

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Friday, March 7, 1969

MR. SPEAKER: I would like to take this opportunity of introducing our guests. I'd like to draw the attention of the honourable members to the Speaker's gallery where we have as our honoured guest Manitoba's youthful representative for the Easter Seal campaign. This year's Timmy is 10 year-old Jeffrey Mossey, son of Sergeant and Mrs. Mossey of the Canadian Forces Base at Shilo, and as such he resides in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne. With Jeffrey is his mother and Mr. Syd Scott, the Manitoba Chairman of the 1969 Easter Seal Campaign. As the honourable members know, the month-long campaign opened yesterday and concludes April 6th, Easter Sunday, and is conducted in rural Manitoba. Timmy contacted polio in his first year but he is a bright and determined young fellow. He is a self-taught swimmer and loves to swim at every opportunity. Jeffrey is also something of a world traveller. Before going to Shilo with his parents, his four brothers, including two year old twins, he spent some time in Hemer, Germany. In 1969, Timmy -- Jeffrey -- represents all handicapped throughout the province who are looking to the Easter Seal contributions to help them to grow into happy and useful adults. We are indeed pleased to have you with us today Jeffrey. You help give well deserved public recognition to the Society for Crippled Children and Adults in Manitoba for its effective work for the handicapped of the province. On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you and your mother here today and say, "God bless you".

We also have with us today as guests 45 students of Grades 7 and 8 standing of the Provencher School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Najda, Mrs. Tascona and Mrs. Delaquis. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly, I also welcome you here today.

The adjourned debate -- the Honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, the member for Hamiota is unable to be here this afternoon, but we would let other members speak. The member for Gladstone is prepared to speak and if anyone else wishes to speak, we have no objections, then let the debate stand in his name.

MR. PAULLEY: It's agreeable to us, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity of saying a few words on this very very important subject matter. The Minister of Agriculture, who incidentally apparently is not in the House at the present time, made a -- or I suppose was out at Brandon the other day at the Outlook Conference, and we had distributed on our desks earlier this week the bulletin termed "Outlook 1969" issued by the Manitoba Department of Agriculture. I notice, Mr. Speaker, that it has taken on a new format this year, and on Page 2 of that report it records at the bottom that farmers -- I'm quoting -- "Farmers experienced extreme difficulty in harvesting, and generally where wet fields would support machinery the grain was harvested in a tough or damp condition. Yields were generally higher and storage became a problem. It is estimated that from 70 to 80 million bushels of grain in Manitoba is in store on farms in a tough or damp condition. The majority of this will require drying on farms. Some of this grain has already deteriorated due to heating, and unless dried in the meantime more will be lost when the warm weather returns in the spring."

I'm glad to see my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture in his seat now. I don't know whether he made this statement at Brandon the other day or not. I know in the past at the Outlook Conference the former Premier and the former Minister of Agriculture used to preface the Outlook Conference with some advice and some long range forecasts, and I suppose that my honourable friend the new Minister of Agriculture is following in the footsteps of the former Minister and the former Premier. In fact I think the former Premier used to kind of take it upon himself as being an expert in the field of long range forecasts and he used to make certain predictions and certain statistical comments to guide the farmers in their destiny. But, Mr. Speaker, what I'm saying is that the department recognized the seriousness of the grain situation, having made a statement of that kind - on page 2, Mr. Minister, for your information - page 2 of the Farm Outlook, where you record that there is presently, or was at that time - and this was January - between 70 and 80 million bushels on hand. Now I know that this is not something that is limited to Manitoba only. I know they have this problem in

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.): . . . . Saskatchewan and Alberta and probably to the same extent, and — Mr. Speaker, I see my honourable friend is having some difficulty finding his Outlook booklet and if he wants to borrow mine — you have found it. Good. But the amendment to the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne in Saskatchewan that was put by the New Democratic Party concerned only damp grain, so they're really concerned about it up there. I have the amendment before me but I don't intend to read it to you now. However, what did disturb me a little earlier this week was this. I attempted to get certain information from the Canadian Wheat Board relative to the number of bushels of damp grain on storage in farm buildings at the present time, and the number of driers that were available in the province and other information in respect to the whole subject matter. They indicated that it was more or less privileged information, although then they proceeded to give me some of the highlights of a bulletin or a statement that was issued at the end of January, and they said it had been supplied to all of the Ministers and the Deputy Ministers of Agriculture in the three prairie provinces and I phoned the Minister of Agriculture in Saskatchewan, Mr. McFarlane, and I phoned the Minister of Agriculture in Alberta, Mr. Rusty to ask them if they had any information on the number of bushels in their respective provinces, the number of driers available, and what the problem was, and they told me. They co-operated very well. They told me that if I could get the information from the Canadian Wheat Board that they had in their possession that I would know the whole story.

Well, here is what I learned from the Canadian Wheat Board. They wouldn't let me have the report, but he said they could give me some of the highlights of it. They said as of February 1st — now the condition may have changed a little bit since then but as of February 1st — they estimate, as my honourable friend has stated, that there was between 70 and 80 million bushels of damp grain in the province; that during January they had dried about 12 million bushel. They have learned from questionnaires sent out that there are, in fact, 734 grain driers in the province but that through the month of January there were only 259 in operation, and the 259 that were in operation in January had processed or dried roughly 908,000 bushel a day. A day. No, pardon me! — They said that if the 734 driers that were available to work had been working to capacity, they could have dried roughly a million bushel a day — 908,000 a day, but since there was in fact only 259 in operation, well it cut it down to where they only had dried 12 million bushel in the month of January. Now if they only dried 12 million, then that means that there's something like 60 million bushel of damp grain still laying around on farms that has to be dried — or there was as of February 1st. So, the question arises, why don't we see that, or why doesn't my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture and the government opposite make every effort to see that every drier in the province of Manitoba is put to work now? Because if 734 driers can do a million bushel a day, it will still take about two months to get all of this grain dried, and we can't wait two months because in two months it will all be rotten — that is, unless it's dried it'll be rotten.

The Minister of Agriculture said that just earlier this week he had announced in the House a program of assistance and I suppose a bill will be forthcoming — probably it's on their desks now. I asked him the content of it and he said they were guaranteeing loans up to \$1,000 per farmer, and this is in addition to the \$600.00 that is available from the Federal Government. In Saskatchewan, they started very early last fall, according to the Minister there, knowing the seriousness of this situation, and they had all of the . . . .

MR. WATT: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member said \$600.00 cash advance? It's up to \$600.00. It's a maximum of \$600.00 cash advance.

MR. SHOEMAKER: I'm sorry — \$600.00, \$600.00. The \$1,000 that the Province of Alberta has made available to each farmer is in addition to the \$600.00 that's made available. Maximum. That's the maximum in each case, the maximum in each case.

Now, the Minister of Agriculture in Saskatchewan told me, as I started to say a minute ago, that they recognized the seriousness of the situation and last fall, immediately after harvest, they asked every ag rep in the province to organize meetings within their districts, and subsequently they set up what they called 900 key points in the province, and at these 900 key points drying facilities were established, and where natural gas was available in these key points the province, at no cost at all, connected the natural gas pipeline up to their driers. My honourable friend knows that most of the driers are propane gas but I suppose can be converted to natural gas, or probably there's two different kinds, but they're either natural gas or propane. And they feel in Saskatchewan that they have the problem pretty well in hand because

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.): . . . . of all this ground work that they started doing some six months ago.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what I'm saying is and what my honourable friend is wondering and we're all wondering, the farmers in particular, what is this government doing to assure, to assure that the number of bushels of grain that will be lost — because let's face it, there's going to be quite a lot of it that will commence heating if it hasn't already commenced heating and will rot; but let's keep it to a minimum — that's what we're saying here. Earlier today we met with the Manitoba Farmers Union and I believe that this afternoon. . .

A MEMBER: Today?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Today -- this morning we met with the Farmers Union. Maybe they're not on speaking terms with the government any more, Mr. Speaker, I don't know, but we met with them today, and I think the New Democratic Party met with them since lunch today -- today, Friday, March the 7th -- today, we met with them. We met with them at 9 o'clock this morning. Us farmers get up early. -- (Interjection) -- I guess not. But anyway, they said in their brief there were just two points that they felt were of prime interest and one was in connection with a resolution incidentally that's on the Order Paper here, put in by my honourable friend the Member for Ethelbert Plains, in respect to the selling of grain to feed mills. Now, I don't agree with the resolution; particularly this year I don't agree with it -- (Interjection) -- no, it isn't the more reason. We can argue this one when we get to the resolution -- but the point is that when the farmers are trying desperately to get rid of their crop this year, that they should take advantage of every possible sale that is available, and therefore I just wanted to get that comment in at this time.

Now Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to speak at any greater length on this particular subject but I do hope that my honourable friend the Minister will not be long in tabling the Order for Return or the Address for Papers that is on the Order Paper so that we in the Assembly, and indeed the farmers of this province, will know where we're at on this very vital subject.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Brokenhead.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I fail to see what an Address for Papers is going to accomplish for the farmer insofar as the question of what we are going to do about the wet or damp grain situation. It would seem to me that the problem is far too important to approach it by way of an Address for Papers. To me, it would appear that one would only delay action by debating the question of an Address for Papers rather than to propose some positive solutions to a problem that is before the Province of Manitoba, indeed the three prairie provinces, and that is extremely acute as far as the farm community is concerned.

The only rationalization that I can come to, Mr. Speaker, is that we're really involved in a problem unrelated to the question of grain when we see such an Address for Papers before us, and I refer to the original Orders of the Day in the first or second day of our sitting, whereby I see that the New Democratic Party has some 17 resolutions on the Order Paper, being the first 17, of which there is a resolution dealing with the question of the damp grain situation; and it's conceivable, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps the Honourable Member for La Verendrye realized the dilemma in which the Liberal Party found itself in, in that they didn't have one resolution on the Order Paper and here the New Democrats are going to talk about wet grain. So one way of beating them to the punch, of course is to pre-empt the resolution.

MR. MOLGAT: You had better read the next Address for Papers.

MR. USKIW: Well, the only point I'm making, Mr. Speaker, the only point I'm making, Mr. Speaker, is that possibly there is a flaw in our rules. I know that this was mentioned during the debate on the rules a year ago, and as a matter of fact, the Honourable Member for Lakeside tended to agree with the Member for Inkster that this was a possibility that such a thing could in fact happen, but that in fact he was sure that no one would do such a thing. Now I don't know whether this is the motivation or not. The point I'm making, Mr. Speaker, is that an Address for Papers is not going to solve the damp grain situation.

If you look on page . . .

MR. GUTTORMSON: Will the member permit a question?

MR. USKIW: Go ahead.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Have you read the Address for Papers by your Leader?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I haven't time to look at another resolution at the present time. I don't know what he's talking about. I know that there's a particular problem with respect to the way in which the rules were agreed upon a year ago and perhaps that's something

(MR. USKIW cont'd.): . . . . that we will all have to delve into subsequently. I just want to pursue the question of the seriousness of the damp grain problem and I just fail to see, Mr. Speaker, where we're going to get anywhere with it, debating an Address for Papers.

I want to refer you to Page 6 of the Order Paper, today's Order Paper, Mr. Speaker, wherein there is a proper resolution that deals with the whole question of damp grain, and I'm going to quote that resolution, Mr. Speaker, for the record. It says: WHEREAS grain farmers have suffered severe income losses due to lower grain prices of the last few years; and WHEREAS costs of production continue to climb each year; and WHEREAS costs of harvesting the 1968 crop were unreasonably high due to wet conditions; and WHEREAS the prices of 1968 grains are very low due to its poor quality and moisture conditions; THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of entering into a cost sharing agreement with the Government of Canada to provide financial assistance to grain producers to cover costs of grain drying.

Now Mr. Speaker, I think that is the proper approach to the question, or to the problem, and I for the life of me can't see why we would be wasting our time here talking about Address for Papers with such an important problem before us.

I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the price of wheat has dropped by some 18 cents a bushel, regardless of the condition or the quality of the price of wheat, under the arrangements of our present International Wheat Agreement. The price has been further reduced this year because of the fact that the quality of our grain is much lower than it normally is and because of the fact that it is in a wet or a damp condition. These are serious handicaps that the grain producers of Manitoba are faced with in this year's or last year's operation. They still have the problem before them this year.

The \$600.00 advance payments that were provided for the purpose - provided incidentally by the Federal Government - the \$600.00 cash advances, that is below \$600.00, is not going to deal with the problem adequately because if you take into account, Mr. Speaker, that \$600.00 is not a great deal of money if one is faced with the possibility of spending thousands of dollars in a drying of grain process. It costs around 10 to 20 cents a bushel to dry grain. I don't know how they ever arrived at \$600.00. I just for the life of me can't understand, and maybe there is something to this point, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps it's because the Liberal Party has not had representation on the prairies for so long that it doesn't really know how to cope with the prairie problems as they arise. Maybe that is the reason why they come up with such a - in my opinion - ineffective scheme to deal with the problem.

It means, Mr. Speaker, that before one can get \$600.00 one would have to have 1,000 acres of production, but if one had 1,000 acres of production, Mr. Speaker, one could not do very much with \$600.00 in the drying of that production, or that amount of production. So, really, we have failed; the Federal Government, Mr. Speaker, has failed to deal with the problem and the Provincial Government has failed to remind the Federal Government or to approach the Federal Government in a positive way in trying to deal with the problem. I think we are quite certain on our side of this House that there are going to be millions of dollars lost on the prairies before summer comes, through the spoilage of grain that should have been dried but was not because of either shortage of cash in the pockets of farmers or the lack of facilities. And this is something that should have been dealt with immediately last fall. There should have been provision to provide farmers with direct financial assistance to cover the cost of the drying of grain.

Now I say to the Premier, although he's not here, that he had made a trip to Ottawa, that he has failed Manitoba farmers by not raising the question of what to do with the plight of the grain producers in Manitoba.

I don't hesitate to add, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier, by some coincidence, did not hesitate to send his Minister to Vancouver over a situation of lack of movement of grain from the prairies whereby we had some 20-odd ships waiting for grain that wasn't at the Vancouver port, but in fact the truth of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that none of Manitoba's grain moves into the port of Vancouver, and just what the Minister was trying to accomplish there I'm somewhat puzzled. Maybe, by coincidence, the fact that we had the by-elections on at the time prompted the government to move in that direction.

We are dealing with demurrage charges, Mr. Speaker, that may amount to a fraction of a penny per bushel, or a very small fraction, Mr. Speaker. Now I know it's important and I think there were some people in the federal authority in the Wheat Board who were perhaps

(MR. USKIW cont'd.): . . . . somewhat negligent in the movement of that grain, but really, to take issue on such a grand scale on the part of the government at that time was really throwing a smoke screen before the producers of Manitoba in that they were in fact dodging the real problem, and that was the problem of how to deal with the question of low prices and, added to that, the problem of the cost of drying the grain in Manitoba. That was the real problem, Mr. Speaker. The Premier should have been in Ottawa negotiating some sort of agreement by which we would have assisted our producers to cope with this problem. I say a plague on both your houses, Mr. Speaker. You have failed rural Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, earlier I had planned on speaking on the following resolution. I'm not sure whether that will be coming forward this afternoon or not. However, I might as well say what I have to say on the matter at this point.

To me, it seems that a different angle should be worked on and should have been worked on in order to get the grain dried. I feel that the answer lies and many farmers delivered dry grain, because this in my opinion would solve the problem. He would then be able to sell, he would get the money, he would have the finances wherewithal to dry the grain and no prodding would be necessary. I'm sure the farmers would be quite willing to dry their grain if they knew that they could deliver. I think our granaries probably would be empty by now. We probably wouldn't have any wet grain on hand if they had only been able to deliver. This is where the crux is. Then, when you look at the stocks that we have, especially at the Lakehead, we find that a year ago we had 60 million bushels of wheat stored at the Lakehead. What's the situation today? Only 31 million. So that you have almost half of your facilities at the Lakehead for the storage of wheat empty. Why aren't they being filled? There's still lots of dry grain in the west, Manitoba and the other provinces, that farmers would only be too happy to deliver, and I'm sure they would then also dry their wet grain so that they could deliver. Why is this wheat not being taken? Why are the facilities not being used? I think this is where we should prod these people to reply and to answer for. There's no reason why these facilities should be empty, when the farmers are crying to be able to sell grain, and this is very wrong indeed in my opinion, Mr. Speaker.

When I take a look at both the Orders for Return here, for Papers, I just wonder whether to ask for Papers between the two heads of government, whether this is sufficient; whether it should not include the top officials of the Canadian Wheat Board and the Board of Grain Commissioners so that we would be able to get more information. I'm sure these people have the information, and why not get it direct and much faster. I feel that we should have a committee of this House appointed and hear the people, because the Wheat Board just isn't a city, that the officials live in the city. Why not have them come to a committee and get all the facts and get them in a hurry and get some action. I think this is what we should be doing and not dilly-dallying around and not getting anything done. So, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the answer is not in supplying money for drying grain; I think the answer lies in getting the grain to move so the farmers can deliver the grain and the other things will take care of themselves.

MR. CAMPBELL: May I ask the Honourable Member for Rhineland a question?

MR. FROESE: Yes, if I can answer.

MR. CAMPBELL: Did the honourable member say that space is available to take in the dry grain?

MR. FROESE: This is the report that I have, that the facilities are only half being used.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. WALLY McKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, no doubt I'm the one that's maybe labelled as bringing this message into the House, having seconded the Speech of His Honour and mentioned the problems of damp grain. I'm wondering — there is another concern now that has been brought to my attention, Mr. Speaker, that all of a sudden the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains has become the expert in my constituency. All of a sudden, Mr. Speaker, isn't that most interesting? He's not an expert in his own; he's not an expert in his own but he knows, he's talking about my constituency, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PAULLEY: He knows the problems of both.

MR. McKENZIE: I doubt that very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sure I can count on the Honourable Member for Roblin to come back to the item under discussion.

MR. McKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To get back to the Orders of the Day and the

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd.): . . . . proposed motion by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye who, in his humble address, he mentions the fact, praying for copies of all correspondence between the Manitoba Government and the Government of Canada, and I'm wondering why that word "Government of Canada" was included in that particular item, Mr. Speaker. Why was it not "The Canadian Wheat Board" or why was it not this group that has just been newly formed, the Canada Grain Council? These are supposedly the experts now that are going to have all the answers, and I'm kind of left high and dry and I'm sure the people in my constituency are quite concerned about the wording of this particular resolution.

The other thing that concerns me this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, is why the Wheat Board in their deliberations have the authority to speak for the three western provinces, who basically are the only ones that are concerned in this matter. This is something that I have not been able to justify.

Then the other thing that concerns me is how come the Honourable Member for Gladstone got into the debate when he's not a farmer. — (Interjection) — If you'll permit me, Mr. Speaker, I would maybe anticipate that that was a leadership speech that he was putting across here this afternoon, and yet, and yet Mr. Speaker, I can't say that it could be a leadership speech for that party because he hasn't got an NDP card in his pocket. I don't think he has. I don't think he has and yet, to be a leader of the Liberal party today you have to carry an NDP card in your pocket. At least this is the experience out in Saskatchewan and Ottawa, and now I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, this party over here have two leaders, so they've got one to spare and I — you know, it just doesn't all add to me. It looks like it's dirty pool, and I just wonder how concerned the members opposite are about the problems of wheat today because I haven't heard anything, as I heard the debate here in the last few minutes, that really gave me any meat for the subject of the problems of wheat.

MR. FROESE: . . . concern. I think I showed real concern and I think I gave you a solution as to what should be done.

MR. McKENZIE: I thank the Honourable Member from Rhineland for his consideration and his judgment in the matter, but this is one that the Premier and the government of this province has been trying to resolve, Mr. Speaker, and don't let anybody kid you that it's going to be solved overnight. It's one of the very difficult problems that we face in Canada today, where all of a sudden a factor, which is basically weather, and weather has done some terrible things in this province — and in the other provinces. We are sitting here today, day after day, wondering what the elements of weather are going to do with the water factor. We could be faced with a flood, and it's an unknown factor. I hear the message of driers being brought across this afternoon in the debate, and I don't think that driers are actually that important because why should we get the farmer involved with another addition to his farm operation, expensive, costly? If he dries the grain, if the Honourable Member from Gladstone would understand, if he dries the grain what's he going to do with it? He can't sell it — (Interjection) — Well if you can't sell it why dry it? Because the Wheat Board — (Interjection) — then let's move onto the philosophy . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I notice the remarks of the Honourable Member for Roblin are quite provocative but at the same time I would appeal to the honourable members to allow him to have his say.

MR. McKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, thank you. Then we move into the great story of the empty ship in Vancouver. Now, was the honourable member of the New Democratic Party out there?

MR. PAULLEY: I didn't have to go. I knew what the situation was and didn't have to involve any expense to get out there.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if, from now on, if the remarks could be addressed to the Chair, by everyone?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I answer the question that was directed to my by the Honourable Member for Roblin. My honourable friend asked me if I knew of the empty ships out . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I didn't hear the Honourable Member from Roblin giving the floor.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, there were so many voices coming across I wasn't able to discern one from the other and unfortunately I didn't hear the speaker, the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Did you ask me a question about the empty ships and why didn't I go out to the west coast? You did? Then may I answer?

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if the honourable gentlemen would assist me to control the debate of the House. The Honourable member for Roblin has the floor. I didn't hear him release it to the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party and until he does, I think he should be allowed to continue.

MR. PAULLEY: The only point, Mr. Speaker, if I may; I understood the honourable member asked me a question and I would like to accommodate my honourable friend by answering if it is his desire.

MR. McKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The question I asked, Mr. Speaker, was: was he there?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend the member for Roblin, speaking in connection with the empty ships at Vancouver, the west coast, asked me if I was there in order to obtain the knowledge as to whether or not they were empty. My reply to my honourable friend was, without going to Vancouver at personal or public expense I knew that there were empty ships at Vancouver because they couldn't get filled with the type of grain that was needed at that particular time. That is my answer. I am sure I could elaborate on that by suggesting that the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture apparently wasn't informed as to the reason of the empty ships and he went out there to see.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. McKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I guess that he read the same article as I read and that was that our Minister was there. I anticipate. But nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, here is the problem today in our society where I think we are three western provinces who are sitting here with a minority of population, many problems, and we are never going to have the "just society" that the Great Trudeau said we were going to have. In fact, I don't think he understands what the word "just society" means. I'm most grateful, Mr. Speaker, that we have a Minister of Agriculture who recognizes that there are problems in this country today. There are empty ships.

MR. SPEAKER: . . . . the honourable members. I regret I must continually interfere but I must remind the honourable member from Roblin that I do believe he has strayed away from the subject at hand and I wonder if he would come back.

MR. McKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Possibly your interpretation of this resolution and mine may be different, Mr. Speaker, but all I am trying to impress upon the House this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that we have a Minister of Agriculture who is working around the clock and we have a premier and we have a front bench that has these problems right on their desks and I can assure, if we get behind this group we'll resolve this wheat problem on one condition - on one condition, Mr. Speaker, on one condition - that we get the cooperation from the Wheat Board that I think we should deserve and we get the cooperation from this new Task Force out of Ottawa which is known as the Canada Grains Council, and if they will come up with the things that they are supposed to do, I am sure we will resolve this problem of the damp grain.

MR. CHERNIACK: Would the Member permit a question? Does he consider that the two organizations last named will deal with the damp grain and dry it, so that it can be sold?

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, that's a loaded question, isn't it? I still -- I would like to go back to one of the last statements of my remarks that the Minister of Agriculture, our premier and our government, if we can get the cooperation and the real concern about these issues from this group here, which is known as the Canada Grains Council, and the Wheat Board that we deserve, and we can debate here all day, Mr. Speaker. We could debate here for a month about the Canadian Wheat Board and it's a long story and there isn't time for this House to deal with this subject, but I would suggest to this House that let's get behind this Minister and let's get behind our premier and this government, and with the cooperation from the Wheat Board and the Canada Grains Council that I think we deserve, we will solve most of these problems of the wet and damp grain.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . a supplementary question, if I may? Does the honourable member suggest that the Minister of Agriculture and the First Minister are going to dry the grain?

MR. McKENZIE: I think the driers will dry the grain, Mr. Speaker, or the wind or the weather. I don't think the Minister has the time.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, I am flabbergasted by the remarks of the last

(MR. GUTTORMSON cont'd.): . . . . speaker who suggests that the farmer should let the grain rot. The farming communities in Western Canada have it tough enough without a member suggesting that they should just let the grain rot rather than dry it and hope for a sale, and to chastise the members on this side who have spoken, who are anxious to get the grain sold, because he feels just let it rot because there isn't immediate sale for it is just ridiculous, and to chastise the member for Gladstone because he isn't a farmer, I suggest to him that he isn't a farmer either and there are a lot of members in this House who represent rural constituencies — (Interjection) — I'm not — so the member talks about being loaded — I suggest to him that maybe he shouldn't be some time then he wouldn't make these asinine remarks.

MR. MCKENZIE: I don't respect that last remark, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I don't think the honourable member would wish to infer what the Honourable Member for Roblin has taken from these remarks, and I wonder if he would withdraw them.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, would you please tell me what I said that was improper, please.

MR. SPEAKER: I think the implication was obvious, and I would ask the honourable members to assist me at all times possible to try and maintain the dignity of this House, as it was in the past and as I hope it will be in the future. There is no question in my mind as to what was imputed. The Honourable Member Member for Ethelbert Plains.

MR. KAWCHUK: Maybe the Minister of Agriculture wants to say something first.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains. Do you wish to take the floor?

MR. KAWCHUK: Yes, thank you kindly, Mr. Speaker. I wasn't going to participate in this debate at this point. However, in view of the fact that there have been certain remarks made by the Honourable Member for Roblin, I can't help but rise to my feet and make a few comments. In the first place, I would like to point out to my honourable member if he and his other colleagues in the caucus of the government side had taken this problem very seriously when it should have been taken seriously last fall, by now they would have had some constructive programs and proposals to submit and carry out programs which would enable the farmers of this province to dry their grain, and for the honourable member to stand in this House and say, "Why dry because you can't sell it?" is an insult to the intelligence of our rural people. When we have today two-thirds of the world's population going to bed hungry and my honourable friend has the gumption to get up in this House and say, "Why dry it because we can't sell it?" Mr. Speaker, you know as well as I do that the farmers had incurred tremendous production expenses in producing this grain and now they have it harvested under very extreme and adverse weather conditions, and it should be the responsibility both of this government and the government down east in Ottawa, to assist in all forms by financial assistance to provide driers which would enable us to dry this grain and store it so that it would be available when we could move this grain.

I would just like also to say at this time that the government, because of its lack and failure of bringing about concrete proposals and programs is now playing pussyfoot with the whole issue, while there is grain sitting in all areas, and including my area and including the area which the Honourable Member for Roblin has the privilege to represent, as well as your area and The Pas area which I mentioned earlier. The people are vitally concerned and awaiting a program to be announced by this government which would help to dry this grain.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, this is anything but a dry subject. I think probably I should make a few remarks at this time. I had not intended to speak on this Order for Return. I had intended to speak probably next week when I got a further report from the Canadian Wheat Board on the situation as they see it in the province of Manitoba at this time, and in Saskatchewan and Alberta. But in view of the remarks that have been made this afternoon by some of my honourable friends, I think probably that I should say something now and I think I should start off by referring back to earlier, or later in 1968, Mr. Speaker, back to November 26th, when the Canadian Wheat Board held a press conference in Winnipeg and at that time indicated what the situation would be in the three prairie provinces as they saw it through the balance of 1968 and through 1969, and at that time, members will recall that they estimated that there would be something like 350 million bushels of tough, mostly damp grain in the three prairie provinces, and that they would only be able to take and to handle through the drying facilities at the terminals from 100-150 million bushels of damp grain. At that time it was forcefully



(MR. WATT cont'd.): . . . . brought forth to the provinces that the provinces would be responsible for the drying of the balance of this enormous bulk of damp grain.

Subsequently, on December 2nd of 1968 a meeting was held in my office, a meeting that was attended by representatives from all the grain companies and our Department of Agriculture, and at that time a committee was set up which was headed and which was announced at that time, I should say to my honourable friend from Gladstone if he wasn't aware of it, and it was well announced that a committee was set up under the chairmanship of Mr. Ed. Hudek, our head engineer of the Department of Agriculture. There were meetings held that same day throughout the province where the Department Extension Services, ag. reps and what have you, were called together to discuss a program that we would set into motion in order to encourage farmers to dry their grain, to bring it to their attention that grain must be dried and to co-ordinate wherever possible the total of our grain-drying equipment in the province of Manitoba. An assessment at that time was made of the total grain-drying equipment and it was believed at that time, and I still believe it now, that equipment was available in the province of Manitoba in the hands of the farmers and commercial people that would dry our grain before it rotted in the spring. And I say again that I believe that this will happen.

Through the winter we have been holding meetings throughout the province. There has been repeated publications on how to handle grain driers. There has been advice gone out through all the ag rep offices exactly where grain driers were in the province and where drying equipment might be available to farmers who wanted to have their grain dried on a commercial basis. And I think that the program has worked well in the face of the problems that have existed, and I name specifically two problems. In the first place, up until the end of 1968 a great many of our farmers believed that the Canadian Wheat Board and the grain companies would take the damp grain off their hands and take it to the lakes heads and dry it. By Christmas time and by the end of the year, I believe many farmers were convinced by that time that this would not happen. If they did not know it then they know it now, and as you are all aware of course, Mr. Speaker, through the month of January a great many driers were idle, and I don't blame farmers through that month for not wanting to go out and dry grain in weather all the way from 25 to 35 and 40 below zero -- it isn't the easiest work, and it's expensive. But since that time, Mr. Speaker, the grain drying operation has accelerated, but I want to point out to you figures that I have from the Canadian Wheat Board, their last survey of the situation. As of January 1969, January 31st, we had in the Province of Manitoba, according to the estimates of the Canadian Wheat Board, dried about 12 million bushels. At that time, as of January 31st, they estimated that there would still be nine million bushels, or in excess of nine million bushels to be picked up under the three - bushel quota, and at that time they estimated that the balance would be a total of 33 million bushels, or in effect as of January 31, 1969, approximately 42 million bushels, their survey at that time.

At that time, they also made a survey of which we were aware through our own committee at that time, of the number of driers in Manitoba, the number of driers that were in operation, and a comparison with the other provinces, and I want to point out to my honourable member for Gladstone - he apparently is not in the House, I'm sorry - that on a comparative basis as of January 31st, in spite of the fact that he has said that this government has sat and done nothing while Saskatchewan has moved forward, I want to point out to him that I have also been in touch with the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. McFarlane from Saskatchewan, from time to time and I've also been in discussion with Mr. Olson, the Federal Minister in Ottawa, and we are quite aware of what is going on in our respective provinces, and I point out to you at this time that as of January 31st, that out of the 734 driers that were in existence in Manitoba at that time, that 259 of our driers were in operation. In Saskatchewan they had 1,330 driers in the province at that time and they had 456 in operation; and in the Province of Alberta where they have 1,016 driers as of January 31st, they had 90 driers in operation, and down the line percentage-wise in respect of our tough and damp grain, as of January 31st the percentage of grain, of tough and damp grain in the province percentage-wise, we had more grain dried than any other province. I just point this out for my honourable friend if he really believes that this province has done nothing.

I discussed this matter the day before yesterday with Doug. McFarlane of Saskatchewan. Their operation is almost exactly the same in Saskatchewan as it is here insofar as assistance is concerned or direction to the farmers. Their committee was set up, I believe, a few days after ours was set up and I believe it was patterned

(MR. WATT cont'd.): . . . . almost exactly the way that we set ours up. I met with Mr. Olson at Brandon on December 4th, two days after our committee had been set up, and Mr. Olson pointed out to me that he had been in Saskatchewan and that Mr. McFarlane was establishing a committee and the direction of the grain drying in their province almost precisely on the basis that I had set out to him that day in Brandon.

Now, a great deal has been said, Mr. Speaker, about the government of Manitoba and the Federal Government participating financially in the cost of drying grain, and it might be of interest to members in the House, Mr. Speaker, to know that in a survey taken by the Canadian Wheat Board as of January 31, 1969, a survey in excess of 2,000 farmers across the three prairie provinces, a survey that asked why they were not drying their grain, 10 percent said it was because of lack of cash. Those are interesting figures, Mr. Speaker. I'm not taking them out of my head. I'm taking them from a survey of the Canadian Wheat Board to the Elevator Associations in the three prairie provinces.

I thought I should mention these figures, Mr. Speaker; they're of interest. There's a list of reasons: a too-cold; no reason given; no driers in the area - 212 out of the 2,000 said no driers in the area; too expensive, 194 - that is where we get the figure of, or the percentage in respect of the cost; 137 out of the 2,000 hope to haul for feed. I assume that's selling direct to the feed mills. Farmers not interested in drying amounted to 100; 87 had no damp grain; drier owners not interested in custom work, 60 out of the 2,000; and so on. But the majority of those that replied that had not dried grain were for reasons of cold weather or they were waiting in the hopes that they might get it shipped out, and so forth. December 7th . . . .

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would mind making available to the members of the House that survey to which he is referring. In view of the fact he's reading from it, would he make it available to us?

MR. WATT: I'm reading, actually I'm taking my figures off a report from the Canadian Wheat Board and I would have to confer with the Wheat Board before I could table the report.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the rule of the House is that when a member reads from a report in the House that the House is entitled to obtain copies of that report, and I would ask that the Minister table the report from which he is reading.

MR. WATT: I'm reading some excerpts from the report.

MR. MOLGAT: You're not reading all -- well then, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister to table these excerpts from the report from which he is reading.

MR. WATT: I'm quite prepared to table it with the permission of the Canadian Wheat Board.

MR. MOLGAT: You're reading it. Did you get permission to read it?

MR. WATT: I'm reading figures.

MR. MOLGAT: If the Minister is reading from the report, then the House is entitled to have the report.

MR. WATT: I have here figures from our own department, from our own assessment of the situation as of now.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order if I may, I would like to have this matter clarified because I think it is important. I think the House is entitled to have this report if the Minister is reading from it and I would like to make it clear now that I am asking specifically for the tabling of that report.

MR. SPEAKER: I understood the Honourable the Minister to say, in reply to the Leader of the Opposition, that he was reading from excerpts from a report, and that he did continue to say, at least I heard him say that he was prepared to set up the scale that he was speaking from and give copies?

MR. WATT: Well, I'm quite prepared to check with the Canadian Wheat Board and table the report. I've no objections myself to tabling the report - no.

Now further to our own estimates of the situation as we see it now, Mr. Speaker, as I said a moment ago at the outset of my remarks that there would be, we expect a further report from the Canadian Wheat by March 12th, but there has been evidence that the rate of drying has speeded up in the past month. A rough estimate would say that 20 million bushels have now been dried and that this would leave approximately 25 million bushels to be dried, and not counting the nine million bushels that is yet or was to have been listed as of the 31st of January on a three-bushel quota. Now, I haven't got figures on what percent of that nine million bushels has been moved out but I understand that a considerable portion has. But in effect, as of now, and

(MR. WATT cont'd.): . . . . assuming that the three-bushel quota of damp wheat would be moved, we would have as of roughly today about 25 million bushels to be dried.

I think those are the only figures that I can give to honourable members today, Mr. Speaker. I just want to make a few remarks in reply to those members who have raised the question in regard to the trip that I made out to the west coast, and I want to say to you that the reason that I went to the west coast with my Deputy Minister, Dr. Cormack, was to find out for ourselves if there was anything in the rumours that were circulating at that time. The Honourable Leader of the NDP Party apparently says he was perfectly aware of the situation before we even went to the coast. But I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, or through you, Mr. Speaker, to honourable members of the House, that I do not consider that it was a waste of time to go to the west coast or a waste of the money that it took for our plane fare and hotel rooms, because in the two days that we spent at the coast, Mr. Speaker, we found the conditions were considerably worse than the rumours that we had heard before we left Winnipeg.

And I think I should say, Mr. Speaker, that what ensued following our trip to the coast very well speaks for itself. I do not think that I need to stand and debate the issue here with anyone because, as you will recall, the question came out in the press and on radio and television for several weeks before finally those who were in authority, those who had been authorized to handle or who had delegated the authority to handle our coarse grains and wheat in Western Canada, finally then went to the coast. And when they returned from the coast their story was exactly the same as mine, and it seemed to me, Mr. Speaker, that they were not aware of exactly what the situation was at the coast or how it affected Manitoba or Western Canada until they went to find out for themselves. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that we are attaching no particular blame to no particular area of authority. Insofar as I'm concerned, my responsibility as Minister of Agriculture was in the interests of the farmers of Manitoba to find out if there were problems and if there was obstruction anywhere in the movement and the sale of western Canada wheat, and what applies in Alberta or Manitoba or Saskatchewan applies to the three prairie provinces. I say, Mr. Speaker, that when you take a pail of water out of a trough it doesn't leave a hole in one end. We are one pool insofar as cereal grains are concerned, and the costs of handling and the consequences of whatever may occur in the movement or the sale of our grain applies to my farm exactly the same as it applies to Doug McFarlane's in Saskatchewan or Henry Rusty in Alberta.

And so I take no back seat from anyone on the trip that we made to the coast. I believe it was in the interests of the farmers of the Province of Manitoba, and I think that it drew forcefully to the attention of those in authority that there were problems that needed to be resolved. I think, Mr. Speaker, that that is all that I have to or need to say on this issue this afternoon. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. EDWARD L. DOW (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I am not a farmer. Maybe I'm not qualified to speak on damp grain, but there is a concern of mine, that as reported to me on occasions yesterday, and particularly from one particular shipping point, that we -- primarily we have in the debate today criticized the Wheat Board, we criticized the governments and so on, but there's one output that -- the point that I wish to bring out, Mr. Speaker, and relay this to the Minister of Agriculture, that the Wheat Board have allowed a 3-bushel quota for damp grains, and in this one particular point -- a large point -- the farmers can't get the damp grain in. So, they're in between two fires here. What will we do? Try and organize to dry it to save the grain or try and get it into the elevators? Now, my understanding is that the Wheat Board have issued the quota allotment to the elevators but the railways are not supplying cars. Now, this is a big point. The honourable minister mentioned that something like, I think he said 25 million in the province on a 3-bushel quota. So help me, Sir, this is not going to help us to issue the quota if we don't get it into railway cars to the driers in the next six weeks. Mr. Speaker, probably my honourable friend misunderstood me. I said, as of January 31st there would be approximately three million bushels still to be picked up on the 3-bushel quota, but after that nine million bushels is moved out, if and when it is -- the 3-bushel quota -- as of today it would still leave us approximately 25 million bushels of damp wheat to dry.

MR. DOW: Mr. Speaker, I may be wrong in the figures and it doesn't really matter whether it's 25 million, 3 million or 10 million, but my point is that the quota is over for damp grain; the railway companies are not supplying cars to elevators to get it out. I don't care how many bushels it is.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, in that connection I wonder if I could ask the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture if he could give us some further indication of the size of the problem by relating that 25 million bushels approximately that he said still remained to be dried to the drying capacity of the driers that are here. How much can be dried by those driers, supposing they worked diligently from now on, and how long will it take to complete the job?

MR. WATT: The total drying capacity that we have in the province right now, the 734 driers that I mentioned earlier, will dry almost a million bushels per day.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, it's been frequently said in Canada that one of our problems is one of communication and it seems to me in this whole question of the damp and wet grain that has been one of the difficulties, that too much time has been spent in saying it's so and so's responsibility or someone else should be looking after it, rather than really getting all together. We have, for example, today the member for Brokenhead who gave us a fairly lengthy oration as to how the matter was not going to be settled by an address for papers. I don't think anyone suggested it would be settled by an address for papers but in any case there was obviously a lack of communication within his own party because his own party leader, on the very next address for papers, is asking for the same information as the one that we're discussing now, and for that member to be giving us a long story as to why we should not be asking for the information when his own party is asking for the same, leads me to believe that he was really more interested in discussing his own resolution and may be annoyed at the fact that a debate has occurred before, and I don't think that will settle the issue.

MR. USKIW: May I ask the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition a question? Is he not aware that there is a difference between asking for papers and not debating them and asking for papers and having them debated.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, the point is that my honourable friend, and his own party, are asking for the identical information that we are.

MR. USKIW: Not debating them, though.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, it hasn't been debated yet but there's every indication that it will be debated. The Member for Roblin constituency gave us also a lengthy oration as to why we should be getting the Wheat Board involved and the Grain Council involved. Certainly, I'm quite pleased to get them involved in the thing. I'm rather surprised, though, that my honourable friends this year should be so interested in getting the Wheat Board involved because last year, when there was another resolution introduced by his colleague, the Member for Virden, on the subject of grain as well, and the method of payment, when that was amended to read: "that the committee on agriculture be instructed to invite representatives of the Canadian Wheat Board to meet with the members of the committee to discuss and consider the question of the Canadian Wheat Board operations in general, and in particular the administration of the wheat and oats and barley pools and the time of payment," when that was proposed that we should ask them to come and meet with the members of the House, who voted against it, Mr. Chairman? The Member for Roblin, along with all the members on the far side of the House. When there was an attempt to have communication with the Wheat Board. Last year we try and get communication with them, my honourable friends vote against it; this year, the Member for Roblin gets up and says, "They're the people who are to blame." Mr. Speaker, that's where this problem of damp grain unfortunately has got into, that everyone is blaming everyone else for the problem.

Now, the problem is caused by weather. It's not caused by Ottawa nor is it caused by this government, but the problem is serious because at the end of the year, on the survey the Canadian Wheat Board undertook at that time, there was something like 90 million bushels of damp and wet grain in Manitoba, and we were the worst off of all the provinces in the west, not in total amount, because we are not as big producers as they are, but the worst off percentage-wise. We are the province that had the worst harvesting conditions and therefore from the standpoint of the relationship of the amount of damp grain to the total production, we were in very serious condition. The time to take action, it seemed to me, Mr. Speaker, was back early last fall.

Now, people will say, well, why should government be involved in what is basically the farmer's problem? If a farmer's got wet grain, that's his problem. Some people say that. Well, the facts are -- my honourable friend makes a comment about Trudeau. I'm glad he brings that up, because if my honourable friend would go and research what was said by Mr.

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.): . . . . Trudeau on that occasion, he will find out that the total statement was a reasonable statement of policy. My honourable friend wants to refer to the first sentence. I refer him to the whole of the statement and I will be glad to supply it to him.

Let's come back to the question at hand - wet grain. There is a logical reason for governments to be involved in the problem of wet grain. Grain being as important an aspect to our economy as it is, when we are dealing with a situation where we have something in Manitoba like 90 million bushels of damp and wet grain, it does take on the nature of an emergency problem. You might almost say a national disaster. After all, when we've been faced with problems, for example, like flooding in the Red River Valley and in other parts of Manitoba, or the hurricane or tornado that occurred in the constituency of my honourable friend, the Member for Pembina, the government accepted that it had a responsibility because it was something beyond the capacity of the individual. When we are faced in Manitoba with a situation that's something like 90 million bushels of damp and wet grain, this, Mr. Speaker, is a potential tremendous loss to our economy. Were all of this grain to be lost, it would mean something in the order of what? \$125 million to \$150 million that our economy had lost. Therefore, there is a sound and sensible reason for government to be involved.

Now, the involvement cannot be by one level of government alone, admittedly. The federal Government has a responsibility in this area, but quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the initiative must come from the Provincial Government, because they are the people on the scene; they are the people who are here and who are best able to judge the seriousness of the situation, how widespread it is, and what action can be taken locally; and when we hear from the Minister that at the end of January 734 driers were located in Manitoba but only 259 were in operation, it isn't a satisfactory situation, Mr. Speaker. The Minister can say, well, it's up to the farmers themselves to take action; and basically it is, but it's also up to the government to give leadership and to get the action taken if for some other reasons the farmers themselves don't move. The Minister says, well, you know, really we're in a better shape than the other provinces because percentage-wise we've dried more grain than any other province. But that doesn't answer the problem, Mr. Speaker, because percentage-wise we were in worse shape than the other provinces, and therefore there's all the more reason, obviously, for us to be better insofar as having grain dried because of that reason.

Now I'm pleased to hear from the Minister that we are now down to the point - and I trust his figures are accurate - of 25 million bushels still needing to be dried. We've been lucky, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker. We could have had a thaw in early February of some two weeks' duration, which has not been abnormal at all in western Canada, and that could have meant the total loss of a large amount of this grain. And while the first person who suffers from that loss obviously is the farmer who owns it, the total economy suffers as well, and if \$25 million of grain that was harvested isn't converted at some stage into a marketable product, then all of Manitoba suffers from it. Hence the government must take the leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not simply wanting to be critical here, but it appears to me that the government did not take the leadership early enough in this whole operation; that faced with this number of driers in our province, and the drying capacity that we have, there could have been more done on an emergency basis to get the things moving. It was done in previous years when problems of drought arose in the province. We've been lucky as it is; we've got a good deal of it dried, but there is still a critical period ahead of us, and this 25 million bushels must now be converted into dry grain before it's too late. Mr. Speaker, I appeal to the Minister not to pay attention to those who say it's someone else's fault and so on. Let's not worry about whose fault it is. Let's get tackling the problem right now and let's get everyone involved who can be involved, and if it means that from a provincial standpoint we must make a recommendation to Ottawa of participating in part of the cost of this, then let's make that approach. Let's get the other provinces to join with us and see if we can have a general Western Canadian stand and go to Ottawa with whatever the proposal is, but let's not wait for someone else to come and bail us out from our problems. Let's deal with them, take the initiative, and deal with what is undoubtedly the most serious agricultural problem in Manitoba at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: I take it it is the wish of the House that we move on to the next item on the Order Paper, or was it not the wish of the House that the Honourable Member for Hamiota be given an opportunity . . . . that was my understanding.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . . misunderstood the rule, Mr. Speaker. I thought, under the rules, if a member is not present then doesn't he lose his rights? I'm not sure.

MR. MOLGAT: I think it goes to him twice, does it not, Mr. Speaker? If he's not here to speak on it this time, once more and then...

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable members generally agreed to what I am suggesting some time ago. So we come to Page 2.

MR. FROESE: On a point of order, though, does this standing it over twice also apply after the resolution or order has been introduced on an earlier occasion?

MR. SPEAKER: I think the wisest answer to that is that we'll deal with each situation as it comes along. Page 2. Orders for Returns. The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I believe I have not yet moved it, so I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains, that an Order of the House do issue for a return showing.

1. The names, emoluments and terms of appointment for all current members of the Economic Consultative Board.

2. The annual budget and actual expenses of the Board for the last five fiscal periods.

3. The initial terms of reference of the Board.

4. The current terms of reference of the Board.

5. The number of meetings of the Board in each of the last five fiscal periods.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I would like the indulgence of the House to permit a slight amendment to this if possible. I would like to delete the word "current" in paragraph 1 and to add at the end of paragraph 1 the words "during the last five fiscal periods."

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I don't see any problem with that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: What's the specific change, Mr. Speaker?

MR. CHERNIACK: I would like to delete the word "current" in the first line of the first numbered paragraph, delete the word "current" and add at the end of that paragraph "during the last five fiscal periods." In other words I'm asking for the information...

MR. MOLGAT: No objections from our standpoint, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Rhineland? (Agreed)

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and members of the House. The reason for this change should be obvious, because in reading the Speech from the Throne one finds that there has been a change again in the structure of the board and it may well be for all we know that there are no current members of the board or that the current members are the members of the Cabinet that are members of the Planning and Priorities Committee. So that I asked permission, and I'm glad that I received it.

The reason for this Order for Return is that I feel there has been a gradual erosion in the attitude of the government to the necessity, and the advisability, of obtaining objective information and objective review of the activities of this government and of the progress, of the economic progress in this province. Some time ago I had occasion, actually it was on April 28th, 1967, to raise before this House the fact that the Manitoba Economic Consultative Board had prior to that time become emasculated by action of this government and when I drafted this Order for Return I did so because of the fears that I had. The Honourable the First Minister referred this morning to the fact that my Leader had mentioned that he had prepared part of his speech on the Throne Speech prior to reading the Throne Speech; I too prepared this Order for Return prior to reading the Throne Speech. But apparently I was quite right in foreseeing the trend that was taking place.

When I spoke on this matter on April 28, 1967, I referred to the fact that the Manitoba Economic Consultative Board was established in 1963 with purposes and objectives which were very meaningful. They were to advise the Manitoba Development Authority on programs and policies to achieve development of the province's economy, to examine the economic performance of the province, to seek agreement between various sectors of the economy to improve the economic performance, to study other matters which are under direct governmental control which may affect the growth and development of the economy and to report whether or not such projects involve government participation by the way of financial aid. What we found was that back in 1966, on July 13th, an Order-in-Council had been passed to reduce the powers, to reduce the powers and eliminate from those powers the purpose of advising the authority on programs and policies to achieve the development of the economy, to examine the economic performance of the province; they could no longer actually go into the economic performance

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) . . . . or to seek agreement with various sectors of the economy unless they were so specifically directed to do by the Manitoba Development Authority, which removed the independence of the Economic Consultative Board in planning its own program of activity and deciding what are the necessary features of the economy which should be gone into and on which recommendations were made. And of course they removed the effective possibility of objectively criticizing the government for its inaction in various fields. And we know that in the past the reports of the Economic Consultative Board were matters that were referred to in speeches in this House on many occasions, were matters that were used to point out to the government the way in which it ought to be dealing with problems and the way in which it was failing to do so. What the government has done in effect was to remove that very important research tool.

I know that it has brought in the TED organization but I have no real belief that the TED organization is doing what the Economic Consultative Board did do in this objectivity of study. We will be seeing the report apparently in due course and we will be able to examine it. But I do know now from reading the Throne Speech of this year that the Planning and Priorities Committee of the Cabinet now replaces the Manitoba Development Authority and the Manitoba Economic Consultative Board. So as far as I read it it means it's finished. This work which has been going on for five years is no longer going on under the same sort of structure which it had before, and for that reason I felt it was important for us in this House to know the extent and the volume of the efforts in the last five years of the Economic Consultative Board, to see what it cost and to see the amount of time it took and the people it involved and to see the extent to which there have been changes in the last five years to the present time. And I thought that by bringing these questions before us and getting the answers we would be able to better evaluate the extent to which this government has supported the work, or in fact permitted it to dwindle down to mere nothingness which is what I fear has happened.

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

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Wellington, Whereas the Provincial Sales Tax has imposed an unbearable burden on persons of income in the poverty level; Resolved that the government give consideration to the advisability of rebating estimated sales taxes received from income tax exempt individuals, based on their income tax returns filed.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion. The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: Since we debated the entire question of sales tax at great length when the Act was first introduced by the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer, there has always been recognition that the sales tax has imposed and is imposing a hardship on many people. It is hitting hard those who are least able to pay, and this recognition is not only I believe, unanimous in this House, and I know I have the temerity to speak for all members of this House because I believe that is so, not only in this House but generally recognized by all tax authorities, that a sales tax is a great hardship on many people in the lower income groups. To that extent it becomes a regressive tax. Because of the fact that we have all recognized the problem created for people in the low income bracket by a general sales tax, the government brought in certain exemptions originally in the Sales Tax Act and after a great deal of debate, discussion, argument, from all sides of the House and of course, especially from this side of the House, the government saw fit to extend the exemptions in certain respects, and today we have a sales tax which recognizing the hardships imposed attempts in some way to alleviate them. Still we find that there are debates year by year, and proposals that there be further exemptions to further alleviate the burden. These deal with specific hardships and attempt to cure the problem.

Mr. Speaker, the problem that we foresaw, and I think we all foresaw it, was that there should be some better approach in a more general way to this problem and to convert the tax into one which is more related to ability to pay. In looking back in Hansard I find that on February 13th, 1967, on Page 1020, when I was dealing with sales tax, I said the following: "Mr. Speaker, sales tax exemptions outlined by a government will not really resolve the basic problem of payment by those who are least able to contribute from their resources. Exemptions may be aimed at lessening regressiveness, but there are other methods which can and should be used to take care of those inequities. I think it is up to the Provincial Treasurer to make it

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) . . . . clear to us why he has not dealt with various methods that have been used to create a better balance in equities and to convert this tax into a more proportionate one." And I said that "there are various methods used to provide a rebate on sales tax, paid by individuals who suffer particular hardship thereby. These involve a calculation of rebate based not only on purchases, but also on family responsibility, on income or on net wealth." And subsequent to that, when the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer on March 28, 1967, was dealing with various comments that had been made on sales tax said on Page -- and I'm quoting from Page 2053, and I quote him. "On one general question, I've been asked to consider whether we would study the possibility of allowing people to claim their payments under sales tax against some other form of tax such as income tax. I notice that matter is discussed in the Carter Report. It's an idea. I'll keep my mind open to any idea. There seems to be logic in it; especially if it could be brought to bear with the progressive character of the income tax it would be a good idea. It would be administratively impossible at this stage," he said, "but I don't close my mind to it." So I assume that not having heard the Honourable the Minister of Finance speak since then on this particular point that he still has an open mind on it and I would like him to bring to our attention the attention which I hope he has given to the problem.

Now the Speech from the Throne does not indicate that any attention he has given to the problem has brought forth any fruit in respect of the problem but it is one which having been dealt with some two years ago we feel, in our Party, should be considered again. I've checked the Carter Report, and I don't propose to read the whole section dealing with this matter, but I would like to read some excerpts on it. The first paragraph on this section in the Carter Report which is Volume 5 Page 62 reads: "An alternative to the use of exemptions would be compensatory payments or allowances outside the sales tax structure. We considered whether such measures could be used to counter the regressiveness of a general sales tax with greater precision and administrative simplicity than would the use of exemptions. It is of interest that three States of the United States, Indiana, Colorado and Hawaii, now grant such credits; and the question that I pose now and possibly the Minister of Finance can answer it, is whether there are additional jurisdictions which have brought it in since the publication of the Carter Report. -- (Interjection) -- Well, he is not aware, he tells us, of any others. Of course there may be others and it may well be that in his capacity he is able to ascertain up to date information. It may also be of interest to know whether he has studied the administrative problems which have arisen in these jurisdictions where it does take place and familiarize himself with the benefits as compared with the costs involved in carrying out the proposal which we are making to the House today.

Carter then mentions several methods and then dealing with this one says: "there is a fourth alternative that is worthy of consideration. This would be to use the existing personal income tax machinery to allow individuals and families a credit for sales tax up to a certain specified amount, with a refund of sales tax paid if the credit exceeded the income tax liability. Such an approach would mean that everyone who wished to claim a credit or refund would have to file an income tax return." And he goes on to state, "that amongst other things, that the basic problems with this scheme would be administrative." Well, Mr. Speaker, the government has dealt with the administrative problems created by sales tax, they were great, they were onerous and I presume they still continue; but surely the government should now be ready to tackle this problem. What it means, of course, is that persons who are not income-taxable and who do not now file tax reports would be required to make application. I have no doubt that if in making application they would foresee that they would get a return of 8 or 10 or 15 dollars that they just wouldn't bother to prepare this income tax return or application for refund; however, it would be used. But to those people to whom it might mean \$100.00 return, it would be very much worthwhile to file them and to process them because that \$100.00 to that family or that taxpayer is a very, very important and large part of the money that he has with which he must provide for himself and his family, because he is obviously in the bracket which is so low that not paying income tax, he needs every penny for his daily need. And it seems to me that we've reached the stage where we can well afford to go into the administrative problems and tackle them and face up to them so that the sales tax that we now have will become less of a burden, or a hardship, on those who find it so difficult to exist today in our today's economy.

There is a report, I don't have the date of it, but it looks to me like it's a clipping from the Winnipeg Tribune, unfortunately I did not date it, but it deals with the report of the select



(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) . . . committee of the Ontario Legislature which recommended revised systems of taxation and collections by the Province of Ontario, and they were proposing a negative income tax in the province, and I read briefly from the clipping: "In one of its major findings the committee suggests that existing exemptions from retail sales taxes be eliminated but that the cost be allowed as a credit against income tax. This would establish a negative income tax in Ontario, which of course means that when a person is not taxable and is entitled to the credit, he would then receive a cheque back to him to make up to him a portion or all of the sales taxes which he has already paid in his daily routine. It would be the forerunner of a minimum income policy in the province." And the committee stated, "the province should be prepared to establish its own income tax administration if the Federal Government refuses to change its administration to permit such credits." Well, the Ontario Government has announced a tax policy, unfortunately I do not have the details of it. I would assume that it has not as yet brought in this feature. I notice that it has plans spread over some period of time and of course I think we were all interested to see that they're looking forward to imposing a capital gains tax, I think in about two years, which I think is interesting coming from a Conservative Government. -- (Interjection) -- Socialists. Well, they're called Conservatives but if they show certain socialist leanings, it is only an indication of the method in which all governments are finding their work progressing.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated, the Provincial Treasurer two years ago said that he had an open mind on it, would be prepared to look at it. I am, in speaking now, assuming that he did look at it, that he does have some information for us, the benefit of his thinking and also of his knowledge in research, and I would encourage support of this resolution so that we could provide a progressive taxation in the low income group in regard to sales tax. It is not a progressive tax in my opinion, in the higher brackets it is only - well, I mean it is only a progressive tax in the low income bracket, if indeed this type of resolution would be accepted and brought into the law dealing now with our sales tax imposition in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this resolution in principle and I feel that it will have the support of our group. I do feel though, Mr. Speaker, that by reason of the fact that a number of people do not file income tax returns as they are not required by law to file them if their income is below a certain figure, that it might be advisable in the interest of clarity to make a slight amendment to the resolution; and the amendment which I would propose would be to - and I so move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, "that the resolution be amended by deleting all the words following the words 'sales tax' as they appear in the fourth line thereof and substituting therefore the following: "paid by income tax exempt individuals." Now, the reason why I'm moving that resolution, Mr. Speaker, is because that if the sales tax is only going to be rebated on the basis of income tax returns filed, well, there are a number of people who are not required to file income tax returns and they would be deprived of the rebate.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre): I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the honourable member, may I ask that this matter stand?

MR. SPEAKER: May the honourable member have leave? Agreed. The Proposed Resolution of the Honourable Member for Burrows. The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan:

WHEREAS the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders has been instructed to review the proposed draft respecting the Protection of Consumers;

AND WHEREAS the sale of Hearing Aids is uncontrolled both as to qualification of salesmen to prescribe them, and as to the price and sales techniques;

BE IT RESOLVED that the said Standing Committee consider the advisability of regulating Hearing Aid Sales Methods.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** Mr. Speaker, the matter of the provision of hearing aids to people suffering a hearing defect is a matter of considerable concern, and it is in fact a matter of concern to the organizations to which the Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs made reference to the other day - the Consumers Association of Canada. It's unfortunate that he isn't in his seat at the moment, but he felt that this organization is very qualified and capable to speak on behalf of the consumers. So I would just like to very briefly outline to you, Mr. Speaker, what the Consumer's Association of Canada does have to say about the present method of selling and providing people with hearing aids. I'm referring to an article which appeared in the official organ of that organization, *The Canadian Consumer*, the very recent issue, the January-February issue of this year. The Consumer's Association of Canada said, and they quote Helen Keller that most remarkable woman who was both deaf and blind before she was two who said "I am just as deaf as I am blind. Deafness is a much worse misfortune for it means the loss of the most vital stimulant, the sound of the voice that brings language, sets thoughts astir and keeps us in the company of men."

The Consumers Association of Canada, Mr. Speaker, did conduct an inquiry into the hearing aid business and their committee reported as follows: That it was a revelation to find out just what being hard of hearing means in terms of frustration, loneliness and expense, and it became very evident that not only are the hard of hearing individuals themselves affected but also everyone with whom they associate, because other people, the members of the family, people with whom the hard of hearing work also suffered. And the Consumers Association of Canada, Mr. Speaker, found that of all persons who could benefit from a hearing aid only a comparatively few use them. They found in a national survey which they did that many of them were discouraged from using them by having had the experience or the misfortune of purchasing one which wasn't correct for them; many were scared off by exorbitant prices; many more were reluctant to admit that they needed aid because unfortunately there appears to be a stigma attached to being hard of hearing, and the committee found that, and as it reports, that one of the most startling conclusions from the CAC survey was that although prices for hearing aids ran from under \$100.00 to over \$800.00 the degree of individual satisfaction achieved bore no relation to the price of the aid. Then the committee concludes its report in saying, "that there appears no doubt that high pressure salesmanship and door to door salesmen are the most guilty parties in the business. These people prey on normal human sanity, shyness, and the fact that their victims often can't hear what they are saying clearly. Furthermore, in many cases salesmen are untrained in what is a very complex matter involving electronics and acoustics." And then the committee states that the question of costs of hearing aids is an important one. It boils down to the fact that like any other contemporary product it is possible to produce a basic useful efficient model that will serve most purposes. Now what the CAC found is that a basic model is required along with comprehensive, reliable facilities for audiology and speech therapy. And they conclude by recommending that rigid licensing should be enforced for persons involved in selling hearing aids. At the present time, Mr. Speaker, this we lack. And it's strange why we should lack some authority, some control or some form of policing the dispensing of hearing aids, some form of regulating the people qualified to dispense hearing aids. That we do not have at the present time. I suppose that if a hearing aid merchant is in need of salesmen he could hire just about anyone to sell hearing aids in much the same manner as a furniture or an automobile salesman may be hired.

Now there is another instrument or device which people use to correct human weaknesses. We use eyeglasses. And there is an Optometric Act - I've forgotten the exact title of it - but it is the piece of legislation that governs the activities of optometrists, and that Act sets out as to the manner in which a person could be provided with eyeglasses. In other words, there is some protection to the public. I go to a doctor or one trained to test my vision, my eyesight; he prescribes a certain type of lens for me and I obtain that type of lens. And this is done with the assistance of a person qualified and trained in that field of work. In the field of the provision of hearing aids there is no such protection whatsoever to the public, and it is for that reason, Mr. Speaker, that I move this resolution, to put it in the hands of the committee dealing with matters related to protection of consumers and let them study this matter and let the committee bring forth some recommendations which would in turn offer the public the form, the type of protection, of assistance which they deserve in the provision of this very very important and very necessary device to enable a person to enjoy life.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this resolution in principle and I hope that in so doing my words are not going to be construed as casting a reflection upon the honesty of any people who are engaged in the selling of hearing aids. But I do feel very strongly that one of the biggest problems that we have today, especially with children, is in determining the amount of the hearing loss and also in determining the best type of hearing aid that can be used for that particular loss. And I think that it would be worth the while of this House to refer this matter to this special committee so that we could hear representations from the people who are vitally interested in the subject, and so, too, that we perhaps can take proper steps to safeguard, or to be assured, that children and other people who are suffering a hearing loss or some other loss are being fitted with the right type of aid.

Now we have an Ophthalmic Dispensers' Act in Manitoba which deals with eyeglasses. The ophthalmic dispensers only furnish the eyeglasses on the prescription of an eye specialist or a doctor and to me it seems only natural and logical that the people who are furnishing hearing aids and other type of aids to individuals should at least furnish them on a prescription from someone who is qualified to determine the lack of hearing in that individual or whatever it might be and the type of aid that is best suited to meet the impairment of that individual. And for these reasons I do support this resolution and I hope that the House will also.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Carillon.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Emerson, that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan

WHEREAS the Legal Research Institute of the University of Manitoba has published a report on Privacy and Commercial Reporting Agencies;

RESOLVED that the recommendations in the Report be considered by the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders which shall report on same to this House.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

..... continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, the matter of commercial reporting agencies is one of increasing concern to the general public, what with the increased mobility of our population, more purchasing on credit and that sort of thing and greater use of reports of this type by employers, so I do feel that the time has come when we ought to take a look at the methods of operation of our reporting agencies.

The Legal Research Institute of the University of Manitoba did do a study on this matter. The committee I believe that studied this was headed by Professor Gibson from the Manitoba Law School and Mr. Sharp, and they did a very thorough and comprehensive study and they do put forth a number of recommendations which I feel that the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders should consider. They do point out that commercial reporting is of extreme importance and it is no doubt a service which we need, which could perform a very useful function in our present day way of life. But they do recommend that the commercial reporting profession should be regulated by means of some licensing regulation or legislation, and they also go on to recommend that arrangements by which customers of reporting agencies agree not to disclose the identity of the agency to the subject of a report should be prohibited, that the source of the information should be made available and that more publicity should be given to the existence and the function and the correction procedures of reporting agencies because from time to time information obtained is incorrect and the incorrect information so obtained could be damaging to the individual that such information is related to. The defense of qualified privilege should be extended to the commercial reporting professions much the same as to certain other classes of individuals in our courts. And this committee also recommends that reporting agencies should be required to notify the subjects of all reports that a report has been made and may be examined at the office of the agency. In other words, an individual upon whom they have a report should be notified of the fact that there is a report on you; if you wish to examine it it is available for your perusal. And they should also be required, when subjects insist, to forward to the recipients of the original report notice that the subject disputes certain items and the sources need not be disclosed unless the licensing authority so order. And this, again, to give the individual an opportunity to speak in his own defense, to give him an opportunity to see to it that there is no information contained therein that may be damaging to him by reason of being an untruth. The permission of the subject of course, should not be required before a report can be made. And their last recommendation is that disclosure of information to officials of a foreign government should be prohibited but disclosure to Canadian Government authorities should not be prohibited, at least until the question of creating a general law of privacy has been studied more thoroughly.

Now this, Mr. Speaker, is the report of one committee which has made a study of this matter. No doubt other people have opinions on this same topic and certainly their opinions should be heard and I as one member of the House would appreciate having the opportunity to hear their views and their opinions on the matter of commercial reporting. And for that reason, Mr. Speaker, we proposed this resolution, moved it in hope that it will be adopted to give it an opportunity to go to committee to hear representations both from the commercial reporting agencies and from all other persons in our society who are concerned with this matter.

MR. SPEAKER put the question.

MR. FRED T. KLYM (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Dufferin, debate be adjourned.

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

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

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

WHEREAS in the 1966 Legislative Session the Assembly unanimously approved a New Democratic resolution endorsing the principle of Compensation to Victims of crime and to persons injured in aiding a police officer, and referred the Resolution to a Legislative Committee for study,

AND WHEREAS by 1968 the Government has brought in legislation which only deals with the part of the Resolution respecting aid given by persons to police officers.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House severely criticizes the Government for its failure to have the Committee meet and deal with the recommendation effectively and to

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) . . . . bring in proposed legislation to assist many persons who have been and will be grievously injured by criminals without compensation for their suffering and financial loss.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, the language used in this resolution is pretty harsh. I prepared it before the last meeting of the Committee on Statutory Regulations whose responsibility it was to deal with this matter and I filed it in the expectation that there would be nothing done of an effective nature on this problem by the committee nor in the Throne Speech, and I was absolutely correct in my assessment. Therefore the only change that I would have wanted to have made to this resolution had I drawn it after the Throne Speech was to change the date mentioned from 1968 to 1969 so that it would be in its proper perspective and show that for three years this matter has been before this House and has not been dealt with effectively.

We have had occasion to deal with the neglect of the government in calling meetings or in carrying forward so that I don't intend to deal with that feeling that this has been explored. But I do bring to your attention the fact that this was a matter which was studied extensively by the spokesman for the government, the Honourable Member from Winnipeg Centre, reported on by him favourably, spoken to by several members of the Liberal Party, and unanimously accepted as being a matter worthy of consideration. And at that time -- and I assure you, Mr. Speaker, I now have a very voluminous file with material on this subject -- but I find that from the notes that I made quite some time ago, I was able to refer then to jurisdictions which had legislation, at that time, of this nature that is proposed in this resolution: Great Britain, New Zealand, Australia, California, New York, Ontario, Saskatchewan, and there may be more now - I think that Newfoundland has to be added to that but I'm not too certain at the moment.

Mr. Speaker, after some time the government produced a White Paper, Citizens' Remedies Code, which was presented to the legislature of Manitoba by Stewart E. McLean, the Provincial Secretary, December, 1966, and that dealt, as you know, with a number of matters of which a portion was on a consumers - I'm sorry - on compensations to victims of crime. I won't read it all, it covers almost two pages, but I will read excerpts because this is a White Paper, this is a statement of policy by this government and is dated December, 1966 - over two years ago. And it states in part, Section 16: "There appears a need to alleviate hardship which many crimes of violence are inflicting upon innocent people. Not only is there presently no compensation by the province, but action at civil law for damages against the wrongdoer who is likely in prison or untraceable is usually unsatisfactory for the complainant and frequently produces nothing but a substantial bill for costs". Paragraph 17: "The increase in crimes of violence in recent years has focused attention on this need. The government proposes to consider fulfilling it by the introduction of legislation establishing a scheme of compensation to victims of crime". Let us remember that last year the government did bring in a little, a little bill, which did establish that if a person comes to the aid of a police officer and is injured, he would be compensated in some way. And I said then, and I say now, that I have not been able to find any record of anybody who was injured in that way and I don't believe that any claim has been made in that respect. But I said then, it was fine, it was a step in that direction.

But in addition to that recommendation the White Paper, which was presented here to this House by the Provincial Secretary over two years ago states - 18: "It is proposed that a claim may be made by any person who sustains an injury after the commencement of the scheme, directly attributable to a criminal offense". It made other recommendations but this is specific. Then it describes the type of protections that society needs against abuse by claimants and the protections that would be considered. I don't want to belabour the record with that, but it does deal with various procedural matters as how it would be dealt with. And it states in conclusion Paragraph 27: "We are aware that the Manitoba Bar Association has interested itself in the problem of compensation to victims of crime and we will welcome the advice and assistance of the Bar Association and other interested groups and citizens in the preparation of a sound, fair and workable plan". This was presented to this legislature and the government took credit for being forward looking and recognizing the needs which have so long been left without any solution, or without any assistance, and says this is our White Paper, this is what this government stands for. Mr. Speaker, this government stands for very little if it cannot carry forward its own undertaking as expressed in this White Paper.

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd)

The Committee met after this White Paper was set up, the committee involved the Manitoba Bar Association as referred to in the White Paper. The government or the committee were successful in attracting as an interested party to this, a highly reputed person of the province - Mr. Justice Schultz, who agreed to head up a committee to study this problem. And I believe I'm correct in saying that Mr. Justice Schultz actually went to New Zealand, actually went to England and actually made a personal investigation and reported back to the committee and the committee dealt with it. The committee which consisted of, and I think one should read their names because they're entitled to the recognition, at least the small recognition that I can give, since I don't believe the government is prepared to give them the recognition of considering their report properly, is signed by the Chairman, Ivan Schultz, Q. C. ; A Montague Israels, Q. C. ; Arthur V. Morrow Q. C. ; Harry Walsh, Q. C. ; and Robert G. Smethurst, who I think is also now Q. C. , who acted as Secretary. These people gave a good deal of their time, and I'm sure they gave it willingly, and I'm sure that they felt that they were making a real contribution to progress in this province, and they did it at a certain amount of sacrifice, certainly inconvenience, and brought forward a report which is about 70 pages long and involved a great deal of research on their part, with recommendations, with very precise recommendations which follow a report on the whole problem and the whole survey and a recognition of the need. And they report on the investigation they made in other jurisdictions and what is being done and what hardships are ameliorated by this type of legislation.

Well, let me just bring to your attention the type of matters that have happened in this province which prompted this kind of proposal which was unanimously accepted here. I have here a clipping from the Winnipeg Tribune of July 4, 1966, the headline reads "Girl 7 stripped and beaten". "A seven year old girl is in hospital today suffering from an attack Sunday in which a man undressed her and beat her. The Fort Rouge girl is in Children's Hospital suffering from abrasions to the face and is in fairly good condition." That must be the physical condition that is being referred to because a seven year old girl being attacked and treated in this manner has a scar within her which it may take many, many years, - if ever, to remove. And there is no thought in this concept of compensation that she could ever be compensated, but certainly to the extent that her family had costs, to the extent that she had the suffering, it would have been considered. I wonder who knows - in government circles, in responsible circles - what has happened in the life of this girl as a result of this incident of some two and a half years ago?

The committee had a letter, a letter that just arrived to the committee from a woman - I don't intend to mention names in this review, Mr. Speaker, - but the letter is on record, it's filed with the Clerk as having been received by the Committee. Her husband was a victim of an attack and robbery in the store which he operated on Logan, and I think King Street, in September, 1966. She wrote this letter November 20th, 1967 - over a year later. She says there, this is a very well worded letter but I don't intend to read it all, she says: "after two months of being in a coma and months of physical anguish, he is still a mental and physical wreck and will be for the rest of his days. She says, "We took a terrific loss in the robbery and in the disposal of the business but we are thankful we can carry on our home". She says, "in my own case, I would be in a position to perhaps make my own life a little easier by taking in some help and not worry about the financial end of it. The burden of caring for a person with brain damage day and night for an indefinite time is very exhausting, physically and emotionally". And to bring the report up to date, Mr. Speaker, this morning I telephoned a person who has the same surname and who I believe was related to this man. I said "do you know - aren't you related to this man", and he said "yes, he's my father". And I was of course, now speaking to the son of the person. I had no intention of bothering him, the son, with it, but I discussed it with him and he told me his father today is a man who is completely incapacitated, unable to work. There has been some improvement but he is still at home an incapacitated person, slugged by a man who I believe has never been found. As far as I can recall, he committed the crime and he was not caught.

May I remind you just recently of the incident in Windsor Park in a school where several boys were beaten up, taken to Hospital. What has the society done for this person through its representatives in government?

May I remind you of a case which happened - I think it was during the summer - of a man

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd). . . . who had a knock on his door about midnight, opened the door and saw a man facing him with a shotgun in his hand, slammed the door but the pellets went right through the door, damaged his lungs, damaged his liver, he was on the verge of death for quite a long time - 6 weeks - and who is only now starting to recover. A person who I believe today is still not working yet, - a person who's loss of income for that time is considerable aside from the damage.

Here is an excerpt of a newspaper Free Press, July 20th, 1966. An Assiniboia man out to avenge a younger brother's roughing up walked into a park and kicked and punched a 15-year old youth, knocking out two of his teeth. And he's quoted as saying: "I found out later that my brother had lied to me and another fellow had done it". The evidence was that this man walked over, after striking him to the ground, kicked him in the head, picked him up by the hair and punched him in the face. This man was fined and I have no knowledge as to what has happened to compensate the person for the damage he suffered. Possibly he sued and those lawyers who are present would know the complications involved; maybe his loss was worth financially \$150.00. The costs involved, the time it would take to attempt to collect would be very great. And this was an innocent boy. A 15-year old boy in a park was suddenly accosted, struck down, kicked, two teeth knocked out and society as such in an organized manner was not prepared to deal with it.

And we have of course the example that we must all recall not long ago about a postman who actually did go to the assistance of, not a police officer, but a girl as I recall it. He saw that a girl was being dragged in some way by some youths, and he went to help her, to protect her and as a result I believe he received a stab wound in his chest - that's my recollection - a postman. He was off work for a considerable length of time and he had financial loss. The newspapers publicized it and as a result a woman with a good heart and apparently with the financial ability to do so, came along and took care of his needs. And I say that this is a wrong thing to have to depend on newspaper publicity, on weeping women -- I'm sorry I shouldn't have said that because it gives a connotation of superiority -- I think a very fine person who is prepared because of what she read to come forth and help them. But we should not be dependant on that, when we in society are all responsible for what happens and should be responsible for compensating people who suffer in this way. The newspapers have come to the support of this proposal, have encouraged it. I have a Tribune clipping, June 23rd, 1966, an editorial quoting Canadian Corrections Association which submitted a series of draft resolutions, one of the points of which is that in each province there should be publicly administered systems to compensate those who suffer loss or injury either through direct action of criminals and that this is a matter of great concern.

Then there's a report in the Globe and Mail of March 21st, 1968 of a master plan for compensation which was proposed by a national committee after two years of study, which recommends, and it's the Canadian Corrections Association, recommending that each province introduce a publicly administered system of compensation to its victims of crime. The item concludes as follows: "The report which was presented yesterday to Federal and Provincial governments" - and I assume that our government received it as well - "concludes after its lengthy study that the Canadian legal system is preoccupied with catching, punishing and rehabilitating criminals and little or nothing is being done, apart from general welfare provisions, to assist the victims of crime, even if they are physically injured or killed or financially ruined or dependents deprived of financial support."

Well, the Government of the Province of Saskatchewan did see fit to enact this legislation, and on September 21st, 1968, the Free Press report, and I'll read only the first couple of paragraphs. "Kevin Miller, 16, had an injured arm and a broken finger and his father was out of pocket several hundred dollars in expenses after the youth was assaulted outside a dance hall here in November, 1966. If it weren't for a Board comprised of a housewife, a farmer and a lawyer that was established 11 months later by the legislature, society's response could have been summed up in two words: "tough luck". And that's what we've been saying for a long time; for many, many years, but for the last three years we've been mouthing something else. We've been saying, we're studying, we're considering, we're doing, we propose -- the Honourable the Provincial Secretary on behalf of the government said "we propose" but all we can say today, because of this government's neglect and because of this government's failure to accept the problem, all we can say is "tough luck". The report does confirm that my impression was right that Newfoundland has a Board similar to Saskatchewan.

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd)

Well the Attorney-General, in the dying moments of the life of the last Committee on Statutory Regulations which, and whose predecessors are supposed to have been dealing with this problem all along, reported to us that the government is considering the financial feasibility of this project and is consulting with Saskatchewan -- and I think he said Ontario and I think he said British Columbia -- but he did point out that both in Ontario and British Columbia they don't have this type of legislation other than the kind we have in Manitoba. But he's consulting with Saskatchewan which as of last September processed, well granted one case; when he has all sorts of jurisdictions with which he could consult -- but don't bother with that -- when he has a report, which he as a member of the government authorized to be done, which he as a member of government requested to be done by Winnipeg people, by Manitoba residents, by Manitoba people who took the trouble to do all the work, which I assume he's doing now, and brought forth this report, which as I say is 70 pages long and contains a great deal of thought -- and he is still considering it. This report dealt with the question of cost; the report did indicate that it's hard to know. I'll read just a paragraph from Page 46 of the report: "We are of the opinion that in its initial years such a scheme must be regarded as experimental. Experience in other jurisdictions has shown it will take three to five years to accurately assess the cost because the differences in legislation in crimes of violence rates and other factors make even a provisional estimate of little value. We think that it is desirable having regard to these considerations to introduce the scheme with certain restrictions and controls until a period of actual operation enables an accurate evaluation to be made of its effectiveness and usefulness, of its cost and of the possibility of enlargement and extension." But they do in their recommendations speak of specific limits. Let's not just go hog wild; let's not promise everything; let's deal with it on the basis of limited means and limited resources; but let's deal with it. This government is doing nothing to deal with it; and the evidence it is doing nothing is the fact that only a week ago we met to discuss a number of matters of which this is one, and we have since the date of the receipt of this report, which was in 1967, December, 1967, the committee itself has never discussed the report. We received it; we heard the presentation; we did not discuss the report which has been sitting on our desks for over a year, and therefore I say the government is doing nothing because had it done something it would have had the courtesy of bringing it to the committee and saying: "This is our approach."

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I don't for a moment apologize for the harsh language which I think is contained in the resolution. I think the government should be ashamed; I think that every member of this House who was a member especially for the first time the resolution was passed unanimously, and who had high hopes that something would be done and that we would be the first province to bring it in, because we could have been had we carried out the intent of this Legislature. But we didn't. It was pushed over to a committee and the committee was not allowed to deal with it adequately. It was pushed on to the Manitoba Bar and I think it's a terrible thing to misuse the voluntary services of a body of people who gave the time and the interest as they did. Mr. Justice Schultz I assure you has a great deal more to do and more to contribute for his own welfare and for the welfare of the province than to spend all the time that was spent on a report and not to have the courtesy of having it reviewed in detail, discussed in depth and acted on, whether in agreement or disagreement with the report. Certainly, it was not a way to treat him, and when I say this government should be ashamed, so should all the members on the side of the government who have been permitting this to continue in such a disgraceful fashion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): I only wanted to ask a question. I wonder if the honourable member would permit a question? Does your resolution contemplate compensation in the cases of direct theft or only in the event of the type of thing you've been illustrating, the results of an action and a crime.

MR. CHERNIACK: I didn't hear the words. Did you say "direct threat?"

MR. LISSAMAN: Theft.

MR. CHERNIACK: No, no, no. It deals mainly with injuries, injuries. Not the loss-- well you can insure yourself for things like that. The concept is for personal injury. And if I may just enlarge a little, the concept also is that all civil means be exhausted.

If it is possible to collect damages from the person causing the injury then that must be done first. It's only in the event that it's a criminal act as a result of which you cannot obtain



(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd). . . . financial compensation for financial loss resulting from the injury that this board would have -- I trust that answers the question.

MR. LISSAMAN: A subsequent question. Can you not insure yourself against many of these types of things that might be classed as accidents.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, I'd be glad to go into the whole question of insurance. I'm not aware that there is a simple form of insurance which the ordinary man on the street carries. It may be that a businessman who has a responsibility of a big business can get himself insured for this type of injury but certainly it's not the kind of thing that people are doing -- as is evidenced by all the jurisdictions which have accepted it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Brokenhead,

WHEREAS the mobility and transportation of masses of people is a vital problem affecting the economic development of urban centres;

AND WHEREAS the failure of the Provincial Government to adequately provide for the costs of transit has added to the ever increasing burden of taxation on property;

AND WHEREAS this has resulted in forcing local governments to request higher transit fares in an attempt to ease property taxes;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Manitoba Government give consideration to the advisability:

(a) substantially increasing the annual grant presently paid towards meeting the deficits incurred from the operation of a public transit system,

(b) exempting municipally owned and operated public transit systems from gasoline and diesel fuel taxes and Provincial Sales Tax on the purchase of equipment and materials.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I believe a point of order might arise here that Your Honour may wish to consider with respect to the question of anticipation and avoiding duplication of debate. Notice has already been given in the Throne Speech that legislation will be brought before the House this Session dealing with the major portion, I don't say the total portion of this resolution, but the major portion of it. I believe the question was put to the Minister of Transport the other day on this subject and he confirmed that there would be an Act brought forward. There's no -- well I shouldn't have to make the point clear, I make it clear, there's no disposition on the part of the government not to want to talk about it, in fact the fact that the government is bringing forward legislation indicates that there's no desire on our part to inhibit debate. But the question that is before the House I suggest and before you, Sir, is whether or not, or under which, by which vehicle this debate can best be regulated. Should it be by the government Act, which we have notice is coming in, and from which some effective action can be taken, or should it be by a private member's resolution which deals with the subject. So I suggest that there is a legitimate point of order here on the question of this anticipating legislation that will be coming before the House, and that purely on the grounds of avoiding duplication of debate Your Honour might well wish to consider whether this resolution is in order.

MR. CHERNIACK: I wonder if the Honourable the Attorney-General could point out the portion of the Speech from the Throne that deals with this. I haven't found it yet. Your Honour could take this under advisement because you might wish to read what I haven't been able to find.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, if I might . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I express my appreciation to the honourable members for their opinion and I think in order to expedite the business and of course deal with this matter as it ought to be dealt with, I'll take it under advisement for the moment.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you'd keep in mind that the only reference is "short term measures to help the municipalities" which is a very vague statement meaning really very little.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member may be assured it will be given the consideration it deserves. The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood, that

WHEREAS the development of the natural resources of the Province should be proceeded with in such manner as would ensure the greatest possible return to the people of the Province; and

WHEREAS the present tendency on the part of the Provinces to bid against one another to induce outside capital to develop our resources is self defeating to the people of all Provinces;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Province of Manitoba take the initiative in convening an all Province Committee whose objective it would be to agree where possible upon standards which all Provinces would adhere to governing terms and conditions of resource development employing private capital.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Would the honourable gentleman repeat the seconder.

MR. GREEN: Seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for where?

MR. GREEN: Elmwood.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, this resolution is prompted by what appears to me to be a rat race on the part of different provincial governments to attempt to outbid each other in attracting private capital to develop the resources of the Province of Manitoba and the concept of a provincial conference to consider the rules whereby private capital would be induced into the development of the resources of a province was first suggested, to my knowledge, by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead last year at a time when just this type of race had developed. And I was interested to note in the Premier's remarks to the House this morning that he recognized the self-defeating nature of this type of program when he discussed the concept of the estate tax. Apparently it's been suggested by people in whose interests it is to make such a suggestion that if only the estate tax were reduced in a particular area that this would induce people with large fortunes to come to live in that particular area, and by virtue of their living in the area there would be an investment by these wealthy people in that particular area, which would give that particular area an opportunity of receiving some injection of capital with which to develop its resources.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that if one follows the logic of this type of proposition one recognizes immediately that it just doesn't wash, and is, and must be, a self-defeating type of proposition. Because if indeed, Mr. Speaker, the proposition was successful, its very success would mean the ultimate failure of what it was attempting to do. Because it's so simple that any particular place could do it. It's almost like suggesting that a grocery store or that a small store on Portage Avenue could drive Eaton's out of business by cutting the price of the product. This is bargain basement development, Mr. Speaker, and it just doesn't work. If the Province of Manitoba was successful in inducing somebody to leave the Province of Ontario, let us say, to develop a resource in Manitoba by virtue of giving some tax concession, and if indeed Ontario lost the resource, wouldn't the Legislature in Ontario then discuss the tragedy of having a resource move to another province by virtue of a tax concession having been given, and wouldn't it make just as much sense then to the Province of Ontario to say "Well let's give not an equal concession but let's give a greater concession." And if we follow the logic through, Mr. Speaker, to the area of resource development, or of the estate tax which I started with, if it's good fiscal policy, if it's good incentive policy to induce millionaires to come to Manitoba by eliminating their estate tax, then isn't it, Mr. Speaker, better sense once all the estate taxes have been eliminated, which would eventually happen because every province would want the same type of attraction or want to offer the same type of attraction, when we have eliminated in that fashion -- and I suggest that the logic is to eliminate all the estate taxes and therefore reduce the public revenues by that amount -- what we would have is no change. If all the estate taxes were eliminated then we're right back where we started and the industry would be attracted to where the Honourable Member for Lakeside said industry is attracted, to where they'll make money, not where they get a tax concession.

Mr. Speaker, but let us assume that we did this, that we eliminated all the estate taxes and depleted the public revenues by that amount that is now being collected in estate taxes,

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . then I suppose we will have some bright Prime Minister say that the way of inducing millionaires to come to Manitoba is to offer \$10,000 per millionaire, and I suppose if we then induce several millionaires to come to Manitoba -- and I don't see that this would be a particularly good advantage but some people seem to think it is -- if it was an advantage, then would Ontario not say "well if the millionaires are going to where you get 10,000 then shouldn't we be offering 20?" So that the ultimate conclusion, Mr. Speaker, of this type of logic would be for the provinces to keep upbidding each other and actually paying money for people to come and enter the province on that basis.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you and I suggest to the House, that the same logic applies to offering of incentive to people to come to develop the resources of a particular province. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the whole principle upon which one argues for the private development of natural resources, if one will engage in that argument, is that if a person sees an opportunity, is willing to risk capital to develop that opportunity, then he is entitled to the profit which results from him having taken that risk; that once that particular element is removed from the proposition, then, Mr. Speaker, we're engaged in a system whereby the public becomes in fact the investor through tax incentives or through programs such as are being suggested, whereas the private entrepreneur receives the profit if there happens to be a profit, but we arrive at the position where it's public risk to enhance private profit. Mr. Speaker, if there has to be public risk, and I would concede that there are areas where there has to be, then I say that there should be an equivalent public profit, and I think, Mr. Speaker, that the trend towards tax concessions to induce the development of resource capital is a dangerous one and is obviously self-defeating to all of the provinces that engage in it.

But, Mr. Speaker, I concede a problem, I concede that there is a problem and I think the First Minister today described the problem. He said that he disagrees with the notion that there should be a waiver of tax rates to induce people who would otherwise pay estate taxes to come to the province. And he gave reason for it. He said that the laws may change in the future. Different taxes could be invoked by the time the person passes away or what have you. But he said that if other provinces are doing this, it puts us into the position of possibly losing the supposed advantage that accrues by not having a similar type of release. Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that there is that much of an advantage. I would venture to say that in countries like India, there is very little estate taxes - in the Bahamas, and other places, or of any places which are relatively undeveloped, there is little estate taxes and a great deal of incentive. I don't think that the Country with the lowest estate taxes attracts the most capital. I repeat, I think that the country whose people are best able to consume, attracts the greatest amount of industrial development and attracts the greatest amount of manufacturing growth, because it's in those countries that the business sees an opportunity of making money.

But the Premier indicated that there is a problem, and the problem was that the certain legislative authorities, certain administrations, are offering this type of base to attract development. They're offering a false incentive in fact to get this development, and if Manitoba is not to lose anything, then it must come into line. But surely, Mr. Speaker, there is a more civilized way of dealing with the problem. And that is, to get the provinces together to discuss just what is to be gained and just what is to be lost by this type of program. I am satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that if the provinces did get together, I am satisfied that there would be great difficulties, but I am also satisfied that there would be somethings upon which they could agree, and even if there is only a small degree of progress on those things on which they could agree, it certainly would accrue to the advantage of all of the peoples who are living in each of the provinces to have this type of agreement with regard to these problems.

Mr. Speaker, I propose the resolution on the basis of the fact that one has been able to witness, not only in the area of natural resources, but certainly in the area of natural resources, one has been able to witness this apparent dangling of the carrot in the eyes of developers, in order to get them to invest in a particular province. One should, by straight common sense be able to recognize that the more one dangles in the eyes of a developer, the more one must give of potential provincial gain to that developer in order to get into the province; the more one must give to the developer, who develops the resource, the less the people of the province retain, and I would submit that on this very common sense basis, that there has to be a better way out. I would think that the same common sense as would apply in Manitoba, would apply to the other provinces. And on that basis, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . that a conference on this question would be valuable and that such a conference should be one that would be convened by the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this question is starting to broaden out beyond the field of natural resources. When I prepared this resolution I had not at that time had knowledge of the fact that the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg is apparently trying this type of tax incentive approach to induce development of the central core of Greater Winnipeg. I asked the Minister of Municipal Affairs whether the government had developed a policy with regard to the proposal that's been put forward by the Mayor of Winnipeg, and I got the very intelligent answer that when a proposal is forthcoming it will be announced in the House. I had expected that it would be announced in the Winnipeg Free Press, where we often see such proposals announced, but apparently the Minister is developing a new policy and that it will be announced in the House.

We know, Mr. Speaker, that when the Mayor of Winnipeg made his announcement there was a photograph - I hope I'm recalling correctly - there was a photograph of the Mayor and I think it was the Premier of the Province, and the developer, who were in this photograph, and the distinct impression was left that the Province of Manitoba had already undertaken to be part and parcel of this project. And under those circumstances I really don't know why the Minister of Municipal Affairs would not want to advise the House as to what the government's intention is in this regard, but I guess I will have no more luck with him as Minister of Municipal Affairs than I had with him when he was the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker. I hoped that the change in title would bring about a change in his style of answering questions, but apparently this . . .

MR. CARROLL: Just live hopefully.

MR. GREEN: Live hopefully. Well, even my elders in the Party have already taught me that. The Honourable the Attorney-General says the New Democrats have always lived hopefully, but never arrived. I will not only live hopefully, but I also hope to arrive and I think that that is the view of most of my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, as I said before, the fact is that the City of Winnipeg apparently feels that there is some gain to be established by offering this type of incentive to resource development. The questions . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I'm sure the honourable gentleman has a little more to say on the subject but I must remind the House that it is now 5:30.

MR. GREEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Provincial Treasurer that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House adjourned until 2:30 Monday afternoon.