

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
2:30 o'clock, Friday, September 12, 1969

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, before you call the first resolution on the Order Paper, I realize that this is Private Members' Day but I have scouted the opinions of the Official Opposition and opposition members and the Independent from Churchill, and I'd like to suggest that we have consent to consider the two bills standing in the name of private members, that if it is agreeable to the House, Your Honour, that these bills be considered first of all in order that they may be processed if it is the desire of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed that the two bills for second reading, one in the name of the Honourable Member for Brandon West and the Honourable Member for Logan, that they may be considered now? (Agreed.)

PRIVATE AND PUBLIC BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading, Bill No. 30. The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL presented Bill No. 30, an Act to incorporate The Brandon University Students' Union, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 30 represents a petition from a group of students at Brandon University representing themselves to be the provisional directors of the Students' Union - provisional members of council, I should say - and they wish to incorporate under The Companies' Act, or at least to achieve incorporation and to have all the rights and privileges which would normally accrue to a company under The Companies' Act and at the same time accept all the responsibilities thereto.

In addition to the powers which would normally be given to them under The Companies' Act, they wish to have the power to receive and hold property, both real and personal, for the benefit of the students of Brandon University. They wish to receive and maintain a fund and to invest all or part thereof and to apply from time to time all or part thereof and the income thereof to the social, welfare, pleasure, recreation and benefit of the students of Brandon University, and to receive funds and to invest all or part thereof and to apply from time to time all or part thereof and the income therefrom to the promotion of educational, literary, artistic, scientific and sporting events for and on behalf of the students of Brandon University.

In addition to this, they'd like to be able to acquire and print a newspaper and to have all the rights and privileges which would normally accrue to the publisher of a newspaper and to a printer or lithographer or engraver, and generally to manage and conduct the affairs of the Union for the benefit of its members.

I think, Mr. Chairman, these briefly are the aims of the group, and the provisional members of council are now applying to this Legislature for the necessary authority.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Brandon. I'm sorry, the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that my honourable friend the MLA for Brandon West has undertaken to introduce this bill. This is a matter that had been considered I believe in the previous Legislature, but for various reasons was dropped at that time. There were various reasons for the withdrawal of the bill. I'm not sure whether the proposed bill is exactly the one that was proposed at that time.

My understanding is that the bill has the approval, or the ideas in the bill have the approval of a great number of groups in the academic community, and I'm thinking particularly of the faculty groups as well as the students. There are a number of detailed propositions involved in this bill which I am sure we will discuss in the committee stage and perhaps I will have something to say at that time, but as a former full time member of Brandon University, I think the bill merits the consideration of this House.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry that I was interrupted just when the honourable member who introduced the bill spoke and mentioned something about The Companies Act and I didn't quite catch what he said. I am interested to know in what way it is necessary for this type of structure to receive legislative approval rather than of the registrar of Companies. I'd like better clarification as to why it is that the Legislature has to become involved in that and why it can't be done in the routine way under various, or

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) . . . . whichever part of The Companies Act that would apply. I've had occasion in past years to question a number of bills that were presented as Private Members' Bills for incorporation of various companies and never received satisfactory explanations that they were not taken through The Companies Act rather than by Legislature, so that's still a question that's unanswered in my mind.

The other question that is unanswered is how the University of Manitoba Students' Union and the University of Winnipeg Students' Union have been able to manage as they did with the newspaper and with other projects without, to my knowledge, being incorporated by Act of the Legislature. Have they been limping along? Have there been difficulties in their way because they were not incorporated, or indeed maybe they are incorporated and that would answer the question. But I would like to have better clarification from the honourable member when he closes debate as to what the justification is. All of the things that they want to do, as set out in the bill, are desirable functions that they should perform, but I question the need for this kind of legislative authority rather than, as I say, either as they've been managing up to now or through the regular channels of The Companies Act.

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

MR. ENNS: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Riel, that debate on this be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading, Bill No. 29. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan) presented Bill No. 29, an Act to amend the St. James-Assiniboia Charter and to Alter the Boundaries of the City and of The Rural Municipality of Rosser, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, the bill that is before the House is dealing with the altering of the boundaries between the City of St. James and Assiniboia and the Rural Municipality of Rosser. The Municipality of Rosser owns approximately 160 acres of land which borders directly on land that is presently being developed by the St. James-Assiniboia City as an industrial area. St. James-Assiniboia City can service this quarter section with the necessary facilities for early development. The Rural Municipality of Rosser and the City of St. James-Assiniboia has arrived at a mutual agreement whereby an exchange of property will provide for the transfer of approximately -- or it is a quarter section of land to St. James-Assiniboia and St. James will transfer approximately one section of land to the Rural Municipality of Rosser which will remain as agricultural land. The additional acreage that is being transferred by St. James-Assiniboia to the Rural Municipality of Rosser is justified in view of the fact that the land being transferred to St. James-Assiniboia can be more readily developed than would normally take place if it were to remain in the Rural Municipality of Rosser.

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

#### PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

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

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, this motion is so straightforward that I assume it will take very little more introduction on my behalf in addition to the five or six minutes which I gave it last day, and I'm sure that it recommends itself to all sides of the House.

The main point behind it, if I can recap on what I stated previously, the main points behind it are that first of all it should be a person's free right to determine his political affiliation and do it if he so desires in anonymity, that is without declaring what he is or what he isn't or she is or isn't, and with the present system as it exists in the Province of Manitoba at the present time a person could be forced into the situation by executive decision, not by a general ballot but by executive decision, to have to make contributions to a political party unless that person wishes to identify himself or herself and to opt-out. Procedures must be taken to opt-out; forms must be filled out and procedures carried on.

This in itself is the main point. I think probably there's more than myself that have received calls from people or have talked to people who have found themselves in the position of belonging to a union and feeling a certain amount of coercion to make the contributions without in fact identifying themselves. I can mention one party in particular that I had a call from

(MR. CRAIK cont'd.) . . . . and I think it's a situation where a person is willing to identify himself to you to say that he is unhappy with it, but he's afraid enough of the system that he does not want his name -- (Interjection) -- we're talking about individuals now and this is a little different, a person who is a man who is earning his living as an individual performing his work in accordance with his company's demands that are put on him, but says in all earnestness, "I do not wish to make an issue of this; I do not wish to opt-out or to take the procedures, but I feel there is coercion" - and says in effect in one final sentence - "and even if I do, why should I have to sign for something that I do not want?" That's exactly what he has to do. He has to sign for something he does not want.

It would be just as analogous a situation if he were forced to be a member of a particular religious group and would have to sign out of that religious order in order to be a free man and choose a religion of choice. And this is the important point. -- (Interjection) -- Well, if you want to talk about shareholders and corporations we can go on and talk about that, but we're talking here about an item, a policy, something that is condoned and is condoned wrongly because this person is having his rights infringed on as an individual, his human rights. We're talking about human rights commissions, we're talking about just societies, and there is no more specific example of an infringement on this person's rights than to be forced before his peers, before his colleagues to tell them what his politics aren't. -- (Interjection) -- Perhaps it would have. If my honourable friend would like to make a speech I'd yield the floor to him. Give us sufficient time, we'll rectify many of the wrongs possibly. It doesn't matter what was done when, the point of it all is that on this specific item that there is no question that this is a direct infringement of a person's rights. At least one province in Canada has rectified it.

I don't think it has ever been a subject of discussion or debate in our federal House. Why it hasn't, I don't know. It certainly -- (Interjection) -- Well, perhaps the First Minister would like to tell us about it. It certainly has been up for very specific debate in the House of Commons in Britain and the decision there was that the provision must be that a person, if he wishes through his employment to indicate his political interests he can do so, but he can do so at his free will, by opting-in, and certainly in their wisdom they have seen that to do other than to opt-in, that is be forced to opt-out, is a direct infringement of the person's rights.

I trust that this resolution, which really has two provisions to it, says first of all, that the Provincial Government recognizes that the checkoff system is a system which is acceptable as far as the democratic operation is concerned, but the two provisions are first of all that the person can do so but by opting-in; and secondly, he can opt-in to the party of his choice.

And with these few words of introduction, Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that we can speedily deal with this resolution and have it passed today so that this very unfair practice is soon halted.

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

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to add my personal support to the position taken by my colleague the Member for Riel on this question, and submit to the Chamber, Sir, that in effect what the procedure and the measure as it currently is constituted, as it currently exists does, is it contravenes accepted standards of procedure under both our judicial system and our democratic system in that it violates the concept of the privacy of the ballot. The First Minister has raised the question of shareholders and the fact that some of their financial contributions may perhaps go in directions over which they have no specific control, but at the same time it can be argued that, as private individuals, these shareholders can make contributions to any party or any organization of their choice, and presumably in a great many cases where they're shareholders of enterprises in which they are particularly interested, they have some knowledge of the role that those particular corporations play in the community and of the directions of the influences that those corporations may bring to bear. So they're not altogether unaware of the position they're in or what they're doing when they invest in certain corporations. They're pretty generally aware of the social positions, positions in terms of the public issues of the day, that the corporations to which they subscribe have adopted or are likely to adopt.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. SHERMAN: Yes.

MR. DOERN: Do you think that the average shareholder is aware of the political strife

(MR. DOERN cont'd.) . . . . of the corporation he invests in, and also is he aware of the amount of money which that corporation may donate to a political party for their funds?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, I don't think that he's aware in detail, by any means, of the type of point that the honourable member has raised, but the point is, under our system, that that doesn't matter. He's a free individual, he's able to make that decision for himself, and he doesn't have to disclose his particular bent, persuasion or leaning by what he is doing, by any action that he takes. Under the practice that's the subject of the resolution under consideration at the present time, the privacy of that individual's position, privacy of his choice and the secrecy of his ballot, or his right to the secrecy of the ballot, is flouted and violated because he has to make the overt and open move, the overt and open decision that's open to complete public scrutiny. The shareholder doesn't have to do that.

MR. DOERN: The shareholder has no . . . whatsoever . . .

MR. SHERMAN: Well that's the point. That's the point. He's a private individual who is able to -- he was aware of that situation, able to make that decision for himself. The union member to whom we're addressing ourselves at the present time, if he wishes to make this kind of overt decision, has to make it openly, has to opt out of something, and therefore has to declare himself openly and loses the right to whatever secrecy or whatever privacy of conscience he is legally and judicially and democratically entitled. Now the Minister has a question.

MR. GREEN: Well, I'd like to ask the honourable member, does he think that the union member would be in a freer and more democratic position if he didn't have an opportunity to opt out, similar to the shareholder?

MR. SHERMAN: Of course he wouldn't but that's only an invasion of his -- what you're suggesting would only be an invasion, a violation of his privacy and of his rights, slightly less serious in import than the one that already exists. That's all. That's a question of degree. He still is being deprived of his right to privacy of his political and social point of view and the protection of that privacy which the secret ballot guarantees under our democratic system. This really is the substance and the import of the resolution which my honourable member has proposed. I have no wish to engage in long, technical or legal debate on the undertones and overtones of the proposed resolution, but I suggest to the Honourable Minister, Mr. Speaker, that this really is the nub of the thing, and I rise in support of the contention incorporated in his resolution.

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

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, my contribution in support of the resolution as presented by my colleague will be brief, and I want to refer to only one specific aspect of it because in various Legislatures, more particularly in the State Houses to the south of us, the question of the right to work, you know under certain circumstances referring to the closed union shop, has from time to time come under very serious political debate and discussion. Quite frankly, personally I would have -- I have my own opinion as to the correctness of the position of a closed union shop. But I don't put that forward in this debate because there is a valid argument, which is used very effectively by those in support of organized labour, that supports the closed shop principle, that says that if members or workers working within an organization or closed community are to derive the benefits gained by the efforts of an organized effort on the part of the working force, that certainly these efforts are applicable to all, and that in that way all should contribute in the manner of union deductions or union fees. And I don't interject this into the debate at this point to particularly put forward a position on that aspect of the debate which could well be debated in the light of the resolution by my colleague, that is, the whole question of closed shops, the whole question of compulsory union fees, union dues and so forth. Particularly I think it should have some appeal to the members opposite who have expressed, cynically and hypocritically, about some belief about personal and individual freedom and liberty. I say this in all seriousness. However, that's a debate for another day. The question is now -- and this is being brought out by the resolution before us -- is that, accepting for a moment the fact -- accepting for a moment the fact . . .

HON. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Minister of Transportation) (Thompson): . . . if we're going to allow the other side to use the word "hypocrite", which is unparliamentary, I hope they get used to the idea that we're going to call them hypocrites, which they in fact are.

MR. SPEAKER: Here is the authority on parliamentary . . . I would hope -- if the

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.) . . . . honourable member used that word, I would hope that it was not meant in any derogatory manner or . . .

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I'm a traditionalist and a Conservative and always prepared to accept advice from Minister of the Crown. However, let me continue. The only point that I want to interject into this debate is that we have in the - and I would suggest more significantly in the last two years - gone one step further in this concept of the compulsory deducted dues that citizens have to pay, and the suggestion has been made or the comparison to shareholders - the question of a shareholder is, I submit, and I submit that this government should appreciate the difference. Now, if I want to go out and buy C.P.R. stock or Royal Bank of Canada stock, that's first of all a luxury that I can afford because I have the extra cash around to do it, and secondly, because I feel that there is going to be a profit motive in it for me. That's quite different from the man that's going out day in, day out, putting in his eight hours, nine hours a day to provide bread and butter for his family. There is a difference, I suggest, and I would really suspect that you would not want to rise too hard on your hind heels and challenge me on that particular issue.

But, accepting for the moment the closed shop principle and the compulsory deduction of union dues. You know, I was compulsory, was deducted monies to contribute compulsory to the Teachers' Retirement Fund although I knew at the time I was paying that money that I could never claim it, that I was never going to be eligible to claim it, because I happened to be one of those unfortunate individuals who tried permit teaching for a brief few years in my career and had no specific intention of carrying on in that vocation, but nevertheless this was, you know, it's not restricted to the what we would refer to as the straight, you know, the labour unions. It's within our professional ranks as well. But that's fine. I don't quarrel with that principle if you accept the idea that certain things are done because it's in the interests of most of us or it's in the interests of the greater number of people we have to do some of these things. So for that reason we accept, and I'm not arguing it in speaking in support of this resolution that I'm putting forward an argument against the concept of the closed union shop, the compulsory deduction of union fees.

But the essence of the resolution that's before us goes one step further, because we are now talking about the dedication to a certain direction of how these funds are to be used other than the apparent one, that is the improvement and the betterment of that particular shop's immediate working conditions or what have you. We are now talking about the dedication of a portion of these funds to a particular political group or particular political thought.

Now, many of us may want to accept - and I have no doubt that many of the members opposite will want to accept the premises that all thinking labour people would support the party opposite. I would suspect that even they, with the arrogance that they've displayed in the short time that they are in government, don't really put that forward as a serious premise; that even they are prepared to accept the fact that the man that is caught up in this situation has the right to make a self-determination as to which particular political organization he wishes to support. And what the present situation calls for is, he has to in some instances declare himself as being "No, I am not an NDP supporter. I want to do something else with my funds." And that's like saying, as the corollary was put, that somebody asks me to put my nickel or dime into a particular charity drive and I have to say, "No, I'm a Mennonite and I will not support that Catholic organization for their funds," or that "No, I'm of Jewish origin and I will not support that particularly, because I have my own obligations to support." This is what you're asking, this is what you're asking the person to do in this sense. -- (Interjection) -- Ah, you don't see anything wrong with it, the Minister of Social Welfare. However, when it comes to a whole -- it seems to be terribly wrong, on the other hand, if we broaden this argument about such things that embrace means tests or that mean some declaration of a person's privacy, some declaration of a person's financial status that may qualify him for various social assistance allowances or something like that, then that principle becomes very important to my members opposite. It becomes very important.

I only ask that you also acknowledge -- I accept your argument that it is an important principle, but accept my argument that it may also be important to me whether or not I wish to acknowledge my political affiliation, or whether I wish to acknowledge my religious affiliation. That's a matter of personal privacy, and you have made eloquent speeches with respect to this very point about, and particularly in the area of, you know, what I would choose to call the general debate about the pros and cons of the principle involved in a means test. I think

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) . . . . that when we have debated in the past, you know, the rightness or the wrongness of means tests, what we have really debated about is the invasion of privacy, the invasion of having one -- the individual having to place himself in a position to reveal personal conditions or personal things about his own situation, his own financial position, to a cold, bureaucratic system, and this to my friends opposite, certainly when they occupied these benches, was always an undemeaning act, an undignified act on the part of the individual. And I'm suggesting to you that, for this reason, that the resolution put forward by the Honourable Member for Riel falls very close to the same principle, falls very close to the same set of conditions that the working man, under the stress, under the pressures of systems in organizations -- and this is something that I would suggest that all of us members as legislators in this House, if we could be, you know, if we want to grasp one common goal or one common effort that would take away the barriers of partisan politics between us, that we should do whatever we can to prohibit the system, to slow down the process of all of us from becoming mere facts and figures and statistical points within the whole system.

You gentlemen opposite have prided yourselves in the -- what is the phrase? -- concern for the people, people's legislation, bringing the human element into the whole business of government, and that means making room for the exception. We can program various computers into doing certain things; we can program, you know, if a certain lathe is to turn out 10,000 bolts and nuts an hour we can do that; our technology can do that. If we want to program that a certain missile shall arrive at the moon we can do that. But how do we program our system, our government, to allow for the wants and needs of the individual person in our society? And this is being trampled. And I'm not saying this in any partisan sense or way, but it is being trampled daily -- not by design I would say. Mostly because of a sincere belief or understanding that the programs that we seek to implement, or the programs that we support, are -- and we use that great justification, that steam roller over individual needs and wants -- that this is "for the greater good of the majority," and in so doing, of course, we accept the inevitable squeeze that it places on personal liberty and personal freedom. I can tell you, and certain members of this House -- not too many, but the Honourable Minister of Health, a few others, the Honourable Minister of Agriculture and others -- can well remember the sincerity and the feeling that individual members -- and I am referring to vegetable growers who appeared before us in very heated and long drawn-out debates on the vegetable marketing question, and I am sure that, quite aside from what position you would wish to take on that, that we could not help but be impressed with the sincerity of some of these growers who spoke, as small growers in this particular case that wanted to withstand the big wheels of progress, that showed, that proved to my satisfaction beyond too much doubt that the course set was the right course in terms of the total economic development of the province, in terms of the total vegetable industry of the province as such, but there was no question, I think, that most of us that sat at that committee, quite apart from what position we were on, felt that we were also part and parcel seeing to the trodding on certain individual rights, certain individual liberties, that kind of shocked us at that time, and I suggest that the resolution that's before us is one that, if you want to examine yourself, examine your position on it really seriously, and do you really want to ask that working man, that union man, his politics? Is that really your intention, or is this really a fair position to put forward? Then you should consider very seriously the resolution that's being put forward by my honourable friend. Thank you.

MR. USKIW: Will the honourable member accept a question?

MR. ENNS: Certainly.

MR. USKIW: Is it not a fact that my honourable friend, the then Minister of Agriculture, trampled on the very rules of justice by implementing something that was traditionally implemented to mean that the majority vote. He implemented it through the means of discretion of his department and not in consultation with the people in question, and that was what I would call trampling on . . . .

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, let me make it very clear that, by our rules of the game, we do things by majority rule, but I for one don't necessarily hold that the majority is always right. I would happen to accept the fact that the majority of Manitobans were wrong in the last election.

MR. BOROWSKI: If this situation is as bad and as undemocratic and terrible as you say it is -- and I'm not arguing -- why didn't you change it when you were there 11 years in office?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, we were going to change it on May 15, 1969.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please. Before I proceed with this motion, I just wish to draw to the attention of the honourable members of the House a point that I would wish to draw to your attention somewhat earlier but it slipped by. An unparliamentary word was used. I had hoped that it was not used in a derogatory manner, directed toward any member of this House. However, may I remind the honourable members that our parliamentary vocabulary does not include words of that type, although I do recall variations of them having been used quite frequently within recent times, with reference to a certain state of affairs or a course of events which is probably of a slightly different nature than using a word of that type with reference to an individual. I would hope that for the sake of the record the honourable members would agree to withdraw the use of . . .

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I am not quite sure if you are referring to remarks that I made, but in the event that you are, I would be more than happy to withdraw any remarks that are not parliamentary.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, for the record, I believe that another honourable member used the word you are referring to, and possibly he would follow suit of the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, I do have a recollection of other members having used a similar word.

MR. BOROWSKI: . . . use it, I did not use the word in the manner he used it.

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

MR. JENKINS: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan, that 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 Assiniboia. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, in speaking briefly to this resolution, I would just like to read it:

WHEREAS longer vacation periods are being more widely accepted throughout the province and Canada, and

WHEREAS our neighbouring province of Saskatchewan has for some years had legislation on their books providing employees three weeks vacation after five years of service, and

WHEREAS increasingly collective agreements provide for three weeks vacation after five years of service, and

WHEREAS many Manitoba tradesmen are leaving every year to work in other provinces where better wages and benefits can be obtained,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the government of Manitoba amend The Vacation with Pay Act providing employees three weeks vacation after five or more years in the service of their employer.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable debate in this House on this particular resolution, and while it certainly merits consideration, I should like to convey to the House some of the legislation in other provinces in Canada, and I would like to start with the Province of Alberta where they have two weeks vacation with pay; in British Columbia they have two weeks vacation with pay; and on the federal scene they also have two weeks; in Manitoba the vacation with pay is two weeks; in New Brunswick it is one week, in Ontario the employment standard there is one week and two weeks after five years. In Prince Edward Island it is vacation with pay one week, and in the Province of Quebec it is two weeks; in the province of Nova Scotia it is two weeks; and last, in the Province of Saskatchewan it is two weeks, but after the employee has worked for five years the vacation with pay is three weeks.

Now I know that there are many non-applications to specific types of industries, but generally what I have expressed here is the situation in Canada. I know, at least I think, I believe, our party does believe that workers should have vacations with pay so that they may enjoy a holiday, and I think it would be certainly more enjoyable than if they didn't have it. Also, I can agree that the objective to a guaranteed minimum insofar as a benefit of this kind is concerned is certainly commendable, and so I would say that, with these facts, that Manitoba is really not out of line. I would also like to say that, from the figures that I have given you here, Saskatchewan appears to be the only province that has the three weeks with pay after five years of service with an employer.

Now then, unions, they do negotiate higher positions with minimum benefits, but I think

(MR. EINARSON cont'd.) . . . . that this does vary from one union to another. I also do not know, though, what such agreements provide, but I would be interested in knowing as to whether the government could obtain information and give it to us insofar as it affects the people who are employed being protected by unions.

Now, as far as I am concerned, I feel there is a principle involved here, the right also of each individual worker, but when we are dealing with employee and employer you are dealing with an industry and those people who are working for that industry, so I would say that paid vacations are a cost to an industry and small business, and this is where I apply the principle factor. . So, with this thought in mind, I don't necessarily disagree with the resolution because I don't want it to be misunderstood, that I think that people certainly are entitled to three weeks with pay but in so many cases where they are not protected by unions, etc., I have talked to a number of business people I know in my own constituency and I have found that because of the progress that the labouring people have made over the many years, it seems to me that the negotiations between employer and employee have become much more satisfactory in this day and age than what they used to be years ago.

With these few remarks in mind, Mr. Speaker, I just would like to say that I believe that the resolution does commend itself to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BUD BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): If no one else wishes to speak, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to adjourn the debate, seconded by the Honourable Member from Flin Flon.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

A MEMBER: In the absence of the Member for Kildonan, I would ask that this matter stand. (Agreed.)

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

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, I did want to add a word or two again and at the time that I am doing it I must admit to being repetitive because I have said it before in the House, I think probably I have said it at this session during the Throne Speech Debate, but I think when the resolution is before us I should add my few words again indicating the support that I have for this resolution.

I think many members opposite, as well as maybe even the proposer of the resolution, believe that tax havens of this type are not in the interests of our country, but whether or not they are in the interests of our country, we must recognize that in our area of Canada we have two of them, one in Alberta and one in Saskatchewan, and that Manitoba's position is such that a climate must be established that is competitive within this region of Canada, and while it is my belief that this can be almost a false taxation policy under some circumstances whereas it can indicate the direction that a government is intending to go, the policy that exists today, that really doesn't have any effect until the death of an individual at some unknown period of time later when there may have been successive changes in government with successive changes in policy, which has an effect on the location of the capital that may be involved, nevertheless policies changing slowly as they do, and it being necessary to be competitive as it is, in providing a climate for the investment capital, particularly I think in this region of Canada and I think to the same or even a greater extent in the Maritimes, within our nation, that we be competitive on this basis. I believe that it is in the interests of Manitoba that until such time as rationalization should take place federally in terms of the estate tax - and there should just be one in my view across Canada - but nevertheless a means has been found to have more than one, and that Manitoba should be competitive in this field and that if the haven is established in Alberta and in Saskatchewan, that that haven should be established here in terms of the location of investment capital within this province.

So, Mr. Speaker, I merely want to say again the same things that I have said on more than one occasion in the House, and to have it in relation to the debate that is before us, that I intend to support the resolution on this basis while recognizing that the end that I would have in view in the long term taxation potential is quite different. I could move on into rates that have been established and modified from time to time by the Government of Canada and of which 75 percent returns to the province, and I have a concern of the agricultural community and the small business community in Manitoba in this regard, an unreasonable increase in the rates of taxation on this basis can really amount to, essentially, the expropriation of the



(MR. WEIR cont'd.) . . . . assets between one generation and the next, and I think that in the period that we are living with in Manitoba that this isn't a good thing. I think that the development of assets between one generation and the next at the present time is in the interests of the development of the province of Manitoba, and so, without carrying on in any great detail the tenor of this debate because we have had it on more than one occasion, may I encourage all of the members of this House to support the principle that is contained within this resolution that has been presented by the Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate I say a few words immediately after the remarks made by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, with reference to the resolution before us having to do with Estate Tax and the remission or rebate of same. I was rather happy to hear the Honourable Leader of the Opposition say, when he spoke during the Throne Speech Debate, that he had some grave reservations about the desirability of rebate of Estates Tax, that he felt nonetheless that perhaps the Province of Manitoba would have to go along with this if only to remain competitive with the two sister provinces to the west. I infer from that statement, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition thinks that this is a practice which would have been just as well not to have started. However, I understand clearly his position and I, for my part, want to say that there is a certain amount of validity to taking that position.

However, I want to also say that I think that it is unfortunate and undesirable in the extreme, the practice that has started here in western Canada with respect to estate tax remission or rebate. I will concede this much: that I believe, like my colleague the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, I do believe that there is something desirable in having some transfer of assets from generation to generation, but I certainly believe that there is also, there is a point beyond which society should not want to encourage it. In other words, I believe that it is a tenable position to take to say that up to a certain amount - and let's not argue about how much - up to a certain amount of assets it is socially desirable to have some transfer of assets from one generation to the other. However, I think that to say that there should be this kind of transfer without any kind of limit, without any kind of rate of taxation, is just unacceptable.

In fact I would go so far as to say that I regard the practice which has started here in western Canada with respect to estate tax rebates as being a form of social pollution in the same way that in the 1930's and 40's and 50's, when provinces weren't yet concerned enough or sophisticated enough, local municipalities were permitted to compete with each other for industry, and of course it's very desirable for municipalities to attract industry, but at what price, Mr. Speaker? Oftentimes in the past industry was attracted by local municipalities that acted completely in isolation to themselves, not really caring what consequence location of industry within their boundaries might have on adjoining municipalities; oftentimes so anxious to attract industry, which is a desirable objective, so anxious however that no thought was given, no standards laid down as to basic minimum of pollution control equipment and procedures, and the result was industrial pollution on a gigantic scale which subsequent municipal governments and provincial and federal government are now reaping the harvest of, and it will require the input of millions of dollars to deal with the problem that was caused years ago because of blindness, because of thinking only of the short run. The industrial pollution problem that arose in many provinces because of blindness of local municipal governments of decades back, I suggest that there is a very close analogy between that and the kind of social pollution we are going to experience if one province, because it finds it has to compete with the others, starts to make it attractive, excessively attractive in my opinion, for capital to come there because there are more favourable terms in terms of estate duties, etc.

I sincerely believe, Mr. Speaker, that it requires at some point for some government to show intestinal fortitude and say that if there are some consequences that will perhaps be a little difficult to live with, nevertheless because of the long run interest, because of the broader interest of society, we shall not go along. There are however, I am sure, in this particular case, certain arrangements that can be worked out. I'm sure that my colleague the Minister of Finance will want to speak in more detail on this resolution, except I wish in this forum to give notice that this government at least is unhappy with the trend that has developed in the past few years with respect to this question of estate tax rebate.

Simply to say that one province has to do it because another one is doing it is not justification in itself. It is in a sense tantamount to submitting to intimidation in a sense, and I don't

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) . . . . believe that any province that has a sense of responsibility, any government that has a sense of responsibility for the less wealthy people of its society can allow itself to submit to possible intimidation by those who have wealth and say, well if you don't agree to certain changes in the tax law which will benefit us then we will take our capital out. I don't believe that any government that has a sense of responsibility for the less fortunate can let itself get into that position. I would hope therefore that the Leader of the Opposition and others, who really don't agree with the principle but who feel it is necessary because of circumstances, I do hope it will be possible to get their support on the larger issues.

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

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, since we're debating the resolution, I think I should add a few words or comments that I would like to make on the particular resolution before us. To me, the estates tax is a discriminating tax since the people living and building up the estates have paid their income taxes, have paid their other taxes over the years and finally have been able to build up a certain estate, and then when death strikes the estate is subject to an additional tax. I don't think we should have estate taxes at all. I think they should be done away with completely. In Manitoba, if I stand correct, what the resolution proposes would probably involve something like \$3 million, and I think we can well do without this particular tax, or at least rebate the portion that is coming to the province back to the estate. I don't know of people retiring to the western provinces that are making the rebates at the present time, but certainly if it was a larger estate it would probably pay off to some of these people.

Then too, as I already mentioned, this particular tax could strike a party twice in succession and within a short period of time, whereas others it wouldn't strike for years and years. So in this respect I feel that the tax is unfair and it certainly can also be hardships under certain conditions. Where your assets are not liquid it means that some of the assets have to be disposed of and probably sometimes at distressed prices and so on when assets have to be liquidated for this purpose and this also in itself can cause hardship.

In my opinion it also encourages corporations, because we find that because of succession duties and estate taxes that more and more people are incorporating into corporations and putting their assets under a corporation. I don't know whether this is so good because we have been discussing the family farm here in the Legislature for years and encouraging family farms. Because of the estate taxes I think in many cases corporations have been brought into being and established and set in for probably this very purpose of avoiding the estate taxes to the degree that they would apply if this was not done. Then too as the resolution and the various whereases mention, that we should try and attract capital to develop our province and if other provinces provide this advantage that we would be harmed as a result. This can well be, that if other matters being equal, that certainly people would then to to other provinces and live there and not be subject to this particular tax. So I will support the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the House Leader of the Liberal Party. The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this for the Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to just briefly comment on this resolution. First of all I'd like to deal lightly with the Preamble. It says that the cost of education represents the largest single charge against property taxes, and I believe that nobody can deny this. It says that education is not a service to property. I don't feel that this is a very strong argument because I think that our system of taxation should be equitable and that we should obtain the money where it's most reasonable to obtain the money and spend it likewise, and in fact we're doing this in most regards anyway, if we consider the sources of money and the places in which it's spent there's not always a very close relationship.

"Whereas the property tax bears heaviest on those that can least afford to pay" is partly true but not altogether true and it's the part which is true that I support. I believe that property tax is in fact working a hardship on many people, but on the other hand there are well established industries that are contributing generously to the system through this system of taxation and this ought to be continued. I for one, Mr. Speaker, believe that education is the responsibility of not only the people but also the industries that are established in Manitoba.

(MR. GIRARD cont'd.) . . . . I think that in some method of taxation that we adopt, we must not forget that not only people ought to be responsible for the support of education, because in fact, not only people benefit from education but those who employ the people do as well.

Now I have no great quarrel with the main resolution therefore, provided that the broad base of taxation that is referred to is equitable in the sense that the densely populated areas will bear the larger brunt. I like to reserve my comments and emphasize more however, the latter portion of the resolution. It says that the foundation program should be re-assessed on a yearly basis, and this, Mr. Speaker, with this I wholeheartedly agree. I think that the revision ought to be yearly not only in a sense that it increases the grants to equal the increase in cost; I think that yearly the foundation program should be re-examined so that the structure of it itself might be changed in such a way as to bring about more equality. To give you a very specific example of this, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to refer to one item in the foundation program in terms of grants at present, and this is the grant issued for administration of school divisions. The administration of school divisions is that portion in cost which is allocated to the maintaining of a school board, paying their expenses, their transportation and their office expenses. Whether the school division which that school board is in charge of be one of 2,000 or 20,000 students, that administration grant is on the basis of the student population. The grant structure at present seems to forget that one school board, whether they look after 20,000 or 2,000 students has a very similar kind of cost and responsibility. I think this part of the foundation grants should be reviewed. There are no doubt other areas that should be reviewed as well.

I think however, Mr. Speaker, that this resolution should go a little further. The very deep problem in financing education today in Manitoba in school divisions, is not the general levy as this resolution seemed to indicate, but rather it is the special levy that works the hardship on the school divisions. That hardship is one that is very difficult to bear in the rural parts of Manitoba where assessment is comparatively low. There are some school divisions as I have mentioned before, where the assessment might be three times that of another, whereas their student population might be one-half of that other. This of course reflects an inequality of assessment per student and we know that the cost of education is really based on that number of students.

Mr. speaker, I support the resolution. However, I would like in the deliberations that these factors be considered and that if changes can be brought about to remedy these few problems, it would be deeply appreciated by many people.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Youth and Education.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Minister of Finance, 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 Leader of the Official Opposition. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . could we have this stand? But I'm sure my honourable colleague would have no objection to anybody else speaking if they so desired.

. . . . continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, Canada celebrated its 100th birthday just a few years ago and Manitoba will be 100 years old in a few short months. I think that it is fitting and proper if we, the members of this House would now take a hard look at our present form of government to see if it should be retained, and if so to see in which way we can improve it.

But if it is important enough to review, and I certainly think that it is, I think that we should do so critically, constructively and honestly. It would not suffice to give lip service to establish and respect a tradition. Paragraph after paragraph of superlatives would be mere window dressing and would be useless. Nothing should be done, Sir, in the spirit of trying to embarrass either a political party or an individual while dealing with this. Any political advantages that might derive from this certainly would not be lasting and would be useless for the rest of Manitoba. The government has taken this resolution very seriously. The government feels that if passed under this present form it would be of limited benefit. The government feels that this resolution is incomplete and I'm sure that the government is ready to spell out what it wants for the people of Manitoba. First of all it will be guided by a policy of live and let live. We do not believe that we can legislate, or at least force enthusiasm for anything that would seem to favour one group and one group only, be it the majority group here in the province. We will do everything possible to develop unity between all the people of Manitoba - and I repeat all the people of Manitoba. We are ready to provide this leadership that is needed. But, Sir, we will also allow history to teach us that uniformity is not conducive to unity but quite the contrary.

Having said this, Mr. Speaker, I wish to state clearly that it is not my intention to oppose this motion but certainly, but certainly I intend to try to strengthen it. It is not difficult, we don't want -- I should say, Mr. Speaker, that we do not want to make this difficult for the people of Manitoba to support. In fact I think that we could make it not only acceptable but desirable by all Manitobans. Sir, I would regret if Her Majesty our Gracious Queen would be blamed for any weaknesses that we may find in our constitution or for any unrest that we might have among some of the people of our country. I think that it would be most unfair. But, Sir, one would have to be gullible indeed to believe that all the people of Manitoba, all the people of Canada are enthusiastic about the monarchy. To pretend that this is a fact would not be facing reality. This is the reason, Sir, why I think that it would be wrong to ask the members of this House to vote on this motion in its present form. It would be tantamount to waving a red flag in front of certain different ethnic groups. Not because they do not respect Her Majesty; not because they are against the monarchy form of government, because it might be interpreted by them that it is taking care or ~~that~~ is catering or wishing to favour but one group, but a part of our citizens.

The mere mentioning of the name of the Queen and the singing of God Save the Queen will not move all the people the same or at least -- or I should say will not move all the people, at least will not move them to the same degree. Now this is a fact. There's no point denying it; it will always remain a fact. There's nothing bad, there's nothing shameful about admitting this and there is no reason why it shouldn't be mentioned. You see, Sir, pride and emotion are something that are within us, something that we can't possibly regulate and it is something that we feel. As I mentioned previously in this House, Sir, if a member would stand here in his seat and say with his hand on his heart, with fire in his eyes and pride in his voice and say that I was born a British subject, I want to live a British subject and I want to die a British subject, he might be most sincere; but, Sir, wouldn't it be expecting a little too much for all 57 of us to stand up and with the same pride and with the same sincerity repeat the same thing. It would be the same, Sir, I believe for me to expect that all the members here are very anxious to celebrate St. Jean Baptiste Day or maybe for the Minister of Education to think that everybody is very anxious to recognize the Yom Kippur holiday. And I could go along and bring in examples of all the different ethnic groups but I think that I probably made my point, Mr. Speaker.

It might be felt here, Sir, that I might be treading on dangerous grounds but I don't think so. I don't think so because we are mature people, we are reasonable, and therefore we should be honest with ourselves and amongst ourselves here. The very cultures, the very cultures of our peoples should make us strong not weak. Diversity if it is understood, Sir, should make Canada. It is a different country and it should be very strong because of the diversity that we

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) . . . . might have. Because I speak a certain language, because I might worship at a certain church or eat a certain dish or dress in a certain way, should that prevent me from being united with some people that might not do these things as I do? I don't think so. Certainly we will not have uniformity; but why not unity. Why not a great pride in our acceptance of the different people that form Manitoba, that make Manitoba. And I say here, I want to underline the words that we accept and not tolerate these people.

Wouldn't it be great Mr. Speaker, as politicians start using the different cultures to unite instead of dividing our people. Personally I have nothing but respect for the Queen of Canada, personally as a person, and also for what she represents; and I'm quite anxious to retain the monarchy form of government, not because I might be thrilled when the Union Jack is being waved, because I'm not, I can't - I'm not motivated the same as other people might. After all, this was the flag that flew on the Plains of Abraham when my forefathers were defeated. So you cannot demand that this excite me as much as it might other people. But nevertheless, I wish to retain the monarchy because I know how very important it is to other people, to other Canadians, and I'm pleased to recognize this. I would like to say to them that I respect your history, I respect your tradition and I know how important it is to you and as a fellow Canadian, I am very pleased to go along with you to respect, and not only to tolerate, but to accept this. But, Sir, would I be demanding too much if I expect the same understanding, if I expect that my rights and what I feel is important to me, will be respected by other Manitobans? Should the Ukrainians, the Swedes, the Poles forget their history and their culture? Now if all would take this attitude, Sir, wouldn't it be more conducive to better understanding, wouldn't it help to eradicate prejudice amongst our people and unite our people?

The former premier ends his foreword in the booklet "What Tomorrow Canada" with this sentence: "The constitution must reflect our hopes and aspirations for the second century of nationhood. In it lies our future." And he also mentioned in the same foreword, "our purpose, to insure equality of opportunity for all Canadians." Well, Sir, we strongly believe this, we agree, but we also believe that the government should be prepared to give leadership and assistance in this field, and I believe, Sir, that the establishment of a secretariat on Dominion-Provincial relations to look into these things is a step in the right direction. And, Sir, I would like to take this opportunity of repeating some of the things I said on August 25, 1969 and I would like to quote from page 147 of Hansard: "The main objective of the Secretariat will be to insure the Manitoba mosaics, not as a political entity but as a mosaic of people living and understanding democracy and the democratic processes, not only of Manitoba but of all our country, Mr. Speaker. The main language for Manitoba must be one that will be spoken in a figurative way of speech, that is the language of understanding and respecting one another. We will not strive for uniformity but unity amongst the different in our mosaic. This Secretariat, Sir, I would hope will promote better understanding and respect amongst the different groups of this province and of the whole of Canada. Let me assure you that this government will not seek to divide the different ethnic groups of Manitoba to derive any political gain, but will do everything possible to ensure that here in Manitoba we will have no second-class citizens. We will work with all the ethnic groups and we will surely work to promote justice for all Manitobans regardless of their racial origin."

I'm sure, Sir, that Her Majesty the Queen, would be the first one to endorse these statements that I'm making today - I'm sure of this - and I would like to quote for you some excerpts of Her Majesty's speech, speeches she made in Quebec City on October 10, 1964 - a speech that she made in French. I will read the French part and I'll translate it because I think that it is important that all the members here should realize how Her Majesty feels: "Il m'est agréable de penser qu'il existe dans notre Commonwealth un pays où je puis m'exprimer officiellement en français - une des langues les plus importantes de notre civilisation occidentale."

It is most agreeable for me to think that there exists in our Commonwealth a country where I am able to express myself officially in French - one of the most important languages of our Western civilization. "

Then again in the same speech, Mr. Speaker: "Cet avenir, nous devons le préparer aujourd'hui. Entre compatriotes, nous devons nous expliquer et présenter sans passion notre point de vue, tout en respectant l'opinion des autres."

We must prepare the future today. Between compatriots, we must explain and present our point of view, without passion, respecting the opinion of others.

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) . . . . .

And again I continue: "Le vrai patriotisme n'exclut pas la compréhension du patriotisme des autres.

True patriotism does not exclude the understanding of the patriotism of others."

And finally, and probably the most important part of her speech: "La Confédération a été fondée par deux races, et je crois qu'il est de mise pour moi de parler dans la langue autant de Cartier que de MacDonald.

"Ce pays est le point de rencontre de deux grandes civilisations, chacune contribuant de ses propres éléments de génie et de qualité. Ces qualités ne sont pas contradictoires, mais se complètent l'une l'autre. Le progrès et l'énergie maximums de la nation ne peuvent être atteints que par une coopération continue de toutes les parties du peuple canadien.

"Confederation was founded by two races, and I believe that it is only proper for me to speak in the language of Cartier as well as that of MacDonald. This country is the meeting place of two great civilizations, each contributing its own genius and quality. These qualities are not contradictory, but compliment one another. The full energy and progress of the nation can only be realized by the continued cooperation of all sections of the Community."

Sir, I hope that the members of this House will realize how important that we adopt this kind of an attitude, the attitude of live and let live of the golden rule, an attitude of cooperation and understanding, and it is for this reason alone, Sir, that I've decided to amend this resolution. You'll notice that I have left out some of the superlatives, some of the verbiage and I think that my remarks indicate the reason I have done this. I hope that the members will not try to find any sinister motive for this at all, will not give it reasons that are not intended, and as I said, we are and I hope that we are mature people. I think that this is a subject that certainly should be placed above partisan politics.

Sir, we are accepting the main principle of this resolution, but we are saying that this is not good enough, it is not good enough if we want the people to really understand the meaning of the Manitoba mosaic, of our Manitoba Mosaic. We must give it more meaning, we must make it acceptable to all the people, and therefore I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, the resolution be amended by striking out all the words after the word "Manitoba" in the third line and substituting therefor the following words:

"WHEREAS Canada is a sovereign state of Her Majesty the Queen is recognized as a bilingual country where the English and French languages are the official languages for all purposes of status and equal rights and privileges as to their use in all institutions of the parliament and government of Canada; and

WHEREAS Manitoba as a province of this sovereign bilingual state is composed not only of people of English and French origin, but of many different ethnic groups with their own culture who together form the Manitoba mosaic; and

WHEREAS the present government of Manitoba by announcing in the Throne Speech of the 29th Legislature its intention to invite Her Majesty to attend and preside at our celebration of the centennial of Manitoba has re-affirmed the present constitution and Her Majesty's role and function therein;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House hereby reaffirms its conviction that our constitutional monarchy form of government, along with the necessary leadership within Manitoba to enable Manitoba to become better recognized as a bilingual province in constitutional harmony with our bilingual country and under the reign of Her Most Gracious Majesty, continues to be the form of government most conducive to the peace, order and good government of Canada and of Manitoba and to the welfare of our people, and that our invitation to Her Majesty to attend and preside at our centennial celebration expresses our endearment to the fundamentals of our constitutional monarchy and our continuing loyalty to Her Majesty as constitutional sovereign of Canada and of Manitoba;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT this House dedicate itself to helping the many cultures of Manitoba to flourish, enabling Manitoba through its cultural mosaic to become a showcase to the rest of Canada, where true unity can be achieved without uniformity and where all its people can live together in harmony."

MR. SPEAKER: May I have the seconder again, please, I'm sorry I missed it.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. WEIR: . . . that you're satisfied that the amendment is in order?

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I believe the resolution was in my name and I had held it for the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. I

(MR. FOX cont'd) . . . . do not wish it to stand in my name so we won't get into any difficulty over protocol.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, I am accepting the amendment. I've tried to keep an eye on both the resolution and the amendment. I see nothing objectionable about it. Are you ready for the question? The question's been called -- the Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. WALLY JOHANNSON (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Logan, that 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 Churchill. The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately the Honourable Minister is not present but I am sure that he would be agreeable to any other member speaking on this resolution if they so desired, and then of course it would be held in my colleague's name if this is agreeable.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed to let it stand? (Agreed.) The proposed resolution of the Honourable the House Leader of the Liberal Party. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. PAULLEY: Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the First Minister is tied in his office. I wonder if we could have this matter stand?

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? (Agreed.) The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, as corrected. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: May we have this matter stand, Sir? (Agreed.)

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

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this for the Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY McKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, when the resolution came up on Tuesday I was over having my glasses repaired so I apologize for the resolution coming up in my absence.

The object of the resolution, Mr. Speaker, is I was trying to draw to the attention of government and this House the need for additional incentives and a development program for those areas of northern Manitoba that are not included in the Regional Development Incentives Act, and I'm thinking in terms of possibly additional funds of approximately some \$20 million. I would also hope that the resolution will throw some light on the role that transportation must play in the development of our north, and I think we have considerable evidence of that in the Mauro Report which is already in the hands of all the members of the House.

I also believe it's quite abundantly clear to those who have studied the expanding economic boom of the north, that some of the reasons of that expansion can be very closely tied with its export capacity, and the expansion, I humbly submit and I believe, has only begun. We possibly can take a look at Thompson today, the symbol of the expanding north, and we find that it has a daily newspaper; it has a television station; it's a modern airport; and certain other incentives have been created to make it other than a mining town.

The Pas. I think we have evidence that the incentive of the Churchill Forest Industries has provided to make The Pas today one of the new refreshing booming towns of the north. In talking to some people from The Pas yesterday, I understand that the housing problem there is one of great concern at the moment, but the incentive of Churchill Forest Industry has helped considerably.

Cranberry Portage. We have the Frontier School Division, the first residential school of the north, which of course has -- the incentives have helped that.

Gillam, with its multi-million dollar hydro development is another example of the north, and Lynn Lake, and one can move around to various places in the north where it is on the move but more incentives are needed to expand it properly. And it's most unfortunate that in the designated regions that are marked out by the Federal Government that that part of Manitoba wasn't included. The priorities and planning provided, I think, by government have contributed much to the north in the past, but unfortunately, as I say, most of northern Manitoba is not included in this new region and I humbly submit that the House must provide as much additional money and ideas as is possible.

The First Minister in his speech yesterday mentioned the \$350,000 in the Supplementary Estimates and where it was to be designated, but I feel that very little of it will arrive in the

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) . . . . north. I think government has many guidelines, Mr. Speaker, to follow in establishing suitable legislation for that portion of northern Manitoba that is not included in that federal Act.

The report of the -- I think it's "The role of need of people in industrial development in northern Manitoba for the period 1960-75" I think is one that you'd find quite interesting, and of course we have the Mauro Report, we have the TED Report, and I think if we follow the priorities that's set up and established in those reports - and I believe that we must commit ourselves - as Manitobans to further the economic development of northern Manitoba - the potential is unlimited.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Brandon West. The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Vital, that

WHEREAS the basic right of personal privacy, like other democratic freedoms must be continually protected with due regard for the lawful interest of others, and

WHEREAS the nature, incidence and occasion of violation of privacy can vary greatly in our modern state so that determination of same is highly difficult.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government consider enacting legislation designed to clarify the limits of personal privacy and protect the citizen from infringement - an Invasion of Privacy Act.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I feel that there should be some general enthusiasm for the intent of this resolution in this Legislature because I think that if there is any common ground which unites all of the political parties represented here, it is in our common concern for the human rights, the rights of individuals in our modern society, and we are perhaps more than ever aware of this particular right in that we have been recently reading of the speech of the Honourable John Turner, Minister of Justice at Ottawa, to the Canadian Bar Association about ten days ago, when he described in vivid detail the many electronic devices that have been produced in recent years that are in fact out-pacing the law in respect to individual privacy. (I use the word "privacy." I admit that perhaps "privacy" is also acceptable. The dictionary accepts either one but common usage, I think, and I would feel a little more comfortable by calling it an Invasion of Privacy Act.)

We're concerned with one particular human right which has been defined by the late Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court as being the right of each individual to determine to what extent his thoughts, sentiments and emotions shall be communicated to others. We're really concerned here with the way in which wire tapping has become a method of determining what our private thoughts and sentiments are when we're not prepared at the time to communicate them to others.

There are other kinds of electronic surveillance devices that make it possible for conversations at some distance away to be monitored, and these are relatively inexpensive devices, and we're confronted with extremely simple ways of converting the common telephone receiver to a bug. We're told by people in the electronic field that the removal and reconnecting of a single wire in a telephone receiver - even though it is in its cradle - can make it a bug which will monitor the conversations in the area. So I think it should be agreed by all of us that whatever we can do to protect the right of the individual, particularly as he enjoys the comforts and conveniences of his own domain, of his private property, if we can protect these rights and privileges from people who would try to be a party to his thoughts and his conversations without his agreement, then I think that this legislation should be seriously considered.

The major problem in enacting such legislation which would make wire tapping a crime under the law, would be to ensure that we did not at the same time provide any cover for people engaged in unlawful operations. We would not wish to interfere in any way with criminal detection so that we would have to admit that, while the right of privacy is a fundamental right, it is not, however, an absolute right, and there may be specific circumstances in which this will have to be encroached upon for the basic needs of law enforcement, or perhaps for state reasons.

I think there should be an admission that under certain circumstances wire tapping would have to be permissible, and some of these would be in matters of national security. There is



(MR. MCGILL cont'd) . . . . certainly no argument that, when the security of our nation was involved, that there should be some way in which these undertakings could be proceeded with. In matters of serious crime it would also be necessary perhaps by law enforcement to resort to these kinds of investigation.

In all activities of organized crime we would want those responsible for law enforcement to be provided with whatever devices they felt were necessary. The decision to authorize wire tapping would have to be one which would be very carefully placed, and we would suggest that it should not in any way be a political decision; that in, perhaps in the hands of the Attorney-General in the provinces of our country and specifically in our own province, the Attorney-General would have the ultimate right and decision to decide when these methods would be resorted to.

We agree that the freedom of the individual is quite valueless if he can be made the victim of the lawbreaker, and every society must retain and have for its use the power to protect itself from wrongdoers. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that this kind of legislation would be for the Province of Manitoba in the nature of a leadership type. We know that the Federal Government is at the present time actively considering such legislation but we have no way of knowing when this might become a law. We do know that at least one other province in the Dominion of Canada has enacted a law for the protection of personal privacy. In the Province of British Columbia, I think in April of 1968, such a bill was passed. It is our feeling that legislation of this type would be in keeping with the sentiments expressed by the Honourable the First Minister when he has publicly given his support to some kind of human rights commission. This would be the kind of thing that a human rights commission would certainly be most interested in.

I would like to leave this with you, and again to remind all members of the Legislature that we are dealing here with a basic human right, and it is the right of the individual to decide when his personal thoughts should be communicated to people unknown to him. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. If I may at this point draw the honourable members' attention to an error in draftsmanship which, according to Beauchesne, I do have the right to correct, because I think that the intent of the mover is quite obvious that it is to be an abstract resolution. I would suggest that we do follow the correct and proper form - that the government consider the advisability of enacting legislation, and I would hope that any other members who have abstract resolutions would take heed and perhaps resort to a procedure that we had followed on last private members day for correcting similar errors. But I believe that I have the power to make this correction for this resolution. I'm referring to citation 199, subsection (1) of Beauchesne: "When a member hands a motion to the Speaker after having spoken in support of it, the Speaker may, before putting the question to the House make such corrections as are necessary or advisable in order that it should conform with the usages of the House. Now in accordance with that I have made the correction and would so rule that the correction stand.

Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. AL. MACKLING (Attorney-General)(St. James): Mr. Speaker, if nobody wishes to speak, I would like to adjourn the debate. I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable of Agriculture that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution in the name of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Swan River that

WHEREAS the rules and procedures employed by the many administrative bodies of the Government of Manitoba are unnecessarily varied and complex, and

WHEREAS it is before these same bodies the citizens most often comes into direct contract with his Government, and

WHEREAS it is desirable that there should be a degree of uniformity in procedures by these administrative bodies so that each citizen could be assured of his fair and proper treatment in appearing before same bodies,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government consider the advisability of legislation designed to this end - an Administrative Practices Act.

MR. SPEAKER: I take it that the honourable member has leave to . . .

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I thank the House for accepting the amendment as I read it. At the time of proposing my resolution there was an error of draftsmanship similar to the error which you pointed out in the earlier resolution, and certainly the correct form should be followed.

In speaking to this resolution, Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind all members of the House of the submission of the Manitoba Bar Association to the Committee of the Manitoba Legislature on the ombudsman in 1966, which submission stated and I quote: "We understand that an administrative procedures act which would improve and standardize the way in which hearings before administrative tribunals are held is being considered by the government." That particular submission urged that that reform be carried out with all possible speed, and it's in that spirit that the proposed resolution now on the floor of the Chamber - Resolution No. 21 - is offered for the consideration of the members of the House at this time. What is at issue here in my view, Mr. Speaker, is the concept of protection of the individual which is contained in official, quasi-official, and totally unofficial submissions having to do with a bill of rights. What's at stake here in this particular resolution is a guarantee of justice for the individual, and a guarantee that in all cases the individual in our province, in our society, will receive a fair hearing.

The Administrative Practices Act as proposed really constitutes just one part, one section of a multiple concept in justice and in law with which all members of the Chamber currently are concerned. It's related very closely to Bill 25 which is before the House at the present time, the proposed legislation that would establish an office of ombudsman. It's related very closely to resolution No. 20 just introduced a moment ago by my colleague the Member for Brandon West, which resolution calls for an invasion of privacy act. All these forms relating to the guarantees of and for the freedom and the protection of the individual, the guarantees of and for individual justice, are part and parcel of one concept - a concept to which all of us subscribe under our Canadian democratic system, under our system of freedom, of free choice, of free expression of will, of protection of privacy, of protection of conscience. So I commend the idea of an administrative practices act to all members of the Chamber and invite their consideration of the value of such a measure of legislation along with their consideration of and contemplation of some of this allied legislation which has already been proposed.

I think that my colleague the Member for River Heights in addressing himself to some of this earlier legislation, particularly that having to do with the establishment of an ombudsman, has stated the case for an administrative practices act eloquently. There is doubtless no need for me to go into a long presentation at this particular time. He has made it clear that he sees as absolutely necessary the establishment of some uniformity in procedures by administrative bodies so that each citizen would be able to know exactly that he is treated fairly and promptly when he appears before the appropriate body, and he feels, and I concur in that feeling, that the Ombudsman Act, the establishment of the office of ombudsman, really would be rendered perhaps somewhat ineffective, at least only partially effective if it were not accompanied by a reform of allied social legislation, which included such legislation as is proposed, Mr. Speaker, in this resolution. For the ombudsman can only do so much. The spirit may be willing but the flesh and the letter of the law and the actual trappings of procedure may prevent him from bringing justice to the persons who come to him with legitimate grievances, may prevent those persons with their grievances from receiving their just desserts under our fair and free democratic judicial system.

I am not a lawyer but as a citizen involved in the complexities of mere survival in our highly competitive sophisticated society today, I am fully cognizant of the need for this kind of overhaul of our administrative practices and procedures, this kind of improvement, this kind of streamlining that would guarantee that there are no bureaucratic road blocks, no diversions and no detours standing in the way of the private individual citizen who has reason to appear before one of the various administrative bodies of our community in connection with some grievance or some specific event in which he is interested or involved. There should be no road blocks and no detours and no diversions which prevent him from being granted the justice which is his right as a Canadian citizen, and a Manitoba citizen.

And of course there is no intent on the part of anyone in administrative positions - at least no known intent - that would see the rights of a private citizen frustrated in this regard. But the trouble is that through the years with the overlay and interlap of different responsibilities, different aspects of legislation, different complicated and sometimes redundant statutes and pieces of legislative machinery, the clear route to justice, the clear route to a fair hearing

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) . . . . is obscured, and is overtangled with the trappings from the past that impose unnecessary and undue hardship on the citizen to whom I refer. So the time is at hand I submit, Mr. Speaker, for a reform of our administrative practices, for an updating and a streamlining of them, and for a condensation of them insofar as that is possible into much more workable and comprehensible and presentable form than that in which they now exist. They are disparate and scattered over the whole spectrum of human activity and the complications resulting from that present overtangled sort of unaligned system, work hardships on the individual today that long since have needed attention and reform.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that those remarks in sort of general outline present the case as I see it for an administrative practices act. I would only underline the necessity of such because of the absolute critical requirement in our system that the individual be permitted to know that there is a certain procedure that has to be followed, that must be followed in circumstances in which he finds himself where he must appear before an administrative body, and that it's his absolute undeniable right that certain forms have to be followed in the pursuit of that procedure; and it's his undeniable, unchallengeable right that his rights are protected in that procedure and in that respect. And as I have said, Sir, that there is a great deal the ombudsman can do but he can't do everything. If the system is against the individual, if it's so complicated and it's so archaic and it's so badly divided among various sectors of the statutory archives of the country and various sectors of the administrative establishment, if it's so badly divided and complicated, then the inalienable rights of the individual to that justice and that fair hearing are going to be inadvertently flouted and violated. The ombudsman will only be able to do so much, and with him and with the invasion of privacy act or comparable measures such as proposed by my colleague from Brandon West, I submit the urgent allied requirement for true justice, for the guarantee of such justice, for the guarantee of a fair hearing for all individuals in our society, there is necessary, Mr. Speaker, such a piece of legislation as is proposed in Resolution No. 21, The Administrative Practices Act, and I urgently entreat the government to consider the advisability of enacting legislation designed to that end.

I think I'd be prepared to conceive that it's an extremely complicated and difficult area of legislation into which to commit oneself, and it will not be easy to design the necessary regulations and the necessary legal language. I know that some attempt has been made to draft and institute an act of this type in the Province of Alberta, in some parts of the United States and I believe in the United Kingdom. But there are obviously a great many considerations. It's the type of legislation that obviously is very involved and complicated particularly in a Federal jurisdiction, a Federal state such as ours in Canada where you have the three levels of jurisdiction and responsibility. I certainly don't envy the task of the Honourable the Attorney-General in addressing himself to this type of a challenge, but nevertheless the objective is a worthy one, and I certainly commend it to his conscience and his earnest attention.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution in the name of the Honourable Member for Churchill. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan

WHEREAS the Jones Report covering the adverse conditions that prevail in the Fort Churchill and Port Churchill area show little sign of being considered, and

WHEREAS the past Minister of Municipal Affairs advised this Legislature that they would be asked to vote large sums of money at the following session to implement the recommendations of the above report, and

WHEREAS the taxpayers of Churchill were asked to pay for a portion of the costs involved in the Jones Report, and

WHEREAS the people of Fort Churchill and Port Churchill have never been publicly advised or consulted in respect to Federal-Provincial negotiations.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this Government consider the advisability of consulting with the people of the Churchill area in respect to what has taken place up to date and undertake to involve the people of Port Churchill and Fort Churchill in all future negotiations.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has made . . . the drafting correction.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. BEARD: Mr. Speaker, I suppose there's not a great deal that I can say at this time that has not been said before, but we'll go ahead anyway. I see the Member for Pembina has already left and he was quite concerned about hearing too much about the north this morning so I suppose he went south for the weekend. And then one of our other colleagues referred to the north as a good potential moose pasture and I don't know whether that's a compliment or not, but -- (Interjection) -- Well, I think at least the moose know where to go anyway.

In referring to the Jones Report, Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to go through the whole thing. I would like to try and table some evidence but, turning to the first couple of pages, really the conclusion and the recommendations from the Jones Report answered the whole problem in itself, and it was (a) the conclusion, the physical, social and economic plight of the Town of Churchill is perhaps unparalleled anywhere in Manitoba or even throughout the nation. I think, Mr. Chairman, that with those few remarks I could sit down but it seems I have some other material here, I have to go through it.

But I wonder what did really happen to the Jones Report because mine was dated February 1968, and both the people of Churchill and myself have not been kept up-to-date as to what has happened, or what the planning is. It seems that this has to be a deep dark secret between the Government of Manitoba and the Federal Government in Ottawa, and I don't think the people of Churchill are really much different to any of the other people in this province or in Canada itself, and I believe that government should at least have the courtesy of telling them from time to time how they're getting along and involve them before the decisions are made.

In some cases, the people of Churchill feel that the Jones Report has been laid to rest; I don't know. But if this is the case, then I would respectfully hope that the Minister of Municipal Affairs will take it out and dust it off and take another look at it, because certainly Mr. Mauro in his report referred to it many times and concurred with what had been recommended in this Jones Report, and the Jones report referred back to the McLean Report of 1920, and you can go on and on, and of course, there's the TED Report and many others. So, I would hope that the Minister will look into these problems of at least getting the communication between the people of Churchill and government ironed out so that they know what is going on, and they know what the future of Churchill is to expect in regard to the development of Churchill.

It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, when we were on our trip to Churchill, that Murray V. Jones accompanied us, and while it is called the Murray V. Jones Report and Associates, apparently it was the "Associates" that had made this report up, but after viewing Churchill, he said to me, "Really, there's not one word that I would care to change in this report even though it is two years old." I think that if this government recognizes the need of Churchill and does something about it, I agree that they could quite possibly eliminate this Legislature's only Independent member and then they could possibly cut down a lot of the debate in that respect. So that would be at least one contribution that could come out of . . .

Now, I think there's precedent being set all the time as far as the Federal Government, and it's the Federal Government I'm going to go at at this time because I think that they have an 80 percent responsibility as far as Port Churchill and Fort Churchill is concerned, and, as I said before, if they've got 80 percent and they can't do the job and the province won't let them, or whatever it is that's holding it back, then maybe Ottawa should take the 100 percent responsibility and take the oil with it. But I did notice, and I congratulate the Town of Flin Flon, but in the Free Press of July 24th it's noted that the Department of Defence in Flin Flon approached the council there on the establishment of a new area for Flin Flon to build 24 homes, and they would be responsible for all the services on that subdivision. This is the Department of Defence at Ottawa. So here they are prepared to go ahead with what has been suggested in the Jones Report at Flin Flon, so we're getting a little closer to home. Maybe they'll move a little further north.

It states in the editorial of September 6th in the Tribune; "Churchill may be justified in laying claim to the most studied town in Canada," and with this I hope that if there's an amendment coming through on this resolution, as usually happens with Private Members, I hope that members of the front bench and caucus wouldn't decide to suggest that another commission be brought in to look into the reports that have come out of Churchill. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, Sir, the most studied town in Canada.

When Arthur Laing, federal Minister of Northern Affairs in 1967, suggested that a financial deal was offered for Churchill if the municipality was incorporated by the province, the Minister was certain grants in lieu of taxes would be made by the Federal Government if

(MR. BEARD cont'd) . . . the settlement was an organized municipality. I think that's just as plain as the nose on your face. The Federal Government have said, "We want to deal with the people of Churchill. We're not prepared to deal with the Government of Manitoba because they may squirrel away some of the money that we give them for Churchill." So they want their thing to it. Let them incorporate and we'll contribute larger grants in lieu of taxes. I think that I can support this suggestion because Churchill will be no worse off - they can't be. If they go broke, then the province has to take them over. They took over St. James and look at what St. James is today: one of the most wealthiest communities, I suppose, in Manitoba, and in fact I understand, when the great Trudeau went to St. James at one time and said, "Well, you're off the hook; we'll withdraw our services," they said, "No, you stay. We're doing very well with your assistance."

I couldn't help but pass along the Free Press report on August 22nd, in which it says: "Churchill boost seen. Schreyer says a great future exists for Manitoba's port." I'm getting very excited and I think the people of Churchill are getting very excited about it. They'll be more excited if -- (Interjection) -- yeah, we put our money where our mouth is. But then we start to look a little further north, and let's get back to this Federal government and the image of northern Canada and what the great Trudeau government is doing for the just societies. And this is Free Press September 2, '69 -- I incidentally came from Neepawa, I was born and raised there, Mr. Shoemaker rubbed off on me -- and it's respecting a ten million dollar city in the works for Frobisher Bay. "These are the first building for the new townsite for the administration centre of the eastern Arctic." That means that they are considering taking away the administration which is now in Churchill. "Ten million dollar city of steel and concrete will lend a sense of permanency and purpose in Frobisher Bay and the whole Canadian northland." If they're going to waste it, I say waste it in Churchill, let's not start closer to home. They're going to build a steel city in Churchill. "The cost of moving building equipment and all the supporting services into the high Arctic is staggering. Pan Arctic now expect to spend more than forty millions of dollars drilling about 20 wells. The Trudeau government's current view of Canada's national priorities will be expressed in the Throne Speech at the opening of Parliament next month and attitudes, understandings, of the three national political parties will be displayed and developed at the National Policy Conferences they are holding in the next three months." I have here underlined: "I plan" -- and I presume this is our Prime Minister -- "I plan and am beginning this week a visit to each of the ten provinces, provincial capitals and Yellowknife and the Northwest Territory, and like most Canadians, I suspect, I have been absent-minded about 40 percent of Canada that lies north of the 60th parallel." He forgot that he'd been in Churchill just a couple of months ago, or a month ago. But anyway: "It is a vital part of Canada today, accessible to tourists who fly up from Montreal on \$90.00 one-day excursions, hopefully a storehouse of mineral wealth, and within a few hours by jet from the crowded cities of the south. We've all heard of the Manhattan. Wednesday, we visit the ship. The Humble Oil and Refinery Company is gambling forty millions of dollars on dropping on to her huge landing deck by helicopter from the MacDonald." -- (Interjection) -- Well, we'll have a little crushed ice up there I guess. "Great project seen for the north if Manhattan's trip successful. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Would the honourable member please identify the newspaper from which he is reading these quotations, or the various newspapers, or is this a continuation of quotes from the same one?

MR. BEARD: The last one was the Tribune, Thursday, September 4, 1969; the steel city was the Winnipeg Free Press, Tuesday, September 2, 1969. It seems unanimous, Mr. Speaker, that everybody's in agreement. The Tribune of August 27, 1969: "Great project seen for the north if Manhattan's trip successful." I might say, Mr. Speaker, that I agree that the news media are usually always right -- I'm not like the rest of the people who say they're misquoting but I'm just trying to prove that the news media are right. So here we have: "Mr. . . . estimated the United States ship building industry would double or triple if a north sea lane were established, meaning a potential investment of about one billion five hundred millions of dollars." -- (Interjection) -- Well, we'll put it in the record anyway. "The north adopts a new look, a rapid change" -- it says in the Free Press Thursday September 4, '69 -- "after 5,000 years of isolation the Eskimos are adapting to a new way of life at a speed which makes the social revolution in the south look leisurely, and they are probably on the brink of a tourism invasion that will integrate them completely into the North American community. Three

(MR. BEARD cont'd) . . . . hundred years ago next year, the Hudson's Bay Company, HBC for short, translated in the north as 'Here Before Christ', began to develop the trading contracts with the Eskimos, but it touched only the edge of Eskimo life."

In the Free Press Thursday September 4th: "The North Adopts New Look". "In ten years Federal expenditures on social services in the far north have increased tenfold to about 70 millions of dollars a year, and the rate of construction of homes is now 250 homes a year." Mr. Chairman, I am trying to prove to you in case you feel I'm wandering too far, that here we have a Jones Report asking for a couple of dollars, and all this money being used to . . . --(Interjection) -- Forget about Churchill.

I'm not going to read very much of this, but I did go back to 1968, and it took me a day and a half to find it and I feel that I should be privileged to use it. It's just that there's unanimous support for this resolution, and I'm going to be very sorry unless we do get unanimous support on it, because back on Page 1737 of Hansard, May 9, 1968, the Leader of the Liberal Party, Mr. Molgat at that time - and I'm just going to quote a short part of it: "The first action obviously must come from the province. That port is part of Manitoba. The first responsibility is Manitoba's. It's up to Manitoba to lead the way and to wait for eight or nine years is not the solution that the people of Churchill expect, and certainly not what Manitobans need. The member is absolutely right in my opinion, when he says that you simply can't wait another year, because the people at Churchill are totally fed up. If action isn't taken this year I think the harm that will be done to the whole of northern development will be very great indeed." I won't continue any further. He just continues on in the same vain supporting it as the Liberal Party.

And then we come to the then Leader of the New Democratic Party, our House Leader, and our very good friend in the north. And he told us this several times in the speech. He says on page 1800 of May 9, 1968. There must have been somebody in the gallery at that time. "Don't await any action from the government when whoever it may be that is elected as a result of June 25" - now this wasn't our election, Mr. Speaker, this has to be a Federal one. "But really be determined to do something on behalf of the people of Churchill. Lip service is no longer any good, and at the port itself, which is likely to deteriorate, and today when we have transient populations like we do, I fear that outside of some of the people who are referred to in the Jones Report as just staying there because there's no place else for them to go, that we will not have the personnel to carry on the occupations required in the Port of Churchill. Mr. Chairman, it is time to stop talking. It's time to start acting, and I trust and hope that government here and the government at Ottawa will get on to it and get with it, and help the people of the Town of Churchill who need help so badly." Oh yes, I mustn't forget this.

This is from Page 1803, May 9, 1968 and it's the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs and she is commenting on the position of Churchill in the Jones Report, and she says: "Now we have not received an answer to this as yet but I would tell the members of this Assembly that we will pursue this, and we must sit down and meet at this level, and with the people of Churchill, and I serve notice on you in this Assembly that you will be asked at the next Session of this Legislature - because it will take a little time - but you will be asked to approve sums of money to do something about the problem at Churchill, and as Minister of Municipal Affairs I can see that this is before you." And some member says: "Sit and wait, sit and wait", and Mrs. Forbes: "No sit and wait about it. No sit and wait about it". But, Mr. Speaker, the unfortunate thing that happened, if you will recall, they juggled, and they had a new Minister of Municipal Affairs and the first thing he did was went up there and said not one cent for Churchill.

But I'm getting close to the end. I was reading through the Mauro Report. I do see that he refers back to W. L. Morton in a study completed in 1950 on northern Manitoba, and stresses the critical role of government. And it says: "When does a community reveal a promise of sufficient permanence; what concentration of population is necessary to justify local and provincial expenditure and the provision of public services? The pattern of growth in the north is not sufficiently uniform as it was in the agricultural south. For rules of thumb to be really laid down a decision must be reached in the light of the circumstances in the development of each community." And, Mr. Speaker, after 39 years I wonder if we shouldn't be considering to do something about this Jones Report. I think that after 39 years that Churchill has proved something.

And finally Mr. Mauro again refers and says: "We have underlined the crucial role in

(MR. BEARD cont'd) . . . . government in northern development. The problems which confront us are not new. The problems of labour turnover, of distance, of costs are the same problems that have faced this country since its inception. These problems are related to western expansion in the 1880s and were resolved by dynamic national policy." And if we could get the ear of Mr. Trudeau, maybe he would become another John A. MacDonald, but -- (Interjection) -- I don't think he does either. But at least Sir John A. MacDonald built a railroad before he really knew what was out here, and we know what's in the north and we're not prepared to go ahead, and this is a problem that has faced Churchill for many years. They say there's apathy, but I think that they're waiting for a dynamic national policy set by the front benches on this side of the House. They have said for years - the Leader of the House used to say: "Plague on the two old line parties. They have not been able to produce." -- (Interjection) -- Yes, plague on your House. So we wouldn't want him to join that type of political philosophy and I hope that he will see to it that it will be looked after.

I think an important part of this is incorporation, and I'm sure that the Minister of Municipal Affairs will have lots of support in the front benches because I know that the Minister of Transportation likes incorporation. In fact he's ready to sit out in the front and make sure that incorporation is given to a community - in front of the building. I can remember when the Minister of Transportation was out there making a point of issue of it, the now First Minister rose one day and he was going to make a speech on democracy and he had reached back to - I think it was either the Greek or Roman Empire until the Clerk of this House suddenly decided that he had already spoke once, and he rushed up to the Speaker and the First Minister had to sit down. I have not got the benefit of what he was going to say but I am sure that if we could get him to give that speech again - as he was going to give it - then there would be no need for me to stand. I believe there were other front benches that supported it now as it was at that time. I hope they will now and I hope that they will come back to communicating with the people of Churchill. Not like it was done this spring. They decided they were going to let people know what they were going to do, and they didn't call a meeting, they thought they were going to have something different - and I think Mayor Juba should consider this -- but they had a hotline. They got on TV for half a hour or an hour and said you call in and tell us your problems and we'll tell you the answers. This is the way we're going to conduct the business of Churchill - via the hot line - municipal affairs. So the decisions of Churchill were made by the hot line. People were so disgusted. I don't think they had too many calls. But the problems are there, this government has to face up to it. I think the real thing is that we must settle down to do a little bargaining. It seems that there's been no hope of the two governments getting together and say, let's as a last resort incorporate and allow the governments to deal with these people on an elected basis, and I'm sure if they can get leadership such as the City of Winnipeg has or the Town or Steinbach or Kildonan, is it, that they will have a Mayor that will be able to speak for them and provide the wherewithal to encourage the federal government and the provincial government to assist them to get off at a running start.

Because this government that was in before made sure that Hydro picked up their responsibilities when they moved into Gillam; and we saw what was done at Gillam. And I believe it was the past government that negotiated with Pinawa to see that the Federal Government looked after their responsibilities in respect to the development of Pinawa. And it was the Liberal Government who negotiated with mining companies to see to it that private industry took care of the responsibilities of developing the sites that they were responsible for. But you know the federal and provincial government have said: "Don't do as we do, do as we say." Because when you come to Churchill the federal and provincial governments have reneged all the way down the line. And, Mr. Speaker, I think that I'd better sit down before I say what I really . . .

I hope that this government will accept the responsibilities that have been asked of Crown corporation and private industry and start to do those things which they preached so well about when it comes to other peoples responsibilities. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RON McBRYDE (The Pas): Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Flin Flon that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution in the name of the Honourable Member for Lakeside. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, at this hour when I know that I have the rapt attention of every member in this House, I beg to move, seconded by the Member from Rock Lake, that

WHEREAS hunting is of major economic and recreational importance to this Province, and WHEREAS with the growing number of Manitobans and tourists engaging in the pastime of hunting, the incidents of loss through careless hunting practices or outright vandalism is an unfair burden to the farmer, rancher or other private property owner, and

WHEREAS the present method of recovering these losses sustained in this manner by the farmer, rancher or other private property owner are difficult and in many instances impossible to enforce, and

WHEREAS the inability to promptly and adequately compensate the farmer, rancher or other private property owner for losses sustained as a result of such aforementioned careless hunting practices has contributed to a deterioration in the relationship between the hunting public and private property owners,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of implementing a program providing for the compensation for losses sustained by the farmer, rancher or other private property owner to be funded by the sale of a hunting certificate.

I believe the word 'good' is redundant in that final sentence, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask your permission, by leave, to have it deleted.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the resolution before you needs little further explanation. There is a specific reason for my presenting the resolution to the House at this time. It was surely my intention, one of the few personal feelings of concern that I had when I assumed the portfolio of Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, that I would do what I could in an attempt to bring about a better relationship between the hunting public and our - what by and large would have to be described as our rural population, the farmers, the ranchers, but in many instances other private property owners - and for this reason the particular wording in the resolution.

We have an unique situation in this continent I would suggest, unique that is from more settled parts of the world, namely Europe, where hunting perhaps partly because of our pioneer past is regarded as a universal right by all citizens. Now I'm well aware that many don't indulge in it but certainly those who have any inclination to hunt have had every reason to, and have been encouraged to believe that it's their right to enjoy the manly or womanly art of going into the woods in the fall or in the winter or at other times in pursuit of game. Certainly I think that this is one of the privileges that we enjoy in this province particularly and in Canada generally. However, we are, because of the increasing numbers asking one, or some segments of our society to bear an increasing responsibility in the consequences of irresponsible action that's carried out by that minute portion of hunters that engage in this pastime, partly for many varied reasons: accessibility, the roads. There's hardly a quarter section or section of land that is not open to some modes of transportation nowadays and that with the vehicles, with the roads and the road allowances open to us in the fall, access to property, to the country generally is there, and unless we can bridge the deteriorating situation between the landowner and the hunting public, we will eventually either seriously have to curtail our hunting to those tracts of land set aside by government specifically for that purpose, in reserves, hunting preserves, or we sharply reduce it to the growth of private hunting clubs if that's a development. Neither ones which I particularly see as being the kind of developments that we would want to see take place in the province.

The difficult thing is that the property owner finds the most convenient thing to do is to simply post his land. He's had bad experience on the odd occasion where an animal is lost or property is damaged, duck blinds are dug in his hole and he drops his tractor into it, hay land is carelessly set on fire and he loses a year's crop of hay, he has sustained losses of livestock, and while it's generally accepted, I would wish, particularly the urban members of the House to accept the fact that most rural persons agree very quickly that this irresponsible action is caused by a very small minority of the hunting public, and that in most instances that I have had occasion to hear about, that even the simple courtesy of a person asking permission to hunt on one's land very seldom is refused. That act alone enables the property owner to indicate to the



(MR. ENNS cont'd.) . . . person that wishes to hunt on the land, to indicate to him certain precautions that he should be aware of. I post my land for instance in the Interlake not for "no hunting", I post it for "no trespassing". I allow hunting on my land. I ask only that the persons that are hunting on my land that they inquire of me that I'm aware of the fact that they're on my land. It enables me to tell them that there are cattle in this part of the farm or there are cattle in these sections, and knowing that, of course for my own knowledge, that I have some idea of who's on my land and whom to point the finger of responsibility to if something goes amiss. I am a firm believer that any man or any person that has enough courtesy to ask a landowner for the privilege of hunting on your land is the last person that would act in any irresponsible way or do any damage to your property.

Now, the essence of this resolution, and it's one that I'm -- I regret that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is not in his seat -- it's one that quite frankly, if I were government today and had the opportunity of being in session at this time, it would be brought in as a government measure. We were well along the way in developing this. I know that the Department of Mines and Natural Resources has undertaken a fair amount of work in this direction. We are hopeful that we could bring in amendments to the Wildlife Act last May or March, during the regular session, to effect essentially what is in this resolution. I think it's the kind of a resolution that the government should give very serious consideration to. It's not an earth-shattering piece of legislation it's just a little bit to help improve public relations between two groups of Manitoba citizens.

I hope it is noticed by the members opposite that I'm not demanding on the part of the government in this resolution an expenditure of public funds. I suggest that essentially or initially the hunting public should basically fund this program through the sale of a general hunting certificate which could be sold regardless of what game you're after. We sell a general hunting Certificate of One Dollar let's say, and then in addition to that the Wildlife Branch sells whatever particular licenses that they have for their various seasons. But this One Dollar is dedicated to the setting up of a fund from which compensation could be paid for various forms of loss sustained by those few rotten apples in a barrel that spoil it for the rest of us. Not only restricted to crop loss, but restricted to the outright, vandalistic acts that have occurred from time to time. The present method, I'm well aware that it's there. If I lose an animal and I think I've lost it as a result of a hunting accident, I have to phone the RCMP. First of all I'm not aware immediately of whether I've lost it, it takes some time, by the time the RCMP comes the animal is partly decomposed, and I have one whale of a time in trying to make any point.

On the other hand, I think that within the mechanism of the government, there are all kinds of means that, you know reasonable proof can be established. I think the use of our agricultural representatives throughout rural Manitoba could be used in this case to help substantiate a claim. And I'm also speaking of claims that aren't necessarily of the more serious 2, 3, 400-dollar loss. I'm thinking about the farmer that has put up a new barbed wire fence, only to have somebody with a pair of wire cutters go through it in pursuit of game. Well, fine, it's not the cost of the wire, it's not the cost of repairing it. The consequence is, what was a nice type fence has been destroyed to some extent, it's very difficult to put the fence back in the same order. But the serious consequence is, the first reaction of the farmer is to post his land. You have great sections of Manitoba that are being posted now, not because the farmers are opposed to hunting as such; they're opposed simply because they want to exercise some control over their property. Even if the farmer was assured that he would have some measure of compensation, whether it was nominal; to begin with, maybe 50 percent of the actual cost involved, but some nominal measure of compensation for the individual property loss that was suffered by the act of irresponsible hunters, I have a feeling that this could go a long way in getting some of the posted lands, the signs off that would help improve the general relationship between the hunting public and the farmers. I indicate to you in true conservative fashion I'm not asking the Minister of Finance to cough up with the dollars in this program immediately, I'm suggesting that those who enjoy the sport to some extent should be prepared to pay for part of this program. It may well be expanded at a later date to include more greater aspects of the program, such as crop loss from game, which could become quite comprehensive. This may require different kinds of funding in the future, but I know that by and large the hunting public, the people that are interested in the wildlife from that point of view would support this kind of a resolution. They are the first ones that are prepared to accept a degree of responsibility for those of their own fraternity who are less responsible.

(MR. ENNS cont'd.)

I would ask the government to give very serious consideration in this area, particularly at a time where you know, quite aside from the immediate problem, but I think it's in the interest at all times to devise and to look at pieces of legislation regardless of their, you know, of their major import or not, but that have an effect that tends to bridge or improve our relationship between our country and city cousins. I think this is the kind of legislation that would take one step towards bridging this difficulty that does arise from time to time.

Now, I notice that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is back in his seat. I mentioned in your absence, Sir, that the department has given this particular problem very serious consideration, and one of the reasons for it being on the Order Paper here is that at the time that I left the department we were short a few months of additional study work and investigation to come up with the kind of a feasible plan or program that would make this possible, and I suggested to the House that if I were the Minister and were having a session at this time, that I would in fact be introducing this amendment to the Wildlife Act. I think it's particularly apropos, we're engaged in a summer session. This doesn't require a great deal of work, it just requires the will to do it. We're approaching that season of year where it's a subject that's on many people's minds; certainly on the minds of most property owners and farmers and ranchers who once again, not with intrepidation or not all with fear, look forward to the avalanche of city people to come out to our fields, to run through our meadows in their pursuit of game and leisure. God bless them, I say; I think this is fine. I'm only looking for a vehicle, for means for making this a more compatible exercise and leisure on both parts; that is the owner of the land whose land is being hunted and that person who is enjoying an outing in the country away from the pavement and away from the business pressures here in the city. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for The Pas. that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: It is now 5:30. . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, 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.