to me as the Minister of Tourism and in this capacity I'm presenting and hopefully having this bill pass through the House as the Minister of Co-operative Development. And I hope the honourable member when he lays his comments before the House about lazy bums from England, that he can make those comments outside of the House where that individual can defend himself and not be protected by the walls of the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the Honourable Member for Pembina on his comments. I believe they were one of the few constructive comments made from that side of the House on The Co-operative Act as we have it before us. The honourable member came across as one who understands the co-operative movement, respects the philosophy of the co-operative movement, and yet does not want any favours by government pertaining to the co-operative movement itself. --(Interjection)-- The Honourable Member for Minnedosa indicates that the Member for Pembina is a socialist. That's the last thing the Member for Pembina is, a socialist.

The Honourable Member for Pembina having made those good comments about co-ops, still leaves somewhat to be desired, in my own opinion, pertaining to the involvement of government - and here I put all levels of government on the same input. I believe that when we're requested by individuals, whether they be formed in companies under The Companies Act or incorporated under The Co-operative Development Act, that governments at all levels should attempt to be of some assistance, that they should not always be left to their own. And that doesn't really mean that we have to give them grants, but at least we should be able to guarantee same if that's needed and if there's no one else that will take it up, because this is really what happens in a lot of cases in the north when co-operatives are formed. There's no local banks, there's no local credit unions, and if you're going to allow people to get together, form a co-operative and launch their own services, they do need that type of assistance. So I see that Co-operative Development Department giving two types of assistance, the assistance in kind pertaining to expertise within the department itself and when needed, guaranteeing of lines of credit, of loans needed to launch their own enterprise.

Now I hope the honourable member will take that into consideration because I know he understands the co-operative movement as well if not better than most members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank members of the House for making their contributions. I hope they'll give us support through Law Amendments and third reading. QUESTION put MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to call Bill No. 86 on the Order Paper, the supplementary Order Paper, to be introduced for second reading.

BILL NO. 86 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE MARRIAGE ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER presented Bill 86, an Act to amend The Marriage Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

BILL 86

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, honourable members are to attach no significance to the fact that I am speaking to this bill. The Minister of Health is not here and there are some short explanatory explanations that I should be making on his behalf. What is involved here, Mr. Speaker, is amendments to The Marriage Act to provide for the establishment of marriage commissioners to be carrying out civil weddings in areas where this was formerly provided by the County Court judges. I'm advised, Sir, that it is certainly with the full concurrence of the County Court judges that this change is being made and for all I know it is probably a practical rearrangement or scheduling of the County Court judges' time. That is really one of the four changes in the bill.

The next one is to provide for the fee for the performance of a civil wedding to be set from time to time by regulation.

The next point, Sir, is in cases where the two persons who are party to a marriage are under 18 but over 16 that this will require --(Interjection)-- Well, perhaps, Mr. Speaker. It will require as well the consent by a judge of Family Court. I guess that's the essential point there. This will remove the authority of the Children's Aid Society who have custody under court order to give the required consent. With the passage of this it would require consent being given by a judge of Family Court. Whether it's regarded as a technical change only or if there is substantive merit, I'm not able to say but certainly it does continue to provide the protection of somebody both learned in the law and familiar with family law problems.

One other point of principle or substance involved in this bill, Mr. Speaker, is that at the present time a person must have 15 days residence in the province to enter into marriage with another non-resident of the province. This residence requirement is being removed and no residence requirement will be required before issuing the license or proclaiming bans to marriage. This involves removing several sections of the existing Act which deals specifically with Saskatchewan residents in border areas being given a special exemption from their residence requirements as well as several other sections dealing generally with residence as a factor entering into marriage law.

In addition to these changes, Mr. Speaker, which I have just outlined, there are a number of references to the Recorder of Vital Statistics which are being changed to the Director of Vital Statistics. That is certainly not a substantive point and that change will be made mutatis mutandis no doubt.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Leader of Official Opposition) (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Lakeside, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Bill No. 80, Mr. Speaker.

BILL NO. 80 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE MUNICIPAL ACT (3)

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 80, the Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY presented Bill 80, an Act to amend The Municipal Act (3) for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, there are three elements to this bill. First is the question of dealing with boundaries, one municipality to another. During the last number of years honourable members will recall many instances where there has been difficulty pertaining to disputes arising from municipal councils disagreeing as to boundary changes. Members will recall the Brandon-Cornwallis dispute of 1971 and possibly will recall also the dispute which occurred between the Rural Municipality of Hanover and the Town of Steinbach. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye, predecessor to the present Member for La Verendrye, was in the House at that time. There have been other matters pertaining to disputes, for instance, between Winkler and the R.M.

BILL 80

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd) of Stanley; Dauphin and the R.M. of Dauphin. I think that up until now our method of dealing with such disputes has been inadequate and has not provided for a proper means of determining the proper recommendations to be made in connection therewith.

So under the proposed legislation, the substance of it is as follows: that all matters pertaining to the requests by one municipality to alter its boundaries must be referred to the Municipal Board for Municipal Board determination. The Municipal Board then may hold public hearing, may explore this matter in considerable detail and then make recommendations to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council as to the changes pertaining to those boundaries. In so doing, the Municipal Board will be expected to consider the long term effects as to needs of the municipality for future expansion, development. Rather than solely dealing with the matter on a short term basis the Municipal Board will consider the long term effects of an extension of boundaries at the same time.

There will be more and more of these I think with the passage of time because we do face more disputes, conflicts between generally a town and its surrounding municipality. I think it's important that we attempt to deal with these in as fair, analytical and comprehensive manner as possible. I've never been satisfied, as I said earlier, that the methods used before have been as fair, as comprehensive and as thorough as it could be. I think that the proposal therefore does present to us a better approach to dealing with these types of disputes.

The second amendment attempts to clarify existing ambiguities in The Municipal Act insofar as dealing with under what certain conditions, subject to certain restrictions, a councillor may enter into a contract with the council of which he is a member. This is especially applicable in rural Manitoba where often the supply of goods or certain services may only be obtained from a person who is a member of council. I think we established the principle and I think there was general agreement that members of council ought to be able to purchase from or to sell to a municipality of which they are a member of council, if there are certain restrictions and safeguards. Restrictions and safeguards being, of course, 1) that there be appropriate notice and publication of the fact throughout the municipality.

So the amendment requires council to publish and to post their resolution seven days before it is passed, setting out the proposal to award a contract for the purchase of goods and services to a member of council. There's an upper limit of \$100 for such goods and services, unless the contract is let on tender, and the tender of the member of Council is the lowest.

The proposed amendment further requires Council to forward a copy of the resolution to the Minister of Municipal Affairs within seven days after its letting or awarding.

A great deal of ambiguity as I stated in the sections at the present time, Mr. Speaker, and there's need for a clarification. Hopefully this will properly clarify those provisions insofar as the future usage is concerned.

Then also, we have a further amendment which deals with the ticklish problem which occurred, which members are familiar with, earlier this year, arising from a misunderstanding, lack of knowledge or otherwise, in the City of Brandon, dealing with the acquisition of land in which, as honourable members will recall it wasn't until the City of Brandon appeared before the Municipal Board was it disclosed, that in fact the City of Brandon has failed to properly pass the appropriate by-law as required under the Municipal Act. We're not satisfied that the provisions in the Municipal Act may not have to some small degree, and I don't believe it was the major cause but I think to some small degree contributed to that situation which affected the City of Brandon, and so that we are proposing that the amendments in this connection which we'll deal with the question of acquisition and disposal of land in order to attempt to remove what might appear to be weakness or ambiguity in the present sections 197 to 200 of the Municipal Act.

Lastly, we have an amendment to the Municipal Act which deals with a situation involving the State of Minnesota, which has been negotiating with the Local

BILL 80

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd) Government District of Piney for some time now in order to construct an airport near the U.S.-Canadian border, and the only suitable site requires that the runway be slightly into Canadian territory and within the Local Government District of Piney. The Local Government District of Piney had been proceeding on the basis that for them to give such permission there would be no need for a legislative change; but of course they were wrong in this respect and it does require some legislation in order to permit this type of situation within our Act here, and of course all the other appropriate steps will have to be followed insofar as the Dominion of Canada, etc. But, at the present time we couldn't even proceed under our existing Municipal Act to provide them with this right to locate part of that airfield within Manitoba, a small portion.

So those are the changes (1) dealing with alterations in municipal boundaries; (2) removing ambiguities in the Municipal Act pertaining to acquisition of land; and (3) dealing with purchase or sale of Municipal Councillor to a Municipal Council of Goods and Services; and lastly (4) this situation involving the State of Minnesota and the IGD of Piney.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move, seconded by the Member from Minnedosa, that this debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 20 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE TRADE PRACTICES INQUIRY ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, will you call Bill No. 20, please, an Act to Amend the Trade Practices Inquiry Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Speaker, if I could have leave of the House while this is proceeding, I've got copies of these notes. If I could have them - there's not enough of them to go around, but maybe they could be. . .

MR. TURNBULL presented Bill No. 20, an Act to Amend the Trade Practices Inquiry Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago, indeed, I think on the day that I introduced the Rent Stabilization Bill No. 19, I also introduced for first reading the Bill to Amend the Trade Practices and Inquiry Act, Bill No. 20.

Bill No. 20, the bill before us now, is one that really is a companion piece to the Rent Stabilization Bill. Bill No. 20 is an Act which will enable the Government of Manitoba under certain conditions to determine the price that may be charged for certain commodities. It is a bill which amends an Act that is some forty years old. The Trade Practices and Inquiry Act has been in the Statute Books for many years. It remained relatively dormant in terms of government use of it until the summer of 1973. At that time the Trade Practices and Inquiry Act was used to let the companies that produced bread in the Province of Manitoba know that the Government of Manitoba would not sit idly by and allow them, an unregulated and relatively limited competition industry, to produce bread at higher prices than were at that time deemed to be warranted. It became evident then in the summer of 1973 that the Trade Practices and Inquiry Act did not really contain the kinds of powers that would make it an effective instrument in dealing with unjustified, unwarranted price increases. So it seemed appropriate this session to amend the Trade Practices and Inquiry Act and to introduce into it sections that would enable the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, on the recommendation of the Board of Inquiry set up under the Act, to have the power to set prices, and this is indeed what the amendments before the House today will enable the government to do.

However, Mr. Speaker, I want the members to know that it is the intention to set certain conditions for the use of the powers given under the amendments that we have

BILL 20

(MR. TURNBULL cont'd). . . before us. Those conditions are quite simple really. They are that the goods or the articles or the products to be regulated in terms of price must be essential to the day to day activities of a significant number of people in the province. There are other conditions set out in the bill. Of particular note is that the increases must be . . . greater than 10 percent in any twelve month period. These changes to the bill, Sir, I think, will make it an effective instrument for this government to control flagrant price increases that seem to bear no relationship to the costs incurred for the production and marketing of particular articles or products.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I do recommend the bill to the House. It is short, it is very simple, and yet I think it may be one of the most effective pieces of legislation that this government could have in dealing with inflation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move, seconded by the Member for Wolseley, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 82 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT (2)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Bill No. 82, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. BURTNIAK presented Bill 82, an Act to Amend the Highway Traffic Act (2) for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of things included in this particular bill, but most of the contents of the bill are housekeeping amendments which do not introduce any new principle. However, they were required to clarify certain ambiguities that ensure better administration of the Act.

Also included are a few amendments which were repealed from Bill 47 because of drafting defects and one omission.

A new definition of a school bus is included in the bill. The need for it arises from the fact that a great variety of vehicles are being used as school buses. For some there are no standards concerning safety features. This amendment and supplementary amendments contained in the bill provide for classification of school buses by types of vehicles and provides for regulations prescribing the standards. Also the definition is also expanded to include the school buses used to transport children to private schools. Such buses are not included in the present definition.

The bill establishes a new principle requiring slide-in campers to be separately registered when being carried on a motor vehicle that is driven on a highway. The necessity for such a provision arises from consideration of equity as between a person who owns a half or three-quarter ton truck and purchases a slide-in camper, and a person who buys a recreation trailer which he tows with a passenger car.

An amendment is also proposed to subsection 9, subsection 1 of the Act, which will permit a person to engage in a drive-away service to transport one additional vehicle, provided that it is entirely carried on the towing vehicle. The industry engaged in transporting trucks have complained that our present restriction to three motor vehicles which may be transported piggyback fashion, is being uneconomical. The amendment will allow that industry to increase the number of vehicles that it may transport without jeopardy to the safety of other road users.

A provision is contained in the bill which will permit the Registrar to issue a temporary registration for a motor vehicle. Presently a person who acquires a new vehicle, and before disposing of the old one, has to transfer the plates to the new vehicle. If he wishes to sell the old vehicle he has no means of demonstrating it to the prospective buyer. His only recourse is to buy full registration and pay for the insurance coverage, and when he sells the vehicle apply for a refund. There are also occasions when persons wish to register a vehicle for a short term for a specified purpose without

BILL 82

(MR. BURTNIAK cont'd)having to pay out a substantial sum of money for registration and insurance.

Under present legislation when a dealer sells a used motor vehicle, he must furnish to the buyer either a certificate signed by him that the vehicle and its equipment is in compliance with the Act and regulations, or a certificate saying that it is not in compliance and is not in safe condition to be operated on the highway. Considering the fact that such a high percentage of motor vehicles inspected by our Inspection Program are found to be defective, it is reasonable to require the inspection of the vehicles at the time it is changing hands. A person wishing to sell a used vehicle would have to travel considerable distance to have his vehicle inspected by a qualified mechanic. Therefore a category of licensed motor vehicle inspectors is established under this Act. To qualify for a licence a person must be a qualified mechanic, or one who is engaged in the business of repairing motor vehicles, or is employed by a person so engaged, and has had at least five years experience. In addition, a person who is not a qualified mechanic will be required to pass an examination demonstrating that he has the knowledge, the ability and the skill to demonstrate whether the parts and systems of motor vehicles for which standards are prescribed, are in compliance. It is important that such persons will not be expected to have the ability and skill to diagnose and repair engines, and drive trains.

As most of us are aware, there have been frequent public complaints about damage done to vehicle windshields by gravel and stones which become dislodged off gravel trucks. In an attempt to at least partially reduce the hazards to other vehicles, an amendment is proposed requiring loads of loose gravel, or loose material such as gravel and crushed rock to be covered by a tarpaulin, unless the load is so contained in the box that it cannot become dislodged in transit. Loads consisting of snow, earth, or mud, will be exempt from being covered by a tarpaulin, as such material does not have the same potential to cause damage.

The provisions relating to loads of logs, the lumber will be strengthened by making provision in the Act to prescribe the regulation in the manner which loads must be secured.

An amendment is proposed which will empower the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to decrease the maximum speed on highways. This provision is deemed necessary in the event it is decided to reduce speed limits on all selected highways in the province.

The bill contains a major new principle which I feel is very important, perhaps one of the most important in this bill, one of the most important amendments is that they will prohibit absolutely the sale of motor vehicles to any person under the age of 16, and require the consent of the parent of legal guardian in the case of the person over 16, but under the age of 18 years of age. While I recognize that we cannot protect everyone from harm resulting from foolish behaviour, we should do whatever we can to assist parents in preventing young persons from acquiring motor vehicles against their wishes. I consider this amendment important, with potential of saving at least one life every year, and without imposing an undue restriction on the sale of motor vehicles.

The amendment also provides for a fine, that in a case of a private individual, the maximum fine is \$500, and in the case of a corporation, the maximum is \$2,000.

The Act provides for the automatic suspension of the driver's license upon conviction of a person of an offense under the Criminal Code related to the operation of a motor vehicle.

The period of suspension is also prescribed, which gets progressively longer after each offence. Indeed on third such convictions the licence is subject to suspension for life. It has been observed that in some cases the elapsed time between convictions has been well over five years. However, as the Act does not define second or subsequent offences even if ten years have lapsed, this seems somewhat unreasonable, and an amendment is proposed defining the second and subsequent offence as one which occurs within five years of the preceding offence.

As the Minister of Finance announced in the House in the Budget Speech, the registration fees for passenger cars will be changed from a wheel base, to curb weight.

BILL 82

(MR. BURTNIAK cont'd) This requires certain amendments to this Act, which are contained in this particular bill. Included is a provision repealing the fee schedules of the Act and providing for prescribing all fees required to be paid out, or be paid under this Act, by regulation. This is not a new principle since many fees are now prescribed by regulation rather than the statute authorizing them as in the case of, say, snowmobile registration fees and certain fees under this Act. These, Mr. Speaker, are some of the main amendments to the particular bill. I would urge honourable members to give early passage to it. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rhineland, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Bill No. 84, Mr. Speaker.

. continued next page

BILL NO. 84 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE REAL ESTATE BROKERS ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services.

HON. IAN TURNBULL (Minister of Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services) (Osborne) presented Bill 84, an Act to amend the Real Estate Brokers Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Speaker, this bill makes a number of amendments which I assume members opposite would like to have explained. Some of these amendments are of quite a complex character but nevertheless, the bill is not quite as complex as it may at first sight appear. The amendments proposed in fact fall into eight distinct groups and with your indulgence and the indulgence of members here, I will go through all eight groups.

The definition section of the Act has been re-written. This has been done because as will be apparent, some new definitions are being inserted and some existing ones changed. We have taken advantage of this opportunity to drop one existing definition which was totally useless, namely that of preliminary agreement. Although this term was defined in the Act, it was not in fact used anywhere in it and never has been, so we're taking it out.

The second group changes are of course required in this Act to implement the transfer of jurisdiction from the Public Utilities Board to the Manitoba Securities Commission. I won't go into a citation of all the sections that have to be changed to accomplish that. Sufficient to say that it goes well over a dozen.

The third group. Two related changes in the system of registration are proposed. Hitherto, Mr. Speaker, all registrations of brokers and salesmen had expired on the 31st of March of each year which has the undesirable effect of concentrating the work of renewing registrations into one period of a few weeks. As there are now about 560 brokers and 1,800 salesmen, this has become a serious problem. Another feature of the existing system of registration has been that the transfer of a salesman's registration from one employer to another has been prohibited. When a salesman has left his employer his registration has been cancelled and a new registration issued when he finds a new employer. In both of these respects, Mr. Speaker, this system of registration differs from that used under The Securities Act. Under that Act each registrant, including salesman, has his own individual registration year which runs from the anniversary of his first registration. When a salesman leaves his employer, his registration is not cancelled but is suspended until he finds a new employer and is then transferred to him. The amending Act which was passed last year, contained provisions to change the first of these two features, namely the fixed registration year, but it was not then intended to change the second. Now that the Securities Commission will be administering both Acts, it is logical that the two registration systems be the same.

Since these two changes in the registration system are interrelated, the amendments enacted last year are not suitable for the change now proposed. Those amendments have not been proclaimed and Section 64 of this bill before us will repeal them. The amendments now required consist of the dropping of the definition of the word "year" in the definition section and of the amendments made by Sections 14 to 17 and part of 18 and Section 20 of the bill.

The fourth group of changes, Mr. Speaker, involve Sections 44 and 45 of the bill. These make changes in this Act similar to those proposed in The Mortgage Brokers and Mortgage Dealers Act dealing with the making of false statements in applications for registration and in other documents filed under this Act and also rewording the offence and penalty provision so as to adopt a more logical arrangement. The provisions dealing with false statements, Mr. Speaker, have already been commended by the member for Pembina when they were introduced for The Mortgage Brokers and Mortgage Dealers Act. We are doing virtually the same thing here and I think, with him, it is a good idea.

The fifth group of changes involve several sections. Sections 9 to 11, 38 and 40 of the bill in effect re-write other sections of the Act. Mr. Speaker, I see that you are not willing to let me get into too much detail in naming sections of the bill. I do so in

BILL 84

(MR. TURNBULL cont'd) order to save some time and to give members as complete an explanation of this apparently complicated bill as I can. And perhaps. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. If I may help the Honourable Minister. Since he has his notes, he can pass his notes across to the honourable members and deal in general. Otherwise we're having the same problem in respect to procedure. We're on second reading which is principle only.

MR. TURNBULL: I was going to ask leave to cite these various sections, Mr. Speaker, but I'll abide by your desire and skip through them.

Mr. Speaker, I will go then to the seventh group and leave out a number of points here. The seventh group really contains the most important changes proposed by the bill. That is the re-writing of three definitions. These definitions are the definitions "broker", of "real estate salesman" and of "transaction" and the introduction into the Act of a new term called "trade" which is also defined.

The fundamental problem which this change is intended to resolve can quite simply be stated. If I list my house for sale with a broker and one of his salesmen brings me an offer which I accept, I can then quite properly tell my friends, "I have sold my house." The salesman can go back to his broker and say, "I have sold the Turnbull's house." Neither of us is misusing the English language but nevertheless we each mean something different when we say, "I have sold." The existence of these two meanings of the word "sell" has not hitherto been adequately recognized in the Act so that it is not always clear in which sense it is being used. This has caused great problems in the proper interpretation of some sections of the Act and those sections do not use the word "sell". These sections use the term, "deal in real estate transactions" and "transaction" is defined to include "sale". It has also caused problems in the interpretation of the definition of "broker."

The solution proposed involves the introduction of a new term, "trade". This will mean the actual sale by the vendor and the purchase by the purchaser. It is the parties alone who trade. The broker who brings them together simply negotiates the trade. The term "transaction" has been retained but it is now used exclusively to mean the things that only brokers and salesmen do, of which negotiating a trade is the most important. This has made it possible to re-write the definition of "broker" and also of "real estate salesman" in a more intelligible form.

Mr. Speaker, I think, abiding by your desire here, that those are the only points I need mention. I will send copies of my notes to those members of the opposition who desire them.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the Member for La Verendrye, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to proceed with Bill No. 89. The Honourable the Attorney-General will be introducing it.

BILL NO. 89 - THE STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT ACT (1976)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. HOWARD PAWLEY (Attorney-General)(Selkirk) presented Bill No. 89, The Statute Law Amendments Act (1976), for second reading. (Recommended by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor)

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell on a procedural point.

MR. GRAHAM: Could I ask the Attorney-General to indicate what sections the Lieutenant-Governor's authority would apply to?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think that the legal draftsman can indicate that

BILL 89

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd)best to us at the committee stage. I'm afraid I couldn't inform him now of that. I'm just wondering also, Mr. Speaker, if honourable members would prefer, I have copies of all the changes to The Statute Law Amendments, the speaking notes, and if honourable members would prefer I could distribute these notes rather than speaking from them and then you could simply read them but if honourable members prefer I will speak from the notes. Mr. Speaker, if the Pages could distribute the notes we could leave it at that.

There is probably two provisions that I should speak to very briefly and outside of that could leave the rest to the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Honourable Attorney-General then carry on and make his two points.

MR. PAWLEY: There's two areas that pertain to the Department of the Attorney-General I wanted to mention. One deals with the area which I had mentioned during the Estimate review and, Mr. Speaker, this would be in answer to the question from the honourable Member from Birtle-Russell too. It would be this area dealing with witness fees.

I'd indicated during my Estimate review that the standard fee of \$4.00 per diem pertaining to Crown witness fees would be increased during the coming year to \$8.00 per diem so that there is a provision here providing for an amendment to The Department of The Attorney-General Act to provide for that increase without specifying the sum. It's intended that it be \$8.00, but permitting that fee to be established in the future by regulation. I don't think that's a matter that would have to be dealt with on a persistent basis through the Legislature.

The second area that I think requires some emphasis is that I have received requests from those that are blind in our community in connection with problems which they've encountered in regard to taking with them seeing eye dogs into places of business. In some instances blind people have been refused entry into places of business because they have been accompanied by a seeing eye dog. This has created problems for some of those in our community that are so disadvantaged. There have been some changes in some other, particularly municipal jurisdictions in Canada, where this type of inequality has been remedied. There is a provision included within the amendments providing for protection to blind people with seeing eye dogs, permitting them to enter into places of business without being prevented from so entering thus creating an offence now within our legislation, for any refusal to allow a blind person to bring his guide dog into public premises.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Morris, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 91.

BILL NO. 91 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE QUEEN'S BENCH AND PETTY TRESPASSES ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY presented Bill No. 91, an Act to amend The Queen's Bench Act and The Petty Trespassers Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that pertains to an inequitable situation which has arisen, I think, through proper interpretation by the courts, but through that proper interpretation I think it has however pointed to an inequality in our law insofar as the communication of information to the public. At the present time where where one can communicate information - and by reference to communication of information - I'm not necessarily referring only to a picket line in a strike but to any that may be peacefully, without breaking any laws, communicating information to members of the public.

BILL 91

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd) .

Under the interpretation of the Supreme Court ruling, I believe it was, it was found that communication of information could be prevented within a shopping area plaza. Though it's perfectly correct and lawful, for instance, for communicating of information to take place in front of a large store or plant, for instance, downtown along Portage Avenue in front of Eaton's or Hudson's Bay, it was improper for such communicating of information to take place, for example, at the Polo Park Shopping Plaza, outside the shopping plaza, simply because it was held that these lands were privately owned.

Now, Mr. Speaker, of course it was always intended I'm sure by the owner that that block of land set aside for a shopping plaza, though privately owned, was land which was accessible to the public. So that all that we are doing insofar as this legislation is confirming that the public does have access to such properties in the same way as they have access to Portage Avenue, Main Street, or any other areas that the public has the right of public access to.

I would be proposing to make some change in committee in this bill because there is reference in the drafting of the bill to employees of an employer that are participating in a strike that is not prohibited by law. It would be my intention to remove that clause and the second one dealing with lockouts, to remove those clauses and relate to the communication of information to the public in the same way as the existing provision applies in The Queen's Bench Act pertaining to the communication of information to members of the public. So that the reference here to strikes is too restrictive, it's communication of information to members of the public in the very same way as is applicable anywhere else under the provisions of The Queen's Bench Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Brandon West, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, if you would proceed with the third readings on the supplementary Order Paper. That is amended bills and the other third readings, starting with An Act to amend The Municipal Act.

THIRD READINGS

Bill 36 was read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, for the Member for St. Johns I would move that Bill No. 45 - Mr. Speaker, this is really a private bill and perhaps I had better leave it. Maybe the member wishes to say something on it.

BILL 65 was read a third time and passed.

BILL NO. 67 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE MUNICIPAL ASSESSMENT ACT

MR. GREEN presented Bill 67, an Act to amend The Municipal Assessment Act, for third reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell wish to speak on Bill 67?

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, can I ask a question of the Minister first?

MR. SPEAKER: Very well.

MR. GRAHAM: Have copies of the amendments been distributed to all members of the House?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I was not at Municipal Affairs Committee, I really can't answer that question. Perhaps the member will take the adjournment and he can

BILL 67

(MR. GREEN cont'd) find out the information that he wants.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Virden, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILLS 27, 35, 45, 71, 72 and 77 were each read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

BILL NO. 56 - THE FOREIGN CULTURAL OBJECTS IMMUNITY FROM SEIZURE ACT

MR. GREEN: I would like to proceed with Bill No. 56 but the Member for River Heights who has an amendment is not here. Is there an amendment? --(Interjection)-- Well, Mr. Speaker, if I proceeded with Bill No. 56 at the report stage - is there an amendment to come that could be put now - then I would call Bill No. 56.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris on procedure.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I don't know how I can answer that question without involving myself in the debate, and I am prepared to do that, and then perhaps when I am through somebody can take the adjournment and they'll understand what I'm attempting to do. I originally moved this particular bill . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: On a point of order. Would it be appropriate now then if I call Bill No. 56? Would there be objection in the House? Because I don't want to call something which would take people by surprise. If I call Bill No. 56 I gather we could regard it as being at the report stage and then proceed from that. Bill No. 56.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, when I spoke . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry, I don't want to drift into a procedure on a point of order. I do not wish to drift into a procedure by accident or by hazard. I gather that on the report stage there can be an amendment which is then spoken to or a member wishing to make an amendment can speak to the bill and that's the basis upon which the honourable member is proceeding.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris will be presenting an amendment and then speaking to it.

MR. JORGENSEN: I move that Section 3 of Bill 56 be struck out and the following section be substituted therefor:

"Expiry Date III - this Act expires on the 31st day of December, 1976."

A motion is now formally before the House, Sir, but it may not be quite as . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I'll have to check my own procedure. At the report stage, does the motion have to be put? It does not have to be seconded I'm . . .

I find that the procedure is that I should have first of all put the motion that the report of the bill to the House be concurred in and that's when the motion of the Honourable Member for Morris will be made to amend the report.

Therefore now I am accepting the amendment to that report and it does require a seconder. So I'll put the amendment to the report by the Honourable Member for Morris, seconded by the Member for Brandon West, as it was read.

The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: I find myself, Sir, in somewhat of a dilemma now because the original intention was to move the self-destruct clause. But since I submitted the amendment to the Clerk's Office I now feel that I have a better suggestion to make that may be more acceptable to all members of the House and I'm going to speak to that particular suggestion without formally moving the motion because I'm unable to do so at this time first of all because I haven't got it, it's being drafted right now, and secondly, it would be contrary to the rules, unless it is possible to be done by leave. As the House knows, anything can be done by leave.

BILL 56

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd)

But let me first of all, Sir, reiterate the particular objection that I had to the legislation as it was drafted. I objected specifically to the section of the bill that permitted the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to determine at any time that they could declare a work or an object of art brought into the province to be subject to the bill that is before us. I took exception to the fact that the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council had that authority without reference to anybody or anything. And what I'm hoping to do. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: On a point of order. I'm sorry that we have got into this rather difficult proceeding where the member has put a motion and says that he is going to suggest something else. I think the Member for Morris, as all the other members, would want this done in the best way possible. Would it be acceptable that we call the bill again and that the suggested amendment be brought forward sometime tomorrow or another day so that you could speak on what you want rather than speaking on something that you don't want.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: That, Sir, is perfectly agreeable. What I thought I would like to do at this time is simply to relate briefly what I had in mind in the way of an amendment so that the House could understand. If that is not acceptable well then I would want to proceed with this particular . . .

MR. GREEN: Well I'm going to ask the honourable member to accept that he is out of order and to indicate to the House that another amendment will be forthcoming some time tomorrow at which time he will be explaining the amendment that he is putting, not the amendment that he is not putting.

MR. JORGENSEN: . . .that is acceptable to the House, I am perfectly willing to let it go at that.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? (Agreed) The Honourable House Leader --(Interjections)-- No way.

MR. GREEN: We just ruled that out.

BILL NO. 37 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE CORPORATIONS ACT

MR. GREEN presented Bill 37, an Act to amend The Corporations Act for third reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Speaker, I believe there is some amendments and I'm assuming that they've been accepted by the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I understand that this bill is under the report stage and there are amendments to come to it. Therefore the motion is not placed.

MR. GREEN: I think you'll have to call the report stage and the Honourable Minister will put the amendments.

MR. SPEAKER: Report stage of Bill 37. The Honourable Minister. He's not ready.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Speaker, as the bill has been for report stage moved, I'll move these motions, seconded by the Minister of Education.

THAT Clause 121 (l)(q) of Bill 37 be amended by striking out the figures \$2,000,000.00 in the second line thereof and substituting therefor the figures \$10,000,000.00

Mr. Speaker, these amendments have been distributed and perhaps it would facilitate matters if we take them as read.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreeable that they be taken as read? (Agreed) They are distributed. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie does not have a copy?

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): No I don't.

MR. SPEAKER: Well I'm sure the Clerk will get him a copy.

MOTION presented on the Amendments as read and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

BILL 37 as amended was read a third time and passed.

BILL NO. 54 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE TEACHERS' PENSION ACT

MR. GREEN presented Bill 54, an Act to amend The Teachers' Pension Act, for third reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, I just have a few observations to make on the third reading of this bill, an Act to amend The Teachers' Pensions Act. I'd like to compliment the Minister of Education in seeing the wisdom of the recommendation of the teachers and of the opposition to review that particular clause relating to war service pensions.

Mr. Speaker, I was a little bit concerned during part one of the Minister of Education's speech in closing debate that he had decided that there was no merit in the comments made by the opposition in the debate. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, he castigated the members of the opposition who had the temerity to indulge in this debate by saying that their comments were hardly worthy of consideration.

But when we got to part two of his speech, Mr. Speaker, we were reassured that after all he didn't feel that the criticisms that had been presented were entirely invalid. I think that the review of that particular clause and the amendment that was brought in will do a great deal to eliminate the criticisms which we presented in the debate of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, we on the opposition side have some affection for the Minister of Education. I know there are times when we feel that he is perhaps overpaid and we introduced motions to reduce his salary, but really I feel that we have a kindly disposal towards the Minister of Education. I feel that he helps us from time to time in our role in the opposition. Many times during the session, without any real feeling of desire to help us the Minister of Education has assisted us and we want him to feel that we don't let his efforts go unobserved.

So, Mr. Speaker, let me just say that I think the bill as amended is a very satisfactory and acceptable bill and commend the Minister for seeing the wisdom of the criticisms that were presented.

QUESTION put MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

Bill 64 was read a third time and passed.

BILL NO. 70

AN ACT TO AMEND THE MORTGAGE BROKERS AND MORTGAGE DEALERS ACT

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, with respect to Bill No. 70, I believe that there was a distributed amendment and you will have to deal with it, as to whether the report should be received.

MR. SPEAKER: But it's not under the report stage.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I understood the Honourable Minister to tell me there was an amendment. There isn't?

MR. GREEN presented Bill No. 70, An Act to amend the Mortgage Brokers and Mortgage Dealers Act, for third reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to say a few words on this because I had done some research on it hoping to find, as usual, some odd twist to it, and the only thing I can say, the Act appears to be a housekeeping Act. It does put a little more teeth into the situation dealing with some of the questionable people that get involved with questionable transactions. But I'm very pleased to see that Directors of these corporations which another bill that the Minister of Consumer Affairs put forward, where we're going to have these one-man corporations, if the corporation does something wrong, I understand by reading the bill (and I could be corrected) that the Director is going to be responsible as well.

BILL 70

(MR. WILSON cont'd)

One of the things that I had to ask myself and when one reads it is that, why this change? Is there going to be a saving to the taxpayers by the Public Utilities Board being really cut down in their duties? Do we suspect that some time the government is going to do away with this board altogether and get back to what the Minister said when he wanted to eliminate them pertaining to control over the telephones and some of the other things? I'm just wondering, are these new people in the Securities Branch, these secretaries and that or whatever, are they going to be as qualified as the people that are members of the Public Utilities Board to look after this? I think that only time will tell.

Again, I wondered if we were looking at a change that was really necessary. However, when you tie it in with other bills that have been presented, I guess Bill 84 and that, I guess we have to assume that it's really creating a further need for a questionable need - and by that two-sided comment I mean I've often raised questions, what does a Securities Commission do? Now that we have that new building over there and they've got almost an entire floor, possibly they will now be able to justify their existence because the Minister has put several new bills before the House which will now be their responsibility.

So with those few remarks I just wanted to comment that it just appears to be a housekeeping bill, but I wondered why, can we get the Minister to admit now that he intends to do away with the Public Utilities Board or is just reducing their duties and is there a saving to the taxpayer?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Speaker, I have . . . minutes left, which I think is all I need to deal with the member's remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the division in between the Public Utilities Board and the Securities Commission is an administrative change that occurred some months ago, and the change primarily was a separation of staff and personnel on the two boards. In fact, Sir, when the Member for Wolseley questions the qualifications of the people who are now on the Securities Commission, he is talking in fact about the same people in many respects who were on the Public Utilities Board. Indeed the past Chairman of the Public Utilities Board is now Chairman of the Securities Commission. I think he is recognized by members who are knowledgeable opposite as being a man of integrity, a man of competence, as a man of energy and a man who gets the job done. I'm glad that he is there.

If the Member for Wolseley does not know what the Securities Commission does here, then I can tell him that there are many investors interested in Manitoba Securities that do benefit from the work of the Securities Commission. It is in fact a watchdog and does perform a very useful task in this province.

With regard to the function of the Utilities Board itself which is really hardly in order in this debate, I can say that the Utilities Board has done a good job in the past. I intend that it will do a good job in the future. It has had in the last 18 months, 24 months, a considerable increase in workload because of the necessity for that board, the Utilities Board, to consider natural gas rate applications in this province. It also had the responsibility for a short time for investigation into the price of gasoline and oil petroleum products in this province. Those tasks in themselves plus the other work of the Utilities Board meant that the responsibilities of that board were becoming such that it was deemed appropriate and wise administratively, to separate the functions and the staff of the Securities Commission and the Public Utilities Board.

As to the abolition of the Utilities Board's functions with regard to MTS, that has to be taken into consideration of the costs of the Utilities Review Board. I think the costs may have been worthwhile although I have not yet seen the total costs involved for the Utilities Boards hearings on MTS.

MR. SPEAKER: Pleasure of the House to adopt the motion.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm lost.

BILL 75 was read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: Can I also take Bill 32 from the Honourable Member for Radisson? Is he ready?

BILLS 32, 76 were each read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Gladstone. . .

MR. SPEAKER: I'll give the Honourable Member for Gladstone a chance to make a change. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTIONS

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON (Gladstone): Okay, thank you, Mr. Speaker. The change is the name of Mr. Graham, Birtle-Russell substituted for the Member for Crescentwood in the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member for Gladstone have another change?

MR. FERGUSON: No, that's it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The time for adjournment being present, the House is accordingly adjourned and stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow morning. (Tuesday)