

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Thursday, June 6, 1974

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 50 students of Grade 5 standing of the Ashern Central. These students are under the direction of Mrs. McMillan, Konzelman and Mrs. Jonsson. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. George, the Minister in charge of Autopac. On behalf of all the honourable members, I welcome you here this afternoon.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions. The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

MR. DAVID BLAKE (Minnedosa): I'd like to present the petition of the Agricultural and Community District of Newdale praying for the passing of an Act to amend an Act respecting the Agricultural and Community District of Newdale.

MR. SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports; Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Questions.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C. (Leader of the Official Opposition) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Finance. It relates to the information supplied in a document from the Provincial Auditor indicating that in that particular case, there were charges for entertainment at--(Interjection)--a document by the Provincial Auditor which was released, or leaked, by someone a few days ago, indicating that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Again I remind the honourable member if he's going to have a preface in order to give information to the House that is the wrong way to utilize the question period, and I would hope that he would co-operate and ask his question. If there's some embellishment necessary to explain what he's asking, very well, but not a long statement of information which the rest of the members may or may not be aware of in the House. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my purpose is to ask the Minister a question but before I ask the question because the information has been supplied in a document released by the Provincial Auditor, there is no way in which that question will be understood unless it's prefaced. It's not for the purpose of information, the information I'm talking about has already been released.--(Interjection)--Well it was information - not released by the Auditor - information released but from the Provincial . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. This is highly irregular in the question period. If the honourable member has a question, let him make it and then we'll adjudicate whether it's in order or out of order.

MR. SPIVAK: Has the Provincial Auditor brought to the Minister of Finance's attention expense account charges that have been made by either Ministers, or by members of the departments, with respect to entertainment costs charged, and owing, and payable to the Centennial Concert restaurant and bar facilities?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (Minister of Finance) (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, the question as I understand it is limited to expense accounts dealing with the Centennial Concert Hall restaurant. If that is the question I will take it as notice.

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

MR. I. H. ASPER (Leader of the Liberal Party) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney-General. Is the judicial inquiry report into Churchill Forest Industries completed?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

ORAL QUESTIONS

HON. HOWARD PAWLEY, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, it has not been submitted to the Government as of yet. Now whether it's fully completed or just in the final stages of completion, I'm not certain. In any event it has not been submitted to the Government as of yet.

MR. ASPER: Well has the Government - to the same Minister, Mr. Speaker - has the Government received any information from the Commissioners to the effect that the report is completed, or that it will be received by Government within a matter of days?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I've received indication that the report will be completed soon, and my opinion was asked as to the number of copies that might be required of the report, and so I'm in the process of determining just how many copies of the report should be requested from the Commission. So from the impression of those questions, I assume that the report will be made available very soon.

MR. ASPER: Could the Minister give the House some assurance that upon receipt of the report, the Government will make it public expeditiously, if not immediately?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, there would be no intention whatsoever of sitting on the report. My only concern would be, and it's one which would have to be weighed very carefully, is that I would have to be assured by all the legal parties that are engaged, including the special legal staff that's working on other proceedings at the present time in respect to criminal proceedings, that the release of the report would not jeopardize the criminal proceedings that had been launched.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I'd like leave to make a motion to change the make-up of two of the committees of the House.

COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? (Agreed) The Honourable Member for Portage.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I move, seconded by the Member for St. Boniface, that the Member for Portage on the Standing Committee of the House on Statutory Orders and Regulations be replaced by the Member for Assiniboia.

And the second one, on the Industrial Relations Committee, that the Member for Assiniboia be replaced by the Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? (Agreed) The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

ORAL QUESTIONS Cont'd

MR. A. R. (Pete) ADAM (Ste. Rose): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Agriculture. I wonder if he could confirm if the report is correct that hog producers in Alberta are killing off their pigs, their hogs?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, I would think that I would know about as much about that as the Member for Ste. Rose does, depending on the extent of our reading of the media.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health and Social Development. I wonder if he can indicate whether the Government has received requests for permission by the Manitoba Cancer Research and Treatment Foundation to add two floors to its present facilities.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Health and Social Development) (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, the Cancer Institute is part of the Health Sciences Centre and is part of the total building program envisaged by the Health Science Centre.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister's in a position to confirm that the request is for permission to build and the moneys would be funded by moneys now in their possession, as well as matched by a grant from the Federal Government.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, there is a fund known as the Health Resources Fund, I believe it is, of federal moneys which are being used for health facilities related to teaching, and this has been used, for example, in the construction of the General Services Building attached to the Medical College. Moneys from that fund could be available for this particular

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. MILLER cont'd) building I suspect; it might qualify, I'm not certain it would, I think it would. So to that extent it would be federal funds. Whether the Cancer Institute has - or Foundation has funds or not, I don't know. If they say they have, I assume they have.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, why has the Provincial Government not given them permission?

MR. MILLER: I'll go back to my first answer, Mr. Speaker. It's part of the total Health Sciences Centre development.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Minister's in a position to indicate whether discussions have taken place with the people involved in the research portion of the Manitoba Cancer Research Foundation as to what the failure of proceeding now means in terms of the total research program that has been under way so far and is in the process of evolving here in Manitoba.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I have not had personal discussion with the people mentioned. I do know however that it's part of the total study which is ongoing now with regard to all the plans of the Health Sciences Centre, all components of it, and the cancer people are aware of this and are involved in and co-operating in that particular procedure.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister could confirm that the second study by his department indicated that they should immediately proceed with the additions of the two floors to the Manitoba Cancer Research Foundation?

MR. MILLER: No, Mr. Speaker, I don't recall that that particular item was prioritized ahead of everything else. I do recall that an earlier study launched by the Co-ordinating Council at that time in the late sixties didn't place quite that high a priority on it.

MR. SPIVAK: Well then what the Minister is indicating at this particular time is that the matter is not being proceeded with . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question please. The honourable member is debating it.

MR. SPIVAK: Well I'm again referring to his answer, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister is indicating that this is not a priority item with respect--Well you said with respect to priority.--(Interjection)--Well, Mr. Speaker, I ask whether this is a priority item as far as the Government is concerned?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, every matter dealing with the health and welfare of this province is a priority item.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, I wonder then, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister can indicate when the Government intends to deal with this request.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, there is a committee established, a committee of two established to sort out the priorities and make recommendations with the Health Sciences Centre. They are on the job now, and as soon as these recommendations come forward the Government will be able to move.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, I wonder if the Minister can indicate when that committee was formed, and who makes up the composition of it.

MR. MILLER: It was formed early this spring. The gentlemen involved are Dr. Clarkson of Alberta, Dr. Vayda of Ontario. I think that was reported in the House on an earlier occasion.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister can indicate whether they have met with the officials of the Manitoba Cancer Research and Treatment Foundation?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I can't indicate whether they have. If they haven't, I know they are going to because that's certainly part of the requirement of the terms of reference.

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

MR. ASPER: To the same Minister, the Minister of Health. Could he indicate the number of nurses that Manitoba is short at this present time, in approximate terms, for the period of the summer at least?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MILLER: No, Mr. Speaker, I don't have that information. That information would be - if it's anywhere - Every hospital will have its own figures. I don't have that.

MR. ASPER: Could the Minister indicate how many acute care hospital beds are non-operative, or are likely to be non-operative during the summer as a result of that shortage?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, firstly, I don't think the shortage and the number of hospital beds which may be closed down for the summer are related to one another. Also, this figure I do not know. It's something that the hospitals themselves work out amongst themselves;

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. MILLER cont'd) each institution makes its own decisions in this regard.

MR. ASPER: Does the Minister have a specific program that he can outline to the House which it is hoped will result in alleviating the shortage either for this summer or for next year?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe there's a shortage per se. As I indicated once before, the summertime is the time when people, both - the patients who might by choice go into the hospital, prefer not to; staff take holidays, it's an annual event, and so I can't accept the fact of the suggestion that there is a shortage. There may be a phasing down of the total utilization of a facility but that doesn't mean that there's a shortage.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Tourism and Recreation, I direct this question to the Minister responsible for the Clean Environment Act. Is it a fact that there are plans afoot within Government departments to establish an airstrip on Hecla Island?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, that would not come within my jurisdiction. The environment in its broad sense does not come within the jurisdiction of the Clean Environment, the branch or the department that deals with contaminants to air, water, or land, and an airstrip would not have to apply for a certificate from the Clean Environment Commission.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister is unable to take the question as notice, I'll direct the question next week.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I rise only to reply to a question taken as notice, a question posed by the Honourable Member for Riel just the other day, with respect to certain of the main terms of the proposed agreement as between Manitoba Hydro and Northern States Power, which will be before the National Energy Board some time later this calendar year. In accordance with the letter of intent, or pursuant to the letter of intent, Manitoba Hydro would supply to Northern States Power electrical energy at a minimum of 11.85 mills per kilowatt hour, for delivery during the summer months only, for the term of the contract. This figure of 11.85 mills would be indexed subject to escalation in accordance with the coal price index as determined by the accepted statistical bureaus of the United States and Canada. The quantity at issue is in the order of 437 million kilowatt hours each summer, beginning the first of May, 1980.

There might be additional energy deliveries, deliveries associated with seasonal surplus, and this could yield approximately 20 mills per kilowatt hour during the summer season. Surplus energy sales during summer will be made in the same manner as at the present with sales and prices negotiated. Any amount that is beyond the amount referred to would be subject to the same kind of negotiation procedure as is the case now, which can be as frequently as on an hourly basis, depending upon systems requirements. For example, recent sales have yielded 10 to 12 mills per kilowatt hour. Manitoba Hydro has no commitments, has entered into no commitments to supply energy in the winter, so that these prices relate to summer surplus only.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the First Minister can indicate whether the coal indexing that he is referring to is to take care and to relate to what would be considered the escalation of costs that can occur in the next period of time while the facilities that Hydro are to construct are in the process of being built, and to take into consideration the increased costs that would occur.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, there are two provisions in the letter of intent. One is the utilization of the coal price escalator; the other is a clause in the letter of intent which refers to incremental costs, whatever that be, plus 10 percent.

Insofar as whether or not this is related to the construction cost escalator that relates to Manitoba Hydro's own construction costs, I'm not really in the position to answer that for the simple reason that we are not talking about year-round energy but rather summer surplus, and as such it doesn't really relate to Manitoba Hydro's requirement to add to plant capacity in order to meet system peak demand in the winter. I'm not quite sure how I can answer my honourable friend's question. I'll perhaps take it as notice and ask the Chairman of Hydro to ascertain whether it lends itself to a reply.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister on the same subject. When does he intend to honour his commitment, undertaken and given to this House, that he would table the letter of intent between Hydro and Northern States Power Corporation relating to the sale of power to the United States?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware that there's a problem there. Frankly, I apologize for the fact that I'm not aware that I made a commitment. But if I didn't, I could have—and if I didn't, perhaps I should have. And in any case I will do so now and the letter will be provided very quickly.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Health. Relating to answers given in the House three and a half months ago when he indicated that he had lifted the freeze on nursing home construction to alleviate the hospital bed shortage, I wonder if he could indicate whether he has any reports that indicate how much construction has been commenced of new nursing homes since he lifted the freeze?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I don't keep a score card. I can tell the honourable member that approvals have been granted by the Health Services Commission. Now whether they're under construction already or just being in the tendering stage, I don't know, but I can tell him that there are a number of personal care homes which have received the green light to go ahead.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, may I welcome the news here. May I ask the Minister to indicate approximately how many units in approximate round terms might be on the market or available for occupancy by the time next winter's hospital shortage . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I wonder if we would start to give the courtesy when we want figures and facts, of giving notice, and it would be so much simpler in the question period when that occurs. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (BUD) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable, the Minister of Labour. I would like to ask the Minister whether he has received a request from the solicitors for Tudor House Limited asking him to clarify his position with respect to the bargaining policies being pursued by Tudor House Management.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): I do believe I did receive a letter from some solicitors - I'm not positive whether it was one Walter Ritchie or not, asking me what I was doing, and I understand that what I did was to refer the matter for the consideration of the Labour Board as to whether or not they should proceed with charges against Tudor Homes based on failure to bargain in good faith I believe under the Labour Relations Act. If I'm not absolutely correct, Mr. Speaker, in my reply to the honourable member, I will recheck my file and reread the letter so that I shouldn't be accused of giving misinformation.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could I ask the Minister then whether he can confirm that he is contemplating having charges laid against Tudor House for failure to bargain in good faith?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. PAULLEY: I believe, Mr. Speaker, I just said that the matter was referred to the Labour Board for its consideration of laying of charges of not bargaining in good faith.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - BILL NO. 64

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would now call Bill No. 64.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. Bill No. 64. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, this debate has gone on for two or three days, and during the course of the debate most of the areas concerning this subject have been covered. I think it's somewhat ironic that today being the 30th Anniversary of the landings on Normandy Beach, D-Day, a day in which thousands of allied soldiers laid down their lives for freedom, I sometimes wonder just what they would think now—I wonder what they would think now if they were to live today and see how far we have gone down the path in the destruction and the loss of that freedom for which they fought.--(Interjection)--Sir, the

BILL 64

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) honourable gentlemen opposite appear to be terribly sensitive on this subject.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. JORGENSEN: And I don't think that they need to be terribly sensitive, because I think that we're all guilty, and not one particular party or one particular group, but I think that we're all guilty of taking for granted that freedom is something that you maintain without doing anything about it, freedom is something that we preserve in this country by leaving it up to somebody else. And I wish my honourable friends opposite would not be quite so sensitive when one rises to speak of his interpretation of the meaning of the word "freedom". I find it somewhat touching to see the concern that comes over the honourable gentlemen when one even dares to touch this subject or deal with it.

I think, Sir, that in the contents of this bill, along with several others that have been introduced into this Chamber, concept of freedom is one that must be discussed. Very often during the course of this debate, or on at least two or three occasions, a document referred to as the Guidelines for the Seventies - I think more appropriately described as the government's Mein Kampf, it has been referred to - and screams and howls of protest have come from honourable gentlemen opposite, and particularly from the Minister of Finance who endeavours to make a clear distinction between the original draft document that was presented to the Cabinet for consideration and the final expurgated version that came out. We all know why it went for a revision, as was explained in the footnote to the document that was submitted to the Planning and Priorities Committee of Cabinet, a footnote that suggested that the document in its present form or in the form in which it was worded might not be palatable because it was too honest, and that it had to be expurgated and that it had to be refined in such language that the public would not become too fearful of what the intentions of the government were.

Sir, I recall for the benefit of the record and for the members of this House the original wording of that document as it relates to the bill that is now before this House. And before I read those words, I want to draw the parallel between the operations of the Consumers Co-operative as exemplified in the co-op purchasing stores. The producers' co-ops such as the Manitoba Pool Elevators and the financial co-ops such as the credit unions, they're all designed to serve the same purpose and to a large extent organized along the same lines.

But let me read the words that appear in that original document before the wording was changed to become somewhat more palatable to the public in the Province of Manitoba. And one can only suggest that that original wording is indeed the intentions of the government. It goes on to say, "At this point it may be worthwhile to consider whether co-operatives might not be a redundant form of organization. After all, if rational and extensive use is made of Crown corporations in both the provincial and municipal levels as a means of countering private monopoly and breaking down barriers to entry, is there any need for co-ops? Is there any way of drawing a line between the proper areas for co-ops and the proper area for public enterprise?" And let it be clearly understood, when they talk about private monopoly, the document itself refers to a private monopoly as one that exists in a small town where the owner of a grocery store in that town may be the only owner of a grocery store - that in the opinion of those who drafted the document and in the opinion of the Government, is a monopoly, a monopoly that has to be extinguished by this government through the incorporation of municipal corporations.

--(Interjections)--Oh, no, my honourable friends opposite now shake their heads in horror. My honourable friends who sit in the back bench would do well to start acquainting themselves with the intentions of honourable gentlemen opposite who sit on the front bench. Instead of being a chorus of supporters supporting only the utterances of the government, they would do well, Sir, to examine what the intentions of the government are and then to draw their own conclusions as to the direction that we're heading.

It makes, Sir, then a reference to the anniversary today a very appropriate one, because the question of how power is used and what the intentions of the Government are when they do, through legislation, acquire power, an important issue in this particular debate. We've had examples of how they abuse whatever power is given to them. And let me make it clear again, Sir, that under our system the Government does have unusual powers. Subject to the constitutional laws that prevents them from exercising power beyond their authority, they have the right to make decisions that can affect the lives of every person in this province. It's true that they have to answer for the abuse in the use of that power. But the abuse in the use of that

BILL 64

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) power could only be answered if the Government are willing to submit to the questioning, and to the examination process that is forthcoming during the course of the sittings of the Legislative Assembly.

We have from time to time made reference to an abuse of that power, and there is no better example of how they intend to abuse whatever authority is given them than that exhibited by the Minister of Agriculture from time to time. His use, Sir, of taxpayers' money to attempt to influence a decision on the part of the rapeseed growers in this province is well-documented. He sees nothing wrong with that, and that's the great danger, Sir. When persons can use that kind of power and think that he is justified in doing that, it then becomes very dangerous. It isn't a question of whether the Minister is immoral in his attitude, one now begins to wonder whether he is amoral. And we have another recent example of that abuse of his authority as a Minister. In a recent letter signed by the Manitoba Feed Grain Marketing Commission to all the licensees . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I do believe we are on Bill 64 and the amendment thereto, and I have no hesitation in allowing one or two references in regards to the argument but if it's going to be a total absence of the bill and just one Minister or two, I cannot allow it as being relevant. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, the subject on which I am talking is very relevant to the bill. I see in the adoption of the powers that are contained in this bill an abuse on the part of government that I think should be put on the record. I'm using a couple of examples of what's happened in the past, and from thereon I want to go on to point out the examples that I think, or the possibilities that exist for the government to abuse further legislation that they very innocently attempt to claim is legislation for the benefit of people.

The Minister of Agriculture, as I was attempting to point out, and I don't intend to make any further reference to it other than to point out this example, has in a recent letter again abused power that is given to him, abused the use of taxpayers' money. And if it happens now, then what more power are they going to have under the terms of the present legislation? I suggest, Sir, that the members of this House ought to think very carefully before passing this legislation as to what kind of a weapon they are placing in the hands of this government in order to further erode the freedoms that those people on D-Day, 30 years ago, fought for.

Well, Sir, they say that it is necessary to have treasury branches established throughout this province. Well, you know, the Minister of Agriculture uses the same sort of argument that the Minister of Mines and Resources used against the Member for Wolseley several years ago, the former Leonard Claydon when he was a member of that House, and I don't think that it was the kind of an argument that was as funny as the Minister of Agriculture thinks it is. When one is talking about freedom and how this bill relates to the usurption of freedom, and the destruction of freedom, at least members on this side of the House regard that rather seriously. Honourable gentlemen opposite have a way of disregarding the implications that are inherent in the legislation before us, and I want to refer to some of the statements that have been made in speeches across the way.

I was rather amused at the Minister of Tourism and Recreation who gave a very spirited defence on this subject, and suggested that he hadn't received any communication from any of the caisses populaires across this country. It's strange, Sir, that he hasn't received any from his own community. I received a communication from them in which they object very strenuously to this bill, and I am certain that throughout the length and breadth of this province you will find that objections are being taken - and the Attorney-General has raised another point that I should like to deal with, and I don't want to be diverted too much so I'll come back to that later. But the . . .

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if I may interrupt the honourable gentlemen just for a moment to indicate that we have 63 students of Grade 5 standing from Linden Lanes School in Brandon, under the direction of Mr. Patterson, Mrs. Watt and Mr. McMillan. As I said, they are from Brandon; it doesn't indicate what constituency, so therefore I can't indicate.

On behalf of all the honourable members I welcome you here this afternoon.
The Honourable Member for Morris.

BILL 64 Cont'd

MR. JORGENSON: The Minister of Tourism and Recreation suggested that in this House what we required was more constructive criticism, and I've always maintained that those who continue to ask for a constructive criticism are asking for nothing more than unqualified praise, and from the antics of honourable gentlemen opposite with - again I will say this - with few exceptions, because significantly there are a few exceptions across the way; there are people on the other side of the House who recognize the purpose of the Legislative Assembly; they understand the functions of government, and they understand the functions of the Opposition, but that is certainly a very small minority of people on that side of the House.

But he went on to suggest that there were no ideas from the Opposition. Well one could draw from that that they have run out of ideas, that they never had any in the first place. They have a whole army, a whole phalanx of civil servants to feed them ideas from which to draw from, and yet they continue - and he's not the first one that has made that suggestion - they continue to insist that the only ideas that are worthwhile are those that come from the opposition. But the difficulty with honourable gentlemen opposite is that they wouldn't know a good idea if they heard one, and we have on frequent occasions urged them, pleaded with them, to do something about the most important problem in this country, and that's inflation, by cutting back on spending. But they never accept that idea. And can anybody say on that side that this is not a constructive suggestion? It's about as constructive a suggestion as can possibly be made in the light of the present times.

But they continue to recite the past, and it was with some amusement, Sir, that we heard the Minister of Tourism and Recreation talking about how when he first started working he was making a paltry 85 cents an hour. What a terrible calamity that was. When I started working, Sir, I was making 50 cents a day. But I can tell you this much, Sir, I could buy more with that 50 cents a day when I first started working than most people who are earning \$5.00 an hour can buy today. They say everything is somewhat relative, and I don't want to go back to the good old days because I like this kind of living. But the fact is that if we continue to persist in creating - and this is really what the Government is doing - inflation to the point where there is a never-ending race to keep ahead of the times - I will not go into what I think will happen, I've done that on a couple of other occasions.

The Attorney-General raised a point that I want to deal with right now, when he suggested that the communications that are coming from the credit unions are sponsored and initiated by the boards of directors of the credit unions. That's a rather interesting suggestion, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General state his matter of privilege.

MR. PAWLEY: I made no such statement. I did ask the honourable member if in fact he was assured that the telegrams were being issued with the permission of the boards of directors of the various credit unions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Well the telegrams that I get are signed by, not the managers, the letters that I get and the communications that I get, are not signed by the managers of the credit unions, they're signed by the president of the boards of directors of the credit unions. Criticism was made the other day that this was a top-heavy sort of representation, that it did not represent the rank and file of the membership of the credit unions. That's an interesting argument because honourable gentlemen opposite reverse that argument when it applies to themselves. How often have we heard during the course of this session when we suggest that this government does not have a mandate to proceed with this program, how often have we heard, "Well we were elected, we're the Government, and because we're the Government that gives us the right to do anything we please."--(Interjection)--Yes. Took it to the people first. But I suppose that the boards of directors of the credit unions are not entrusted with the responsibility of making decisions on behalf of their membership either. It applies only to themselves, Sir. And that is another indication of the mentality of honourable gentlemen opposite.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. JORGENSON: This is a consistent argument on their part. Whenever they're confronted with the suggestion that the direction in which they're proceeding is one that is not in keeping with the wishes of the people of this country, or the people of this province, they reply by saying, who got the most votes? It's the numbers game. Well we can carry the numbers game just a little step further. They argue that they got 197,000 votes in the last election, but the numbers of people that voted against them in the last election amounted to 260,400, and not

BILL 64

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) for one single minute, Sir, am I going to suggest that honourable gentlemen opposite, in spite of the fact that they did not get the majority of votes in this province, haven't got the right to govern, because I'm not making that suggestion. I am simply drawing reference to a fallacious argument on their part that the numbers game is not applicable in a democracy.

MR. KEN DILLEN (Thompson): How many votes against Conservatism?

MR. JORGENSEN: Sir, significantly, and in response to the very intelligent question asked by the Member for Thompson, the members of the honourable party represented by honourable friends to my left and ourselves are as one on this particular issue. We ostensibly are speaking for the people who elected us. We have to agree on this issue. So that means if you're going to play the numbers game, that the numbers game amounts to 240,000 as opposed to 197,000. If you want to play that game, then of course a majority of the people in this province are opposed to what the Government is doing. But I'm not going to use that argument, I'm not using it as an argument. I'm simply using it as an illustration of the fallacy of your own argument.

The fact is, and if you want to carry it a step further, that to a large extent the credit union movement in this country had its origin and is largely concentrated in the rural areas. I ask my honourable friend to check the votes in the rural areas to find out how much support they got there. And if they want to play the numbers game, then play it in that respect too. Carry it through to its logical conclusion instead of playing it half-way. My honourable friends continue to suggest that because they got the majority of votes on the last election that entitles them to do anything they choose, and I am not going to quarrel with their right to govern; that is long established in a parliamentary democracy. I have never taken the position that it is anything but that. But I suggest, Sir, that equal to that is the responsibility of the Opposition to do and to use whatever means at their disposal within the framework of the rules that we operate under to prevent the Government from making what we think is a mistake. We intend to exercise that authority, and we intend to oppose this measure, because we believe that in the interests of the people of this province it is wrong. Well, Sir, my honourable friend the Member for - I forget his constituency - it shows what contribution that he has been making that I can't even remember the name of his constituency - continues to chirp from his seat, and from time to time we see reversals of his position on certain subjects.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Would the member permit me one question? Do I take it from his remarks that he believes that he and the other members on that side of the House speak for the people of the Province of Manitoba, for some of the people of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: No. The Government speaks for the people of the Province of Manitoba because they are duly elected to do so.--(Interjection)--I don't know the occasion, I don't know the occasion when I've taken any other position than that. So I don't know why the purpose of the question.

A MEMBER: I wanted you to tell Sidney that.

MR. JORGENSEN: I simply say, Sir, that in our rule as Opposition we have the right, and we have the obligation, and indeed the responsibility, of attempting to avert disaster on the part of the Government. And . . .

A MEMBER: And you're doing a good job.

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . I wish we could have averted the disaster on Wednesday night by being a little more active in the participation of a certain event that took place on that occasion.

The Member for Minnedosa I think advanced an argument that so far I haven't heard, in spite of the fact there have been several members on the other side of the House that have spoken, and some of those who listen so intently on the backbenches at the moment might undertake . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . might undertake to refute the argument that he presented with respect to the comparison between the inauguration of a branch of a bank and the incorporation, or the starting up of a credit union, with respect to the staff that is required, with respect to the laws, with respect to the amount of money that is necessary, and the amount of service that that particular institution can provide to a community. Not a single word has been

BILL 64

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) mentioned by honourable gentlemen opposite in response to that argument. Not a single word. They have studiously avoided that kind of an argument. And if they have avoided that argument, one can only assume that there is no answer to it. And if there is no answer to that kind of an argument, then what in heaven's name are they going into this for? Well one can only come back to the Mein Kampf of the NDP Party when they - and I won't bother quoting it because it must at this time be well known to honourable gentlemen opposite. The suggestion that the way that they can control the economy of this province and take over the economy, is first by the institution of treasury branches, second by the development of municipal corporations, and then by a holding company that would sort of oversee the municipal corporations or the various development corporations. Now they've taken that one step further and brought in a trading company, and one wonders just how far that they want to carry this business of a complete takeover of the economy of this province.

Well, Sir, the thing that is amusing to state at this juncture is that it was with some vigour, some chagrin, that the Minister of Finance in referring to the Member for Rock Lake in the advertising that he was using during the course of his campaign, the arms around the Legislative Building, now appear to be underestimated, now appear as though that the Member for Rock Lake did not even at that - and I haven't seen the advertising that he is purported to have used, but if that is what he was using, then by George he has underestimated the real intent of this Government as outlined in the Manifesto, and as outlined in the series of bills that are now before this Legislature.

A MEMBER: Not just the arms, the burly legs should have been around it too.

MR. JORGENSEN: I think that the attitude of this Government is pretty well summed up by Art Coulter. He's not . . .

A MEMBER: Dr. Coulter.

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . one that has been noted to embrace the philosophy of the present Government and . . .

A MEMBER: Present Opposition.

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . of the present Opposition. He is one that has lent his support morally, psychologically, physically, and financially I presume, to honourable gentlemen opposite. Dr. Coulter in a letter to the Minister of Labour just the other day he had this to say.

A MEMBER: Dr. Art Coulter.

MR. JORGENSEN: "It is obvious to us that the administration", and when he refers to the administration he's talking about honourable gentlemen opposite, "are running on their own, and that we are intended to be a rubber stamp." He goes on to - he says that, "they are being asked to accept a pig in a poke." He said, "particularly in that your administration is operating a secret society . . ."

A MEMBER: A secret society.

MR. JORGENSEN: ". . . with no appreciation that dialogue . . ."

A MEMBER: And that's from the President of the Manitoba Labour Federation.

MR. JORGENSEN: ". . . dialogue, or any opportunity to exchange information or ideas is important." And that, Sir, is precisely what we've been trying to say for a number of years. Dr. Coulter has awakened to the real intent of this Government, and he's revealed it very dramatically in this letter to the Minister.

We, Sir, have from time to time been attempting to convince the people of this province that this is precisely what is happening. The series of bills that are now before the House, one after the other, are a planned, deliberate, takeover of Manitoba's economy, the shoving of the small businessmen aside, and the operation - and let it be noted that honourable gentlemen opposite are applauding vigorously that statement. One can only conclude that that is precisely what they want.

A MEMBER: Right.

MR. JORGENSEN: And let that, Sir, be on the record.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J. R. (BUD) BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): Well, just a few brief remarks, Mr. Speaker. First of all to the Member for Morris when he alluded to the contribution of the Member for Minnedosa. Of course some of the problems to be faced were outlined by the Member from Minnedosa, and he's right on as far as staffing and the rest of the problems are

BILL 64

(MR. BOYCE cont'd) concerned. But of course the Member for Morris uses it as an argument that because we don't have the solutions to all the problems at the moment that we ignore his argument.

But, Mr. Speaker, during this debate much reference has been made of the inability of the Government to run the affairs of the province. They use such examples as the loss with Autopac, and such other things. It was strange the other day after the Leader of the Opposition had made his contribution I went home and in the mail I received a statement from a reputable investment outfit in the City of Winnipeg I have a small relationship with, and here it's - these are supposedly very competent people in the investment field. In February of 1972 the particular international mutual fund was worth \$8.04 and in this particular month they have managed to rise to \$5.02. So over the three years that this investment, this particular fund has decreased in value from \$8.04 to \$5.02. So I question when I see this kind of financial statement coming to me, who they're lending my money to. They must be friends of theirs or something because it seems that when I read the stock pages until recently that some of the oil stocks have taken a dip, but everybody else in the country is making money on their stock investments except myself. So you find inefficiencies in any kind of investments, or any kind of managements.

And of course the Member for Minnedosa was right on the management group that you attract to any facility will determine how much profit you make. There was an article in the Globe and Mail that they, and with reference to Saunders Aircraft, that they pointed out that the Federal Government had contributed through DREE and purchased some 4 millions of dollars because of the shift in emphasis of this particular company, but in there they alluded to one of the problems of attracting and keeping at the upper echelon competent managers. And of course in this day and age to attract competent managers you have to pay what the man's hire is worth, and it's quite competitive at this level. I fully understand that problem.

But, Mr. Speaker, just one other word. When somebody makes a good case about what some of the problems to be faced in a particular program are going to be, I think it's irresponsible to just brush them aside and not say well, no, those problems will have to be faced and those problems will have to be solved.

But yet for the Member for Morris to try and parallel the relationship between Government as an elected group and boards of directors as elected groups as being parallel, of course, this is entirely fallacious in this context, in that the Government of the Province of Manitoba presented as its case for being elected, that one of the things that they would follow through on would be the establishment of treasury branches in the province. But of course we usually don't spend much time reading each others propaganda, or literature, or whatever you want to call it, campaign literature, so it's quite understandable that the Member for Lakeside didn't see mine.

A MEMBER: We've seen all yours and we believe it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. BOYCE: Well of course if you read it you would have believed it, you would be like the rest of the people in the Province of Manitoba, because they believed it also. We said in '69 that we were going to do a number of things, we said in 1969 that we were going to do certain things, and we did it. We said in 1973 that we were going to do certain other things, and we are in the process of doing just that. One of the things that we said we would do is establish treasury branches. And in fact last year in one of the instruments that we used to test people's opinions, in my particular constituency 77.2 percent of the people were in favour of the establishment of treasury branches. Albeit I wouldn't place too much emphasis on the instrument that we used because I would suggest that perhaps it's not that reliable. It's not as reliable as you know a better designed instrument.

But one of the things that has come to light, Mr. Speaker, I'm informed that one of the main thrusts or main arguments of the Leader of the Opposition was that Autopac had lost \$10 millions, and this showed mismanagement, and how terrible it was. Well in checking, and the figures were bandied about, 135 millions was lost by the insurance industry in general. It has been reported that the insurance industry in Autopac lost more than the 135 million, but the net balance of 135 million is relative to the total operation, so that they lost much more than the \$135 million relative to automobile insurance, so that in proportion the loss was much greater than in Manitoba.

But I just wanted to point out to the Member for Morris, Mr. Speaker, that while I

BILL 64

(MR. BOYCE cont'd) appreciated his contribution, nevertheless when he says that there is a parallel between the position of the Government when they say that they present a program to the people and the people, you know, make their choice by opting for one political group or another, it is not the same when a board of directors of a credit union or anything else express the opinion of that particular board. If the credit unions want to survey the members of their organizations and see what their position is, I think that they would be in a much better position to inform us as to what the feelings of the members are. As I said, in my constituency with an admittedly crude instrument 77.2 percent of the people opted for treasury branches, and I would suggest a goodly number of the people within my constituency are members of credit unions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: I wonder if the member would permit a question, Mr. Speaker. He mentioned that he had a mutual fund that he held had gone from \$8.00 and something down to five something I believe. The fund I would suggest is managed by one of the recognized management groups as being one of the best management groups in the financial community. I wonder if he would have felt more at ease if his funds had been administered by Government body or a Government agency.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Well I didn't mention the name of the particular group because I would agree that they're one of the most competent perhaps. But nevertheless it - no, I'd feel uncomfortable no matter who loses my money. But the mutual funds for some reason or other, I really don't pretend to be a financial wizard, are in difficulty generally. Not as bad as Cronfield's tribe, I guess.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, in listening to the various government spokesmen try to explain their position on the introduction of a near banking system in Manitoba, I didn't really learn anything from the last speaker because he didn't espouse either of the two main arguments that have been put forward by the Minister who introduced the bill, the Minister of Finance, and the other arguments by the Minister of Mines. At least I would think that the two different arguments proposed were worth listening to because, behind the philosophy of both gentlemen, the reasons don't seem to stand up. For example, I understood the Minister of Finance, when he was introducing the bill, to say that this was permissive legislation, there was no cause for alarm; the Government was not going to go into the banking business in a major way, but their main concern was to serve communities that had either no competition or had a complete void in that field. Now this is the understanding I took out of the Minister's presentation when he introduced the bill; that he used the word "permissive". He said that it was to fill a void in certain communities in the province, although he didn't name any of the communities, and he said that it was to provide some competition where there was presently no competition or practically a minority.

Now we take that argument and set it to one side and we examine the argument presented by the Minister for Mines, and he has said, when he was speaking about the banking system, that his personal view was that if a government is by legislation able to own 20 percent of a bank, well then it must be even better to own 30 percent or 40 or 50, and finally the best thing of all is to own 100 percent of the banking branch that they're contemplating taking a part in. Now, the Minister of Mines also said that the reason that he supports this is that they're out to supply a financial institution to the people that will make money and will be fully involved in supplying a people's bank.

Now if we take these two arguments and try to make them square with one another, well they just don't, because the proposition espoused by the Minister of Finance is bound to be a subsidized operation where you're not going to make any money. If you're going to go into uneconomic positions and locations, obviously you're going to do it at a loss to supply the service. If you take the Minister of Mines' proposition, you're out to make money and you're going to go into every area of the province possible. So that really the reasons between the two lines of thought expressed on that side don't seem to be a sound basis to go into such a major operation as establishing treasury branches across the province.

I suppose, and I think it has been mentioned before, that when the Government gets into this business that they will find ways to pressure groups or other levels of government who

BILL 64

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd) have to do business with them, and that is, accepting grants or accepting loans, that there will be reasons presented to school boards and municipalities as to why they should do their banking business with the Government bank system. It's bound to happen, Mr. Speaker, that if you are making available either loans or grants to groups, you'd expect and you would ask them to do business back with you. And this, of course, will be an advantage that no other banking system or no other credit union can offer.

I note that in the bill itself - and I really don't quite understand this but it seems rather surprising - on Page 3, Section 9, and I quote, and it says, "Notwithstanding the terms and provisions of any contract, the Minister may, in accordance with and subject to any limitation prescribed by the regulations," and Section (a) and Section (b), and I quote Section (b): "use money in the fund to make purchases of goods, wares or merchandise for re-sale on such terms as to payment as may be agreed upon."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not an expert nor am I a lawyer, but I understand this to say that the treasury branches can then branch into any type of a retail business they wish to go into, because they're authorized under the Act to buy and to re-sell. So I would like the Minister, when he closes debate, to explain why the need for that section if it isn't the case that treasury branches then become head offices for any kind of retail business the government cares to go into, and they would already have the authority under this bill to begin. They would need no more recourse to the Legislature to go into any retail business in the province because they would have the authority in this bill. All it has to do would be to pass some regulations and they could enter any business, any retail business in the province, because we are asked to give the authority to allow them to buy and sell merchandise. And if that isn't a retail business of a nature that would make the Hudson's Bay or Eaton's look to see if this is not going to be a bigger business--well, perhaps the Minister will answer this, is it the intention of the Government to go into the retail business through treasury branches? Well, I'd like to hear the Minister's words on the record in that regard.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I have an article out of today's paper. The headline states "Credit Unions Seek MLAs' Help", and I think that the whole article should be put on the record because I know some of the MLAs on that side are not very comfortable with this bill. I think some of them feel, some of them feel that the Cabinet have led them down the garden path and they don't know how to get out of the garden now. --(Interjection)--Yes. Yes. I would like every member on that side to stand up and speak in support of this bill if he really supports it. Let them stand up and say yes, they are for this bill, because many of them presently are squirming in their seats. They wish they'd never heard of it. They wish that they'd never heard of this bill, Mr. Speaker. So I'd like to quote from the article in today's newspaper: "Nearly 400 representatives from Manitoba credit unions unanimously passed a resolution Wednesday opposing the proposed provincial treasury branches - near-banks - and calling for a write-in campaign to MLAs."

"Ron Curtis, President of the Co-operative Credit Society of Manitoba, said the Government has not shown any need for treasury branches. Treasury branches constitute a threat to the credit union movement, he said. "However, the group would support the treasury branches if it could be shown they would fill needs the credit unions could not, Mr. Curtis said."

"In a letter to the society Wednesday, Premier Ed Schreyer said the Government is committed to establishing treasury branches to extend most banking services to isolated communities, but it still supports the credit union movement. An act to establish Government treasury branches is being debated in the House."

"Premier Schreyer listed three reasons for establishment of treasury branches:

"To increase competition in financial markets, and thereby narrow the spread between borrowing and lending rates."

Well, Mr. Speaker, if I can digress from the article for a moment, that's an interesting reason, because what he's really saying is, if there are 20 or 30 financial institutions in the field of lending money and they're competing with one another, and of course they expect to have the money repaid, and they expect to pay the taxes and pay salaries and pay administrative costs and pay for buildings, and hopefully to show a small profit, I wonder what good it is doing to add one more bit of competition. And if that one other competitive organization is going to compete and not be subsidized, then they must do the same things. They must pay

BILL 64

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd) the competitive interest rates. If they borrow money or if they lend money, they must lend competitively. They must have administrative costs, buildings, pay salaries--(Interjection)--When I'm finished; when I'm finished--so I can't see what good it is doing for people who need the services to have one more added to the 30 or whatever number, say in Winnipeg, probably it's close to 100 in Winnipeg, and I can't see why Government decides that they should offer one more service.

The other reason in the article given by the Premier as to why the Government is going into the business, is "to ensure the maximum possible retention of funds within the province."

Well, Mr. Speaker, if I can speak to that one for a moment. Isn't that what credit unions are all about? So that if you set up a competition to them, then you're going to appeal to people who have a similar philosophy, the philosophy being that we like to own our own financial institution. We like to keep within the province our money. Now by the Government going into the banking business, will they really do any better than the credit unions are doing already? I doubt it. The Minister nods his head and says yes they will. Well, if he means they will, then he means he's going to drive them out, or greatly reduce their strength. Well you can't do both. You can't live side by side in peace if you're out to put the other one out of business. You can't say, "We are the ones who are going to be the instrument for retaining funds in Manitoba," and the credit union has been doing this for years. So either you're going to muscle them out or you're going to stay out, because you can't do both.

So I return to the third reason as to why the Premier says it's desirable that a banking system be set up in the province: "To attain better distribution of funds between regions of the province."

Well, Mr. Speaker, this has been a cry of the have-not provinces to the central government for years and years, and with some justification. But there is a move afoot to regionalize banking. Governments in every province have recognized the problem that they must retain and keep enough financing within their own province, so that this question is being dealt with. And I say again that this is part of the credit union philosophy as well.

Now if what is meant by this is that you open treasury branches in, say, Winnipeg or a centre where there is an accumulation of wealth, and you transfer the money or some of it to parts of the province where they need money, and it's not done on a reasonable basis where the economics are satisfactory, well then, all you're going to be doing is pumping money in by way of bad loans if the economics of that region won't support it. I don't know of any location in Manitoba where there's a business or a farm or a logging industry, or whatever, that if they have a reasonable program and some record of performance that they have not been able to obtain funds. This is the reason we started the Manitoba Development Corporation - to give some competition to existing institutions. Now if the Government intends to go further using people's money to put them into uneconomic operations, well then, we then have a subsidized banking system run by Big Brother Government but paid for by taxpayers whether they like it or not, and I don't think that's what the majority of the people of this province want.

Quoting again from the article: "Renald Guay, President of La Centrale de Caisses Populaires du Manitoba, the French Credit Union group, said the credit union representatives are afraid of any Government intrusion into a field where it will not compete in the market." Well, Mr. Speaker, these aren't the children out in front of the tanks that are talking, that the Minister of Mines was talking about last week, that members on this side stood up and spoke because the credit unions were a popular thing to defend, and he referred to them as "the children who went in front of the tanks" and I guess by the tanks he meant the Bank of Canada and the other large institutions. I don't think Mr. Guay and his group would appreciate being referred to as the children going in front of the tanks. This is a strong movement in Manitoba. But they say that they are afraid of Government intrusion in a field where they will not offer fair competition. In other words, they know they're going to be up against competition that is subsidized, and I imagine from their point of view that's pretty hard to take.

Again back to the article, Mr. Speaker: "In his letter, Premier Schreyer referred to a Government offer of exclusive banking rights for the credit union in Leaf Rapids - an offer which was turned down. The society officials countered that the offer was turned down because there weren't enough resources to establish a branch at Leaf Rapids at the time the request was made, but it now is possible."

Well, Mr. Speaker, when did the Government say to the credit union you should go up

BILL 64

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd) there? When it was on the drawing board or when the town was unpopulated? There was no homes there. --(Interjection)--Well the credit union has said that they would go anywhere that was uneconomic if the Government would give them some co-operation. --(Interjection)--Well, if you are going to go in and lose money in a place, is it not reasonable to take part of an organization and say, "Well, will you go in there until it's uneconomic and we will pay a part of the cost?--(Interjection)--Well, the Minister of Finance is speaking from his seat and disputing what I'm saying. I asked the question that when he rises to speak, how much consultation, how many meetings were held, and how deep did you go into this with the credit unions? I would like to know the answer to that. My guess is that the same sort of a co-operation and partnership and dialogue, the same as Mr. Art Coulter had with them with respect to a bill about the mechanical engineers. That's my guess, because --(Interjection)--That's right. A secret society. And that's my guess, because, Mr. Speaker, had there been a degree of co-operation, had there been meetings held, the Ministers opposite would have been proudly declaiming the fact how that they had tried to co-operate with this great institution and tried their best, but it in the long run failed. Because obviously if they had sought co-operation and found it, then there would be no need for a Treasury Branches bill to be before this House.

Again the article says, and I quote: "Mr. Curtis said credit unions' hope is that we can discuss the matter with the Government and convince them that working through the credit unions and caisses populaires. we can do everything they want to do with treasury branches." Now, I would like to know what the Government's answer is going to be to that request, and I would like one or the Ministers of the Minister who introduced the bill to tell us, in this House, what is the answer to that request.

Again in the article: "In his letter to the society, Premier Schreyer said only one treasury branch would be set up in each rural region, but he couldn't guarantee the number in Winnipeg." Well, Mr. Speaker, we are now getting down to the numbers game. First of all, the Minister of Finance was very vague. It was permissive legislation; they were only going to go into the areas where there was a lack of competition or a lack of service. The Premier says he can't guarantee the number that will go into Winnipeg. So I think it's time that there was a Cabinet meeting over this and you should tell us the single story and not have it dragged out day by day, a bit at a time. I think you have a duty and an obligation to tell the people of the province what is this plan: Phase 1? Phase 2? How many branches this year? Where? How many branches next year? Where? - instead of one Minister letting out a little bit of information, another one being a little more frank and open, and the Premier states in the letter that he can't guarantee the number that will be in Winnipeg. So who's kidding who here?

Finally, the credit union official said that "their research indicates a gap of banking services for the small intermediate and farm-support industries which have had trouble obtaining financing. However, a group of Canadian co-ops and credit unions was ready to sponsor a chartered bank to meet this unfulfilled need." So, Mr. Speaker, if the Government is really serious and really honest, they have a number of courses of action that they are compelled to do, compelled by moral responsibility if no other reason. That is, they should meet with the credit unions and try to see if the credit union movement itself can supply the shortfall in needs that exist in the province. They have a duty also to co-operate in helping out in the beginning of a new regional bank, but the approach that they, the Big Brothers in government, decide that they are going to open treasury branches all across the province, without regard to need, and enter competition with organizations who have been serving the communities for upwards of 100 years, and if you can tell me, Mr. Speaker, that this group opposite are going to beat the competition and beat them fairly and squarely in fair competition, I suggest to you that's an impossible hope and they know it. I suggest to you that the only way members opposite can beat the competition is by subterfuge, by hidden subsidization, by pressure on vulnerable organizations to make them deal with treasury branches, and, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion that's the only way, and if the Government persists with The Treasury Branch Act they will see and the people will pay in the years to come.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. DILLEN: I have really two questions, Mr. Speaker, of the member who just spoke. One is, I wonder if he could tell the House whether or not he is a member of a credit union. And the second one is that in reference to the first paragraph of the article that he just read

BILL 64

(MR. DILLEN cont'd) from, I see where it states that the resolution was passed on Wednesday, and yet I myself received at least one letter last week from this same group and I was wondering if he has any answer for why the resolution was passed on Wednesday and the letters were sent out the week previously.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well answering the member's first question, I'm a member of the Portage Credit Union. They have one of the largest credit unions in Manitoba with 40 on staff, and it's the largest financial organization in Portage la Prairie. I believe it does more business than any bank.

As to the other question, I honestly don't know, but I do know that the various managers of credit unions and the secretary-director, if that's his title, of the whole organization have been active either by telegram, letter, phone or personal visits to us in the Legislature, all opposing my honourable friend's crazy ideas.

MR. BILTON: May I make a short announcement?

MR. SPEAKER: Well let's deal with the motion before we go to announcements. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, it would be my intention to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: Oh, very well. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTIONS

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): With regard to the personnel of the Standing Committee for Industrial Relations, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the name Bilton could be substituted for the name McKellar. (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make, by leave, a substitution on the Industrial Relations Committee. Substitute the name of Osland for Green. (Agreed)

. continued on next page

BILL NO. 64 Cont'd

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do not particularly feel compelled to reveal my financial affairs in this manner but it seems to be a matter of question. Yes, I have been a member of a credit union for the past 20 years. I deal with the Bank of Nova Scotia and the Imperial Bank of Commerce - unfortunately not with the Royal Bank - at which I'm known. In other words, Mr. Speaker, I have a long-developed habit of spreading my debts around. I just don't believe that any one organization should accept that burden all by themselves.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, it's not my intention to reiterate a debate that I've already had on the subject matter. I also say, with some considerable regret, that the Minister of Finance has of course for some time tuned out on anything that I have to say in this Chamber and seldom gives me the courtesy of a response or reply, or even the courtesy of listening to anything I have to say in this debate. But, be that as it may, that doesn't absolve me of my responsibility for making the contributions that I think I, Sir, as a member, feel compelled to make. And, Sir, it is not my intention to repeat the debate that was made nor to reiterate the excellent debates that have been made by members opposite. And I say "opposite" and I say it with some greater feeling now from having just listened to the past speaker.

The ideological debate, Sir, has been made. The ideological position has been presented. The serious questions of principle as to the necessity, as to the reasons, as to the possible end results of this Government's actions, have been asked, have been debated, but what hasn't been asked, and I choose now to ask and I would ask the Honourable Minister of Finance to take that special consideration and perhaps considering these remarks in his response in closing the debate, what hasn't been asked are in fact the actual mechanics of the bill as to how he intends to carry out the bill, should it pass.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't like to put forward a defeatist image. I believe, in fact I believe there is reason to believe just in this last little while, that the Honourable Minister may well choose to accept the precedence as has been set by another very capable Minister of that Cabinet in withdrawing a bill, that he may well want to consider with this bill, consider the advisability of following the course of his House Leader. But, be that as it may, that doesn't solve the problem that I'm faced with in speaking to the second time on this particular bill which is, namely, that nobody has really asked, what does the Minister intend to do should this bill become law? And I ask very straightforward, simple questions, Mr. Speaker. I'm asking questions in terms of his goals, how many branches does he intend to open up, you know, in the foreseeable or predictable years of his jurisdiction - which are three right now - what kind of target goals has he set for himself in terms of attracting deposit investment; which particular areas of the province would have kind of a priority rating.

Mr. Speaker, I ask these questions with some background of knowledge that a Minister doesn't simply propose a measure like this in this Chamber without having, you know, a pretty good idea about what he intends to do. Now, ironically enough, it was a Conservative administration, a Conservative Minister, that moved publicly into the field of insurance, crop insurance for instance, some years ago, but when that bill was introduced in this House the then Minister of Agriculture had to answer for and had to have some idea about the particular areas where this new program was going to get itself introduced to, involved in; what particular crops were going to be insured; what kind of staff was involved; in other words, some mechanical assessment of the problem that the Minister faces, should the day happen when this bill becomes law. (Applause) --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, it's from those few moments when I have been at a loss for words. I say no more.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat my arguments with the Honourable Minister of Finance. I would ask him to consider, at least - I think that he does not owe me that answer, Mr. Speaker, he has shown over the past little while that he owes me precious few answers and perhaps he doesn't. I've always respected any Minister's right to answer any members of the Opposition's questions - but he does owe, he does owe those people outside of this Chamber, namely the credit and co-operative movement, some answers in this respect, and I think the Minister appreciates that there have been relatively serious questions and concerns raised on their behalf, not just motivated by a malicious opposition but by a genuinely concerned group of people now engaged in the business of near-banking in the Province of Manitoba, who want to at least have some indication of what kind of competition that they have to expect. And so, Mr. Speaker, I ask the Honourable Minister to consider to do us a favour in closing debate on

BILL 64

(MR. ENNS cont'd). . . this bill, when that time comes, to at least spell out some of the mechanics involved in the passage of this bill.

What are his particular priorities? You know, the bill has somehow been clouded a bit, the issues have been clouded a bit by talk about bringing a kind of a banking service to isolated areas, or areas not now served by people in the chartered banks, by people in the credit unions and something like that, but really, Mr. Speaker, one can't really take that serious. I mean, this bill isn't here before us so that we can put in a treasury bank eight miles north of Woodlands or something like that. That's not the reason why this bill is here. The bill is obviously here to attract deposits of Manitobans. And I, Sir, am one that I believe I must take issue with many members opposite who have spoken, who have suggested that the treasury branches of Manitoba will not make money or cannot operate successfully. Sir, I have every confidence, I have every confidence in my friend the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources that, with the dedication and determination that I know they're capable of, the treasury branches proposed and to be presented and introduced into the scene of Manitoba will be eminently successful and will make money. Because, Sir, they can legislate that they will make money. And I've also had sufficient experience in this House to know that they are capable of doing it. So I don't buy the argument that has been put forward by members opposite that it's impossible for the treasury branches proposed in this bill to be reasonably successful, to attract reasonable deposits, and indeed in the broader business sense be successful and make money.

The Honourable House Leader has not heard my opening remarks in this debate and I'm always a little concerned about it when he thinks that maybe I all of a sudden, you know, I've lost my ideological position in my argument and I've conceded something to him. I just want to reiterate for him, Sir, that I have made my ideological position clear in an earlier debate in this House. I am now asking, in my second opportunity in speaking to this bill, for the Minister of Finance to give us the courtesy to spell out, for the Government to give us the courtesy - and not just us, but the people most directly affected, the banking community, the credit union people - to give us an indication of how in fact they intend to carry out this piece of legislation when it becomes law, if it should become law. I should also indicate for the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources that I did encourage the Honourable Minister of Finance to at least acknowledge the wisdom and the mature judgment that the House Leader showed in reconsidering a bill from time to time, and that perhaps this bill should be reconsidered.

Mr. Speaker, I'm also a practical and realistic politician. I know that you can't push your luck too far and I know that while the Opposition may have gained a particular reprise in one instance, that it is likely not to happen again; --(Interjection)-- I, like my friend the Honourable Member for Pembina, can count. I can count the numbers on that side and I can count the numbers on this side, and I suspect this bill will become law before we leave this Chamber. And I think the Honourable Minister of Finance should, in that event, tell us and tell the people affected, give us some outline of how he intends to introduce the treasury branches into Manitoba in terms of priority; where they should go; in terms of scope - I mean, how big of a program is this going to be; how many people is this going to involve; what are the kind of targets set out for them. Are they hitting out for 200, 300 million deposits in the first year?

A MEMBER: Are you going to buy off the credit union managers?

MR. ENNS: And I think, Mr. Speaker, also indicate to us very clearly - there have been pretty serious suggestions made on this side of the House as to the degree of fairness the Government is prepared to bring in, not only this bill but other bills - but I want to restrict my remarks to this bill - you know, when they talk about competition, just how fair will the competition be? I would like specifically to ask - and I want it recorded in Hansard - that for instance, that any farmer that is applying for, through a Government agency, through the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation, will not in any way be induced to do his banking business through the treasury board. I would like to know, for instance, that there will be no pressures placed against those quasi-government agencies which the senior government, the Provincial Government, has some budgetary control of - schools, hospitals - that they will not be placed under any specific influence or pressure to do their banking with the treasury branches. I think these kind of things, Sir, should be spelled out.

BILL 64

(MR. ENNS cont'd)

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe the words that I'm saying right now. I have a tendency to believe the words that, whether from his seat or otherwise, that the Minister the House Leader said. If I were going into business, the financial business, and I had the authority and the power and the influence to make sure it was successful, then I would surely want to use them. Sir, I would surely want to use them. And I would defend it, I would be doing it in the interest of the taxpayers, the people of this Province of Manitoba. But, Mr. Speaker, the problem that I am presenting to you is simply this: That they cannot, as they have been doing, on the fundamental issues that are facing this province and the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, they have shown a lack of faith in those things that they believe in. They have shown a timidity, you know, and just a general feeling that their policies on their merits alone aren't persuasive enough. They have to somehow mask them; they have to somehow cover up the real intent and the purposes of the legislation. And if the Opposition in the - I'm not going to say dying days of this Legislature because I have a feeling that the days aren't dying at all and this Legislature isn't dying at all, and that we'll be here for some time - but, Mr. Speaker, that's not my doing. The fact of the matter is that of January 28th or 29th or 30th when we started this Session, 99.9, as the Ivory Soap commercial says, 99.9 of the substantive legislation is now before us, and although we have some difficulty in maintaining the enthusiasm and simply the physical capabilities of continuing our opposition to this Government, the fact of the matter is that opposition has to be made. And I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, that in the last in these substantive pieces of legislation, the Government has shown to me really a surprising lack of confidence in their own beliefs, in their own philosophy.

They have presented legislation to us in a manner and way which is totally different from that which they presented to the people outside. They talk in terms, they use semantics, they talk about fair competition, and then we get revealed in this Chamber, not officially as yet and I'm trying to challenge that right now, about just what degree of fairness, what do they mean, Sir, when they talk about fair competition. And I think in this particular bill the Minister of Finance should indicate to us very clearly just how he envisages the treasury branches to operate. We haven't had that, Mr. Speaker, up to now. I think the Minister purposely -- you know, he threw the bill at us and he said now he expected the ideological challenge, and we rose like pickerels to the bait. We fought the battle. Here's another intrusion in the free enterprise world; it was a battle worthwhile to be fought and my colleagues fought it well. But, Sir, what's happening is that in fighting the battle we have lost sight of the fact that, okay, having lost, you know, what are the terms, what are the unconditional terms of surrender that we may have to live under? And while we in this Chamber may well fight this battle, the fact of the matter is there is the whole credit union movement out, embracing some several hundred thousand of people that are concerned about this. The co-operative movement in this Province of Manitoba is concerned about this, the banking community -- I even hate to mention that word because nobody worries about the banks.

A MEMBER: The banks don't worry about anybody else.

A MEMBER: They sure do.

MR. ENNS: Well that's a statement that the Honourable Member from Radisson says, but I can indicate otherwise. I can indicate otherwise. As I said, I believe in spreading my debts around, you know, and I would not be here if it wouldn't be for the fact that occasionally, you know, a bank has supported my existence. But, Sir, the fact of the matter is, I think that maybe slowly - you know, with members of the Fourth Estate above and through them - that maybe slowly this question we're getting across. We are not getting the straightforward -- for instance, look when George Hutton presented a bill to intrude violently into the private sector; he was going to go into the insurance field. It was unheard of. A Conservative Government walking into the domains of a private sector of insurance.

A MEMBER: Crop Insurance.

MR. ENNS: Crop Insurance. And what did he say? He said, "This is what we're going to do. We're going to set up zones. We're going to insure these and these crops. Cereal crops to begin with; no other fancy crops; no rape nor anything else. Wheat, barley and oats. And we're not going to offer that to all people in the province for the first offering, because we have to gain some experience." We set out certain zones which only covered about

BILL 64

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . 30 percent of the province, of the agricultural land in the province. We said those farmers in those zones, they'll be privileged for the first year or two, and be able to buy that crop insurance while we gain some experience. And this will be the premium rates. We will set up district offices. We will hire crop insurance adjusters and inspectors, and that's how we are going to move into this particular field.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we've had massive pieces of legislation thrown at us, and they have - I have to admit cleverly - relied on the fact, as I said, that we would just kind of automatically arise to the principle that's involved, and we have, if anywhere, Mr. Speaker, fallen down on our job as Opposition in asking them and indeed making them, as it is their responsibility to do, to spell out the mechanics of it. And, Mr. Speaker, if there's one area that this government is in real difficulty in, is when it comes out to putting into implementation; and it's a fact those lofty ideological words that they like to put in the Throne Speeches and putting them into actual fact and practice in the field, it's the difference as black and white. And those senior administrators in that government know how difficult it is to translate, and the House Leader knows how difficult it is to translate a noble idea, a good idea, into practical application in a mineshaft in the province of this Manitoba. Now that may be an unfair remark, but accept it in the way I give it. I'm saying that we have all too often kind of lost sight of that particular aspect of the responsibility of the Opposition, to challenge the members opposite as administrators, as to how they're going to carry out particularly policy programs. We have allowed ourselves to be trapped into fighting solely the ideological argument, and quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I'd feel happier fighting the ideological argument. It's safer ground for me. I know what side, I know that when I look over this shoulder that there's an angel there.

But, Mr. Speaker, nonetheless on this particular bill, on this particular bill --(Interjection)-- my wife's over here on this side - on this particular bill I challenge the Honourable Minister of Finance, in closing debate, to give us the courtesy of this Chamber but, much more important, to give people who are directly involved, the credit union movement, the co-operative movement involved, a pretty clear-cut idea about the direction, the specific goals. You know, I don't ask this for the next ten years, a prognostication for the next ten years, but you know, within the foreseeable future, the life of this government, which is three short years.

A MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. ENNS: Just three short years. But let him tell us what in three short years they intend to do with the treasury branches.

A MEMBER: . . . three long years.

MR. ENNS: No, if you were listening, I never said that last year. Mr. Speaker, I think that's a legitimate request. I think it's a legitimate request coming from the Opposition. That it's not just good enough to have the Minister of Finance come into the Chamber at the closing of a speech and ignore the requests made of him. I know that he can read them in Hansard. I doubt very much whether he spends too much time reading anything I have to say in Hansard. But, Sir, the credit union movement and other people outside ask that he spell out, he spell out in his response some indication as to how this legislation is going to affect many, many people in this province. He has, I suspect, relied on the fact that we can maintain this debate solely on an ideological argument and never really owning up to answering just how this bill, if it should become law, will in fact be carried out, just to what degree it will intrude in this particular field, and to give some forecast as to what they are aiming for.

Mr. Speaker, there are only that many investment dollars to be had or that many deposit dollars to be had in this province. The chartered banks have a fair share of them, the credit unions have another fair share of them, and now the Minister of Finance wants his share of them. Now if it's going to be an open, fair competition that's one thing, but I think we have reason enough to believe that we should ask the Government now to spell out the terms of that competition. Mr. Speaker, I believe, as I believed when I spoke on this bill at its Second Reading prior to the motion now before the House which suggests that this bill should be reconsidered, should be thought out again, that it is again part of a --(Interjection)-- No, not -- and I have to disagree with my honourable friend the Member from Morris. I think he was quoted the other day in the press that this was all part of a conspiracy or part of a dark and deep and hidden plan. To this extent I have to disagree with him. It is not.

BILL 64

(MR. ENNS cont'd) It's a plan that is very open, a plan that is available -- well, not quite for publication because they published an abridged version of it, but you know, at least enough copies are around that we know, we know what the Government wants to do, and I simply want to challenge the honourable members opposite that they are supporting the kind of debate, the kind of honest debate -- and I use this word, Mr. Speaker, recognizing that you have a sensitivity for that word lately. I use that word in the sense, Mr. Speaker, in the sense that we're not having the kind of an honest debate that I think many members would enjoy; that many members would enjoy, if they but truly bared their colours, you know, at least the colours that are the bottom part of my tie -- although you notice that my top is Tory Blue -- but bared their colours and we'll have the debate on our side. But it's impossible to debate when we're always dodging the issues and when we're camouflaging the real intent of legislation. --(Interjection)-- There, I see the colour and I see it clearly. And, Sir, it sets my adrenalin flowing and I know I can respond to that colour, and respond in the last race to that debate. But, Mr. Speaker, when I have honourable members indicating otherwise...

A MEMBER: Put the wagons in a circle.

MR. ENNS: When I have bland statements talking about the desirability of the private sector maintaining a full and meaningful role in our society, then I'm confused.

Mr. Speaker, I did not want to particularly speak at any great length on this bill. I just simply reiterate that I think the Minister should not lose sight of the fact that while perhaps a good portion of the debate had centred on just simply the principal question about whether the government should or should not enter this particular field of endeavour, I have sat and listened and not lost sight of the fact that we should be asking him specifically how he intends to enter it, to what extent, how many bodies, what is he shooting for, what are his priorities. We move principally into the urban areas first to attract that deposit dollar. Will he move into the principal or the larger rural urban centres, Brandon, Dauphin, Swan River, Morden, Steinbach? You know, what are the -- you know, I can't really believe that his only concern is for those few isolated areas now not covered by the credit unions or the banks. That's not the reason for the bill. I think nobody really believes that, and he doesn't believe that. The reason for the bill is to attract deposit dollars, and the Minister has singularly failed to tell us just exactly how he intends to implement the bill. What are his targets? Does he intend to hire a staff of 200, 300? Does he intend to have ten branches operating within a year? Twenty within a year? What are his targets? We all have targets.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I leave those few comments on record for the Minister to consider. He may -- he may, if he's feeling good on a particular day -- decide to respond to them. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Bill No. 71, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Stand? Oh I'm sorry. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition on Bill 71. I called for the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. It should have been the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. (Stand.)

BILL NO. 75

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Bill No. 75, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm much calmed down from this morning and I'm not going to extend this debate for any length of time. I merely want to indicate to the House that the movement from the First Commissioner of Northern Affairs Bill to the Second Commissioner of Northern Affairs Bill to the Third Commissioner of Northern Affairs Bill

BILL 75

(MR. GREEN cont'd). . . are all movements in the direction of giving more local autonomy to the communities; and that anybody who would interpret it in the reverse is either perverse himself or is trying to create an issue when none exists. Because this Act that I operated under as Commissioner of Northern Affairs gave me all of the powers and more than the Leader of the Opposition is talking about; gave the communities no power at all. There were no elections under the Commissioner of Northern Affairs Act when I took over that particular post. The Commissioner could establish a local advisory committee, he could have these committees serve - where in the opinion of Commissioner there is sufficient population and he deems it advisable the committee may provide for an election . . . some of the members of local committee and may provide for the qualification of voters, the preparation of voters' lists, the nomination of candidates. That was all done by the Commissioner. Now it has to be done by regulation. The regulation is passed by Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition, let's just look at what he has said. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition says that there is now in existence a regulation of 65 pages. I think that's what he said. About 65 pages on the election. Now listen to this, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member says that that regulation being in existence could have been put into the Act. Mr. Speaker, it could have --(Interjection)-- why not the whole thing? Why not the regulation since we know it exists, Mr. Speaker, it could have been . . . Now let us assume, Mr. Speaker, let us assume that that 65-page regulation was put in the Act. Does anybody in this House have any doubt about what the Leader of the Opposition would have said about the Act? He would say, here is an Act 150 pages long - because now we have to add to whatever is now in the act an additional 65 pages as to how people in Pukatawagan and Wabowden and Pikwitonei and Ilford, as to how they will vote, or Moose Lake, and he will then go through that regulation and say, oh my God, they brought in this 130 page Act in the dying days of the Session, although I don't know that the Session is dying or anybody suggested it was dying, and they expect us to deal with this complicated set of legislation, Mr. Speaker, that's what he would say. --(Interjection)-- Well, Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting -- you know the honourable member has not, the honourable member though he has had unlimited time apparently has not had enough time. --(Interjection)-- There is no point of privilege. I have said nothing, Mr. Speaker, which could conceivably represent a point of privilege. What is the point of privilege?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member state his matter of privilege.

MR. SPIVAK: If the Honourable Minister is suggesting that he infers from what I said that this is the position, that's one thing. If on the other hand he says that I said, Mr. Speaker, I did not. I said the question of who can vote, the qualification of a voter, which is in the regulations, and it doesn't apply to any particular area but who can vote, if the government now has that in regulations it should be put in the Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no point of privilege. I said that the honourable member said the regulation should be put in the Act, and I'm suggesting, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Let us at least try to get along. I realize that each debator has a particular style of delivery and he may not necessarily be saying that which one other honourable member wishes to hear, but we cannot have continual points of order or interruptions in regard to when there is a genuine difference of opinion and I think that we should understand that. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I think I'm entitled to the same rights as the Honourable House Leader and he would be the first to object and to be on his feet if anyone suggested he said something that wasn't so. So therefore, Sir, I say to you that I did not say that all the regulations should be put into the Act at all. But I specifically said that with respect to the regulations the qualifications of who should be able to vote should be in the Bill.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, as I heard the honourable member I thought he said that the regulations should be in the Bill. And if he did not say that, Mr. Speaker, then I will retract that suggestion that he said that the entire 65 pages of regulations should be in the Bill. But, Mr. Speaker, if he objects to government enacting those things by regulation, and if what we are talking about is the preparation of voter lists, the qualification of voters,

BILL 75

(MR. GREEN cont'd). . . the way in which candidates are nominated, then he has a problem. Because if he says that the qualifications of how to vote should be in the Act, because we have already spelt it out and we know it and therefore we don't have to do it in the backrooms, then how can he separate that, Mr. Speaker, from the fact that if we know what the qualifications are, the method of nomination, and the other things relating to election, then why should those three be spelled out in the backroom?

And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if the honourable member is now using that argument it is only an afterthought. That what he indicated was that because these things have now been done and have been passed by regulation that there is no need now for them not to be put in the legislation. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that if we had put them in the legislation the fact is that he would have said, you've given us another long bill at the closing days of the session, we haven't had time to consider it, we haven't had time to debate it, we only debated it for three hours, one speech, and we really need six hours for one speech. That's what he would have said. Because, Mr. Speaker, we've learned from experience that that's what he does say.

Does he know anything about communities like Moose Lake or Pikwitonei or Ilford? Does he know, Mr. Speaker, that the problem here, that the problem here relates to the fact that we are not talking about a geographic area that can be that can be identified by any surveys; that we are talking about a group of people who happen to live in proximity with each other, that some move out and some move in, and that the first elections for Community Councils were not elections of the kind that he is talking about at all. That some of them were held, Mr. Speaker, in the Community Hall and that that's the way they elected their Community Council. And that the qualifications as to how to vote in a community with as little formal organization as the communities that we are talking about, it would be, Mr. Speaker, an injustice to the community to write those regulations into a statute on the basis that they could be made statutory in the same fashion as let us say elections to the Legislature or elections to the House of Commons, and that's why they were specified in the regulations. And, Mr. Speaker, under the Leader of the Opposition's government they weren't even in regulation. How was it done? By the man who says that the Minister is making himself a Czar by setting each of these communities as a corporate community with powers to enter into contracts, etc. How was it done under his administration, that freedom loving administration, the administration that didn't try to seize power, that didn't try to act like commissars or Czar. --(Interjection)-- Well here it is. Where in the opinion of the Commission - not that they have a right to vote, not that they have a right to vote - where in the opinion of the commissioner there is sufficient population. Just to show the honourable member what we are talking about when we are talking about isolated communities, your Act gave the Commissioner the right to decide whether there was sufficient population and he deems it advisable, the commissioner may provide for the election of all or some of the members of a local committee, and may provide for, Mr. Speaker, the qualification of voters, the preparation of voters' lists, the nomination of candidates. And, Mr. Speaker, I did that. I did that. I said that there will be an election. I said that I will not control the funds. I said I will not be the Czar. I said I will not be the dictator, and I tell the House that the present Minister of Northern Affairs has moved further in the direction of local autonomy than was the case when I was holding that portfolio or holding that commission, and I had moved further in the direction of autonomy than was the case under the Act as enacted by the Conservative administration.

So if the Leader of the Opposition had come to this House and said what you're doing is a useful thing, that what you're trying to do is to give some more local autonomy to communities and you have erred or that you have not made it in this direction or you have not made it in that direction and that there is a modification that you could put here or a modification that you could put there . . . what was his pitch to this House? That this government with its thirst to acquire control and power is trying to make the Minister of Northern Affairs the Czar of Northern Manitoba. --(Interjection)-- He assisted. That's right.

Well, Mr. Speaker, you know I used the analogy before, there is a society in the world that is known as the Flat Earth Society and despite the fact that spaceships have gone around the world they have issued a statement that yes there are Sputniks flying around the world but the world continues to be flat. And the honourable member, despite what is plain to any citizen of the Province of Manitoba --(Interjection)-- What is as plain as -- Well,

BILL 75

(MR. GREEN cont'd). . . Mr. Speaker, the honourable member says that because I say it is so. . . I have not said it's so. I have read the --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, you know the other day I got up and I was up for - the honourable member spoke for three hours. He never let me finish a sentence. Today I get up and he does not let me finish. --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Would the honourable member state his matter of privilege.

MR. SPIVAK: This has gone on and on and on. Mr. Speaker, the honourable member has referred to the fact that I spoke for three hours. Now that was a fair exaggeration on his part. He said I spoke for three hours today, and I think the record shows that I spoke for an hour and 10 minutes. And, Mr. Speaker, the point is that that is an exaggeration. It is not a fact. He asserts it as a fact. It weakens his argument, Mr. Speaker, and I would appreciate at least if he would be accurate in what he says.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member's point is well taken. It's a big point, it's well taken. I admit that to me it seemed like more than three hours. Mr. Speaker, it is a question of relativity. Einstein's Theory of Relativity is explained as follows: If the Leader of the Opposition sat on my knee for a second it would seem like an hour. And if Raquel Welch sat on my knee for an hour it would seem like a second. And the fact is that I will admit, I will admit that it seemed like three hours and, Mr. Speaker, it was only an hour and a half. You know, it was only an hour and a half, and you know one does sometimes exaggerate, and I spoke in that hyperbole and I will admit that it was subjective. But the fact is that as long as it was, it was too long by everything more than five minutes, because the honourable member repeated himself and continually alluded to a situation which was entirely incorrect.

I ask any reasonable person, I ask people in the Conservative caucus to look at the provisions of the present Northern Affairs Act; to look at the previous Northern Affairs Act; to look at the first Northern Affairs Act and see whether there hasn't been a steady progression of authority away from the Minister and to the community. Because that's what has been enacted; and if there is a criticism with the present Northern Affairs Act is that in the attempt, in the very, very sincere attempt to make it so that these communities have the authority which they do not now legally have that they are all given a corporate status which involves them complying with formalities which they do not now have to observe. But as to power, the Act that the present Minister of Northern Affairs is introducing is an Act which divests himself and confers upon the community the Act that was in existence under the Conservative administration gave no power, no power I repeat, none. You will find no authority to the communities in the Conservative act establishing the Commissioner of Northern Affairs. Not one iota of power. They did not have control over their unconditional grants. I gave that to them without legal power to do. I took a chance because I said that we're going to make this Community Council, there's nothing in the Act which gives me the right to divest myself of the unconditional grant, I will do it because I trust the community to proceed on their own authority rather than the Commissioner of Northern Affairs. There isn't one iota of power to the community under the Conservative Act. There is a good deal of extended authority under the act that's now being proposed; and when members are trying to digest the only one and a half hour speech of the Leader of the Opposition they can take that fact under consideration.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition have a question?

MR. SPIVAK: Would the Honourable Minister submit to a question? I wonder if he can indicate whether under the Conservative Act the power was given for the Minister to become involved in the establishment, acquisition and operation of a commercial or industrial business or activity with an incorporated community?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, any municipality can do that, and they have done it. Any municipality can do it and have done it. Therefore the Commissioner being the municipal authority for all of the north could do those things, and did do some of those things.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM (Rupertsland): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I've listened with astonishment at the incredible interpretation of the Leader of the Opposition on Bill 75, the Northern Affairs Act. I've discussed the kind of Northern Affairs Act that the communities in my constituency would like to see both as a private citizen before the

BILL 75

(MR. BOSTROM cont'd) . . . election and after the election; and I know that of the nine communities that make up part of the 37 communities which will be affected by this Northern Affairs Act, the nine communities that fall within my constituency are in agreement with the provisions that are in this Act. When the Leader of the Opposition claims that the legislation was not reviewed it's simply not true. The legislation was drawn up, drafted by the communities in Northern Manitoba. This is the first time, I would believe this is the first time in Manitoba, if not in Canada, that an Act of the Legislature was actually drawn up by the people whom it will affect.

The Act, the kind of provisions which were considered important to the communities under the jurisdiction of Northern Affairs were discussed in meetings, in group meetings of community representatives, in meetings within the community. As well consultations were taking place on a regular basis on the kinds of provisions which would eventually go into the Act. I personally heard the representations from the communities in my constituency. I've reviewed the consultation report which came out of these consultations with communities in my constituency and I can say that the comments by the Leader of the Opposition when he said this legislation was not reviewed is just completely not true. He makes the statement that this Bill should be referred to a Committee of the Legislature, and I would ask him why, what is the reason? Why should we refer this to a Committee of the Legislature when the five northern MLAs have reviewed it with their constituents, have reviewed the provisions of this Act with the communities which will be affected by this Act. The MLAs have looked at the report that came out from the consultation process where the communities set down the kinds of priorities and concerns they had with respect to the kind of Act which should be drawn up for Northern Manitoba. --(Interjection)-- And now he says that this Act should be reviewed another time. If that is the case then this will be about the third or fourth time that this Act will be reviewed.

I would ask that if the Leader of the Opposition is so concerned about the provisions that are in this Act that he wants to discuss them with the communities then he should take it upon himself to do that. Discuss it clause by clause. In fact I would challenge him to go to any one of the communities in my constituency which is affected by this Act and tell them that this Act is no good for them. If he knows better than the communities know, I challenge him to go up there and try to prove to them that this Act is no good.

After such a consultation process where the communities if anything probably got tired of talking about the kinds of things that were going to go into the Act, if anything they were completely saturated with information and had more than enough opportunity to discuss the Act. And he would pooh, pooh this kind of consultation process and say that this Act was shoved down the throats of people in the North. He has the gall to call the Minister of Northern Affairs the Czar of the North, when in fact, as the Minister of Mines and Resources has said, he's the Minister that has given if anything more autonomy to the communities in the North.

He refers in his comments on this Northern Affairs Act that the Government of Manitoba has failed in Northern Manitoba as far as northern development is concerned. Well I would ask him if such is the case then why did the people of the north send five New Democratic Party MLAs to this Legislature in the last election if the failure is so evident. The Leader of the Opposition reveals his attitude towards the people of the North.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. BOSTROM: The Leader of the Opposition reveals his attitude and the Conservative Party, which is making noise behind him, reveal their attitude toward the people of the North. They say that they know what is best for the people of the North. They look at this Bill, they read it over and they say, this is not the right kind of bill for Northern Manitoba so they disregard it; try to prolong the process and perhaps even hold up the passage of this Bill which is urgently required in Northern Manitoba and in fact demanded by the residents of northern communities. They want to have the provisions, the powers and responsibilities that are laid out in this Act. They've requested them time and time again. If this Bill is not passed in this Session of the Legislature there will be many communities in the North that want to take advantage of these opportunities who will be disappointed.

I would just point out to members opposite the contradictory statements that the Leader of the Opposition has made. He says that the Northern Affairs Department does not

BILL 75

(MR. BOSTROM cont'd) . . . consult but in fact directs northern communities. Well this is simply not true, simply a gross misrepresentation of the facts. The approach of the Northern Affairs Department since 1969 has been a move towards more and more local autonomy, more and more decision making at the local level, whether it be in deciding what to do with the winter works grants that are made available to the community or on what they should do with the other funds that are made available to them, or the kinds of government services that are going to be offered to their community. A steady process of consultation has taken place on all of these things, and more and more decision-making power has been laid right in the hands of the community councils in these communities. And this is in direct contrast to the kind of thing which was happening before 1969. Sure there was a Commissioner of Northern Affairs and there was a staff that worked under that Commissioner but they made the decisions for the northern communities. If there was money available for northern communities the staff, the bureaucrats made the decisions. The Provincial Government people sitting right in Winnipeg made decisions for somebody living in Norway House. If you travel to Norway House today the people there will show you where the money was spent previous to 1969. There are two . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. BOSTROM: There are two docks, Mr. Speaker, in Norway House which were built previous to 1969 and the community people are still walking around scratching their heads wondering why those docks were built where they were built.

A MEMBER: They built them on dry land.

MR. BOSTROM: Because they were built in a place that's completely inconvenient, in a place where they're absolutely useless to the local residents. And here is a case of waste and mismanagement of money, waste and mismanagement of resources that are made available to northern communities. They talk about waste and mismanagement in the past four years. Here is an example of the waste and mismanagement that was a part of the policy of the previous government, the previous Conservative administration.

The Leader of the Opposition has said that there's too much - on one hand he makes the statement that the Northern Affairs Act is going to be taking away powers from the communities; in fact the Northern Affairs Department will be directing the affairs of the communities. And he goes on to be critical of the fact that he maintains that the Government is not establishing proper priorities within the northern affairs communities. Now the two statements just don't jibe; If on one hand he says that Northern Affairs has too great a hand in the affairs of the communities and then on the other hand he says that they don't have enough hand in the affairs of the communities, they should be setting the priorities.

He takes a look at the Northern Affairs Act and in his criticism of the Act he looks at the first few pages of the Act where it says in Part III on Local Communities, that local communities can be appointed by the Minister to look after the affairs of the community, and he uses that as the major point in the Act that this Act is giving the powers to the Minister. I think that's as far as he read in this Act. He read up to about page 10 and the Act as members notice goes to page 44. If you read a little bit further in the Act you come to Parts V, VI and VIII; V is political organization, leading up to Part VII, the powers of incorporated community councils. Here is the proof that the powers are not being given to the Minister; in fact the Minister is giving up his powers. He's giving up his powers and making it available for the community councils in the North to take on those powers and responsibilities.

Section 80 on page 28, power to levy taxes on taxable property within the community. That power will be . . .

A MEMBER: Subject to his approval.

MR. BOSTROM: Certainly it's subject to his approval. The incorporation of the community council is subject to the Minister's approval. That does not say that the incorporation of the community council will not take place. I would be a bit afraid of it taking place if this party over here was in government. It goes on to give powers to the community council regarding police services, ownership and operation of facilities. And on page 30 - and I ask the Leader of the Opposition to look in his Act and read a little bit further than page 10 and to look at the powers that are given to the communities, that are available to the communities. Power to acquire, use and dispose of property. Power to develop and redevelop land. Power to establish, acquire and operate businesses. Do you say that this is not making powers

BILL 75

(MR. BOSTROM cont'd) available to the communities? Acquisition or construction of housing for rent. All of these are powers which are in fact even greater than those offered to the municipalities within our province.

This Act goes further in giving local autonomy to northern communities than the Municipal Act in its application to the municipalities in our province. And the Leader of the Opposition is able to stand up and say in this Legislature that this Act does not give powers to the community, but in fact the Minister is going to control these communities. I ask you to consider, consider the Act, read the Act and see if that's what it says.

The charge that the Leader of the Opposition makes in one of his statements during his address is that some people in northern communities have said to the Minister that we want you to make the decisions. The communities which make this request I would submit are few and far between. The communities have made it very clear to the Minister of Northern Affairs and to the New Democratic Government that they want to have more powers, more decision-making power at the local level. And if anything, the New Democratic Party in Northern Manitoba has based its reputation on just bringing that kind of approach to northern development. Bringing the approach of local democracy, of having communities for the first time decide on priorities, priorities not only in their community but in development that takes place around the communities. If you want to look at the channel area loggers, as he mentioned and he brought it up as an example of somehow taking away some powers from the community, I would submit that if you go to Berens River and talk to the people about Channel Area Loggers you'll find that the people are pretty happy with that operation and it's bringing economic benefits to that area and at the same time allowing people to participate in the decision making process in operating a business.

He criticized the regulation regarding qualification of voters. And as the Minister of Mines and Resources pointed out that wouldn't have been a problem under the old Act as it was administered by the Conservative government because they didn't have any voters, they didn't recognize any voters. The community councils under their jurisdiction, the community committees were appointed, and it wouldn't have mattered even if they had been voted in because they weren't given any powers. As I said the powers were exercised by the Commissioner and by the bureaucrats who worked under him. They were making the decisions in the community, where and when the money was spent and how it was spent in the communities. Giving absolutely no powers to the communities; having their friends in the communities, in fact deciding on where the money was going to be spent if there was any consultation at all.

He even admits that what we are doing in the North is more than the Conservative Government was doing. I would agree with him there. The most important difference, however, I would like to point out is that the New Democratic Government has taken a different approach to northern people and development in the north; and that approach rests on the basic premise that people in the North know best what should be done in the North. And the approach to development or spending of moneys in the North has been a process of consultation; consultation on programs, consultation on policies effecting the North and giving the maximum opportunity for local decision making at the community level.

He talks about private initiative, and says that somehow in Northern Manitoba private initiative has suffered under the New Democratic Government. I would say private initiative in the North has never had it as good. For the first time people in northern communities are able to take part in decision making, and if that's not private initiative what is it. He says that private initiative is somehow being denied or reduced. I would ask him to consider what about the development in community councils and the decision making power at the local level? What about the businesses that have been developed through the Communities Economic Development Fund, giving private people in northern communities the first opportunity to own and operate businesses; businesses that were just not possible, just not able to get funding from the private banks which these members seem to be so hung up on, so worried about in their debate against the treasury branches in this province. Somehow worried that their friends in the banking business will have some reduction. The credit unions have not been operating in northern remote communities so the operation of treasury branches in northern remote communities will not affect credit unions whatsoever.

He somehow knocks the idea of establishing local crown corporations. He makes the

BILL 75

(MR. BOSTROM cont'd). . . claim that somehow this will reduce private initiative. I would say that where there is no opportunity now, absolutely no opportunity for private initiative to develop, for people to have the opportunity to use their private initiative in operating economic enterprises in their communities, that a local Crown corporation will give them an opportunity to use and develop their private initiative. There are entrepreneurs in our northern communities who have the ability and the intelligence to participate in the operation and decision making on a business venture, but a small scale business venture in the logging industry for example is just not economically viable. Any small individual person who has very limited financial resources is precluded from using his private initiative in developing a logging or pulpwood business in a remote community. A local Crown corporation however could be established, it could be established separate from the community council or it could be separated as laid out in this legislation as a Crown corporation responsible to the local community and it could acquire and utilize that private initiative, the co-operative private initiative of members of the community.

There's been tremendous progress in Northern Manitoba in community councils in the last four years. If you were to see some of these communities four years ago and to go there now and see the kinds of developments that have taken place, the human developments - the development of facilities in that community, the development of enthusiasm, the success that these people have had in developing local governments has given them an incentive to try bigger and better things. And that same success, Mr. Speaker, when that success has given them that kind of incentive, I say that we should give them the opportunity to expand on that kind of incentive. We should give them the opportunity if they want to branch out beyond local government, to branch out into economic development; that those same community councils should be able to do that. And in so doing it's going to be a benefit to Manitoba as a whole and in particular to their remote communities. It's going to mean that there will be a reduction or elimination of welfare payments to these communities. If we can give them the opportunity to develop local economic enterprise it's a saving of the welfare payments that are ordinarily made to that community. For every person that is taken off the welfare rolls and is given a soul satisfying job, a job that will give them some pride and give them an opportunity to develop a pride in his working in that community, it will be a saving to the province in welfare payments; it will also mean an increase in the production of goods and services for this province. So there's a net gain there that's even bigger in real terms than would ordinarily show on the bank balance book, or the balance book of the accountant - and the kind of benefit to that remote community that can be shown in human terms and human development that can't be shown with the accountant's pencil on his bank balance book is just unestimatable.

I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that I've studied this Act very carefully, and I submit that I've studied a hell of a lot more carefully than the Leader of the Opposition. And this Act, if you read it with a fair and honest mind will show you that it increases decision making power at the local level; it increases the responsibilities and control at the community level, and it represents the desired changes of the people who will be affected by this Northern Affairs Act. And for the Leader of the Opposition to suggest that this somehow represents more control by the Provincial Government represents either an appalling lack of understanding of this Act, or it's a deliberate misrepresentation of the facts - and I don't know who to blame, I don't know who to blame. Is it him or is it his speech writer? If this is the case, if it is a misrepresentation of fact, a deliberate misrepresentation as I suspect it is, then it's just another demonstration from the Leader of the Opposition on the basis form of petty partisanship in this Legislature. And I would submit that he reveals his disrespect for people of the North when he says they will not understand this Act. Because, Mr. Speaker, the people of the North wrote this Act. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would submit to two questions. I wonder if he'll indicate whether Bill 75 in its printed form, which I believe is the Act we're talking about now . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SPIVAK: . . . Bill 75 in its printed form has been seen by the leaders and the people of the remote communities that he represents?

BILL 75

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, in the printed form, in the way it is submitted to the Legislature I cannot answer that, you know, in truth it was seen by the people in this particular booklet form. But they have seen and they have discussed all the provisions that are in this Act. They have discussed it in one form or another, in one written or verbal form or another, all of the provisions that are in this Act and they are in agreement with them.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the honourable member could indicate whether with reference to the items, whether it be the levying of the tax, community services going into business, that it's the understanding of the people in the communities that he represents that they are prepared to proceed on the basis that everything would be subject to the approval of the Minister and to his veto.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: I believe that the people in northern Manitoba understand that the Provincial Legislature and the Government of Manitoba is the final authority in this province and that they recognize that there must be some final authority and responsibility for an Act passed by the Legislature - and that they recognize and accept this fact as given in the way it is printed in this Act and they are in agreement with it.

MR. SPIVAK: But there may have been some misunderstanding. I wonder if he could indicate whether the people of the community they represent understands the decisions that they want to make with respect to those items that he referred to are subject to the approval of the Minister and to his veto.

MR. BOSTROM: Well, Mr. Speaker, it seems as though the Leader of the Opposition, you know, is revealing again his basic misunderstanding of the provisions of this Act and the legislation as it's presented. The incorporation of community councils, the first step in incorporation of the community council is just that alone - just incorporation, that they in fact can take on further responsibilities and powers as they desire those responsibilities and powers - and as they take on each form of power, whether it be that of levying taxes or that of acquiring a business, each one of those steps is at the approval of the Minister and they recognize that fact and accept it as right. Mr. Speaker, if I can just continue to complete my answer to the question, that to suggest that this is somehow a sinister plot as the Leader of the Opposition seems to be suggesting, is just unacceptable.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY McKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Swan River that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Bill No. 77, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance. The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): May I have that matter stand please, Mr. Speaker? (Stand)

BILL NO. 90

MR. CHERNIACK: Bill No. 90 Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable the Attorney-General, the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer unequivocal support to the principle of this bill, unequivocal support to the idea and the concept contained in it, but as some of my colleagues have pointed out in debate on the legislation earlier, it's not enough merely to set down a human rights' statute on paper such as this and then lean back and assume that you've done it all. It's not enough to just have it here embodied in written statute form and then operate on the principle that you've done everything necessary in the field of human rights and human rights' legislation; so while complimenting the Government for having had the initiative to structure this proposed legislation and to introduce it in the House and to set it down in printed recorded form for members of the society of Manitoba, I would add my injunction and my plea to words expressed earlier in that direction by some of my colleagues. We will hope that the Government will follow through in, not only its application of the

BILL 90

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd). . . principles contained in this legislation in putting Human Rights' legislation really into fact and into existence, but we hope that that kind of attitude will translate itself into the general approach the Government takes to the conduct of the affairs of Manitoba people at all levels over which this Government and this Legislature have jurisdiction.

For this bill, admirable as it may be, Sir, requires - and I think you'll agree - much more than mere lip service, and up to this point in time as has been suggested by other members on this side of the House, there hasn't been much other than lip service coming from this Government in that area. This is what my colleagues were trying to say when they spoke yesterday about the two nurses at Selkirk, and I recognize that there were diversionary tactics employed that carried the debate far beyond the channels of argument that originally were intended by the remarks of the Honourable Member for Morris and the Honourable Member for La Verendrye. The fact of the matter is that they were talking precisely about applying in practice in actual day to day living fact the sort of principle that's set down here in writing, and they used that case of the two nurses in Selkirk as a case in point as an illustrative example.

We then got into some interesting exercise in semantics and theory over unions and the right to strike and the effect of the strike; and the degree to which the strike inhibited the rights or failed to inhibit the rights of other workers. The Honourable House Leader, the Minister of Mines and Resources introduced some truly mind boggling interpretations of strikes and strikers and strike effects into the debate at that juncture but, Sir, while being interested in that aspect of the subject and intending to return to that, I don't want to bog down on that point at this particular juncture because I'm racing the clock and I wanted to say one or two things about the bill as the principle of human rights is detailed therein, and particularly insofar as discriminatory practices are effected and hopefully will be curtailed by it.

There are provisions in the bill, Sir, which I think all members of this House recognize are highly desirable in society and no doubt substantially overdue. There are provisions dealing with discriminatory practices and with the prohibition of those discriminatory practices, so that all Manitobans, all members of this society regardless of background and culture and colour and orientation are treated fairly and equally in terms of accommodation opportunities, in terms of education opportunities and in terms of employment opportunities. So those, Sir, we laud most enthusiastically. But there are at the same time notwithstanding these merits, Mr. Speaker, one or two areas of the bill, one or two aspects of it that trouble me a little bit, and I want to just recognize them for the record and urge the Government and urge the Minister responsible for this legislation to have a look at what I think are a couple of areas that do require some looking at.

One of them is related specifically to that part of the bill, Sir, that has to do with the prohibition of discriminatory practices in the area of notices and signs etc. The bill after all is designed to protect people, designed for the protection of people and their rights, and surely that concept of protection extends beyond simply those specific areas - perhaps I shouldn't use the word "simply". Surely that concept and that goal of protection extends beyond specifically those areas of race, colour, creed and religion outlined there. Surely the concept and the goal of protection which is embodied and implicit in the legislation is meant to extend across society in general and should apply to employers and to persons who are involved in particular enterprises and particular practices who have the best of intentions in the field of human rights but maybe victimized inadvertently and unknowingly by circumstances beyond their control. I refer here specifically for the Honourable the Attorney-General's attention, Mr. Speaker, to broadcasters and publishers. I refer specifically to that section of the bill which indicates that there is to be no discrimination practised in the area of publishing or broadcasting or thereby disseminating information that is discriminatory or intended to be discriminatory to any person on the basis of race, colour, creed, sex and the other aspects of life detailed in the legislation. I understand the objective of that part of the bill, of that section of the bill, and I subscribe to the desire to insure that no such material is disseminated by any broadcaster or any publisher, but it seems to me that there is no protection offered the broadcaster or the publisher who inadvertently may be victimized by some material, some information that he simply has not or she simply

BILL 90

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd). . . has not had an opportunity to investigate thoroughly. I think the Minister would agree, Mr. Speaker, and all his colleagues on the front bench and all their associates in government at the deputy ministerial level, that it is extremely difficult for a man or woman in charge of a substantial-sized operation to know everything that's going on and to be fully conversant with all the things that are going on in that operation every day, and just as government ministers can be caught off base by things that happen down the line in their departments that they're not able to scrutinize on a day-to-day basis, so a broadcaster and a publisher can be caught, caught off base and victimized by material that perhaps should have been attended to by him or by her, but for one reason or another, for reasons of the organization of the establishment, were the responsibility of someone down the ranks, and that person down the ranks, down the line, failed to deal with it the way it should have been, and as a consequence the broadcaster or publisher is left out on a limb as a stationary target for the kinds of penalties prescribed under this legislation. And I think that there should be some consideration, Mr. Speaker, given to that person, that member of society, and his or her right to protection in that area too, just as the legislation lays out the protection on other levels for other persons in society. So that's one of the anomalies - not anomalies but perhaps one of the oversights and loopholes in the bill that I would bring to the Attorney-General's attention.

I notice that I'm on the short end of the clock. It's 5:30, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to call it that time.

MR. SPEAKER: The House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning. (Friday)