

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, April 14, 1970

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. CLERK: The Petition of Guy Simonis and Others praying for the passing of An Act to incorporate The Manitoba Sports Federation.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: At this point I should like to direct the attention of the Honourable Members to the gallery where we have with us 85 students of Grade 5 and 6 standing of the Lansdowne School. These students are under the direction of Miss Seredny, Mr. Woroby and Mr. Miller. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and Commissioner of Northern Affairs. And we have 60 students of Grade 11 standing of the Nellie McClung Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Stepler and Mr. Campbell. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Pembina. On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you all here today.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate. On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Osborne. The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage La Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I agree in part with what the Member for Swan River had to say yesterday about the importance of the findings of the Northern Task Force and the importance of the Government making the decisions on what course of action they should take. It was noted I believe that there were about 50 meetings held of the Task Force from October 30th until February 11th. Members of the Force travelled by every means under the sun including foot, I believe - on one occasion we had to walk a few miles. But I think even those who had not been up north before or those who were not on the Task Force, would notice without travelling that the northern problems really fall into two distinct groupings. The problems in the urban areas of Thompson, Churchill, Lynn Lake, Flin Flon and The Pas are really urban problems that are found in any other community where people live in towns or cities, but on top of the urban problems, they have slightly higher costs of living and a more severe climate to deal with. Although it was not the intention of most members I think we found ourselves involved with the other half of the northern problems, and that is the conditions found in the isolated and remote communities where - well the living is much like it would be in the early days of the settlement of this country. It's hard to imagine communities without electricity, without a road, without the simplest comforts of life like indoor plumbing. --(Interjection) -- I don't know if Rhineland's like that or not, but it certainly is like that in nine out of ten of the remote communities of the north and when our recommendations were turned in I would think that two-thirds of the recommendations deal with the people who are in isolation and in the remote areas of the province, so I think that of the 49 recommendations about 12 of them are in the federal field and the other recommendations lie within provincial jurisdiction.

As to whether or not the Northern Task Force should be reconstituted, I personally don't think it should be. The problems have been identified, it then becomes a governmental responsibility on what to do about them, and if another body such as the northern task force were to be set up, then I would think that it would have to be set up with a different directive. It would have to be given some depth by way of expert staff and it would then take on the function of government in supplying answers to the problems that were found, so I don't think that the northern task force should be reappointed. Work has been done as far as I can see and what has to be done now is for the government to decide. They were elected to deal with problems such as this and I think it is their function to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. SPEAKER put the question.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN Q. C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Labour that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion, Introduction of Bills; Orders of the Day.  
The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

#### ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. LEONARD H. CLAYDON (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, I hope you will forgive me. I can't be accused for not trying but I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Cultural Affairs again - concerning the Hugh John MacDonald House. Yesterday the Minister said that the government never had files officially opened on this subject and yet I have copies of letters before me written by himself and also the Premier. I have a letter here as recent as April 9th and the reason I'm bringing this up is tomorrow is the day that the axe is supposed to go on this House and there is one statement from Jean Chretien, and he says this: "It is my understanding that the house is still under consideration by the Manitoba Historical Advisory Board whose chairman is Mr. J.D. Hiebert, Director of the Manitoba Museum of Man and Nature. It would seem that this is a matter more for provincial consideration." -- (Interjection) -- I want to ask him a question but I have to read this in order to ask the question, Mr. Speaker. "It would seem that this is a matter more for provincial consideration and I would therefore suggest that you take the matter up with the Manitoba Historical Advisory Board." I would like to ask the Minister in view of this last paragraph is it still too late to save this house?

HON. PHILIP PETURSSON (Minister of Cultural Affairs) (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, the matter was referred back to the Honourable Mr. Chretien for decision by his historical sites board and their decision was that it was not a site of sufficient historical importance for their interference in it or their active efforts to preserve it. That was their final answer to the Historical Sites Board in Manitoba which felt that on its own it was unable to take any action.

MR. CLAYDON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I'm aware of what the Minister said, but the decision coming out of Ottawa was that it was not of national architectural or historical significance - he points out it's provincial. Now is it still too late for the province to do anything about this?

MR. PETURSSON: Mr. Speaker, it's too late to this extent, that the whole matter was raised far too late for active or practical consideration. There was a large sum of money that would have been involved. The government had not budgeted for this type of expenditure and the Historical Advisory Board in looking over the scene felt that there were a great number of other sites that were of far greater historical importance than this particular one and therefore the Historic Sites Board felt that it could take no action, and the government in its turn, as far as it was able to look at the matter on very short notice, felt that it could not take any steps.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, in pursuing this matter further, the Minister stated large sums of money were involved. Could he state what the amount is involved in this particular case?

MR. PETURSSON: There are varying figures that have been mentioned - ranging anywhere from \$85,000 to a quarter of a million.

MR. SPEAKER: Order of the Day. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. Due to the ever increasing flow of tourists at the International Peace Gardens, and also due to the rise in the cost of maintaining the same, is the Minister considering any increases from the regular \$15,000 grant a year for the coming fiscal year?

HON. PETER BURTONIAK (Minister of Tourism and Recreation) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I think I'll have to take that as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to

April 14, 1970.

887

(MR. DOERN continued) . . . my friend the Minister of Youth and Education. In view of the fact that the voting age in Manitoba has been lowered to 18, could the Minister explain to the House what steps the Department of Education has taken or is taking to improve the curriculum so that students are better prepared for this responsibility.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Youth and Education) (Seven Oaks): This is a question of policy and I'll be glad to discuss it during the estimates.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, on March 18th I asked for an Order of Return asking for correspondence between the Canadian Government and the Manitoba Government regarding Pembina Dam and I haven't got any. I just wonder could I expect this fairly soon?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, it will come in the normal course.

MR. HENDERSON: A supplementary question please. Can I expect this before your estimates are through?

MR. GREEN: I don't know, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WALTER WEIR (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could direct a question to the House Leader in the absence of the First Minister. I wonder is it impossible for members of the caucus to talk about matters of policy in caucus?

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK Q. C. (Minister of Finance) (St. Johns): It's a matter of policy.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Finance. Is the Minister now in a position to tell us when we might expect the budget?

MR. CHERNIACK: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I want to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. Can he indicate whether there is any communication between Manitoba and Saskatchewan provinces regarding any water diversion from the Churchill River into the Saskatchewan?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any between the province of Manitoba and the province of Saskatchewan.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. J. R. FERGUSON (Gladstone): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address my question to the Minister of Agriculture. Has the government reached a decision as to the location of the veterinary clinics in Manitoba?

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac Du Bonnet): Well, this is worked out between the districts and the provincial veterinarian. I understand that the provincial veterinarian has been travelling throughout the province talking to municipal officials, and where there is a district formed, or one that exists, that is willing to enter into an arrangement that this is possible now. There is also a question of priorities which is determined by the need of that particular area.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK Q. C. (River Heights) Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, my question is to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder if he can inform the House whether the government has made either some representation or is considering representation to the Federal Government in connection with possible proposed changes of the auto pact, between the United States and Canada, particularly as it affects combines and tractors and their manufacture in the province?

HON. LEONARD EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, we are always prepared to make representation to the Federal Government when it pertains to the economy of Manitoba. I would take this question as notice at this point and hope to be able to provide the member with some more information in due course.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. A report from the Wildlife Branch of the Department seems to indicate that some 30 geese were found dead in the Round Lake area and it is suspected it's some form of mercury poisoning. Has the Minister anything

April 14, 1970.

(MR. MCKENZIE continued) . . . to offer the House?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'll take the question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the Minister of Finance. Could the Minister tell this House if we can expect a budget before the visit of the Queen this summer?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RON. MCBRYDE (The Pas): Before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Is the report in the Free Press of last Saturday true in regards to municipal assessors have been sent on Indian reserves with the intention of taxing land although Indian property and interest on land are legally tax exempt?

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Selkirk): The honourable member had given me notice of this question and it relates to the fact that in some municipalities there are located Indian reservations. The Indian Band leases its property often to neighbouring farmers. These farmers are assessed for their interest as any other occupier of Crown land would be assessed or as an occupier would be assessed if he was leasing from the provincial Crown land itself. So it's true, but it's in relation to Indian Band land being leased by neighbouring farmers.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the House Leader and ask him if it is his intention to appoint a mediator to assist in bridging the communications and credibility gap that seems to exist between the front bench and the back benches of the government?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources - its the same question as to the Minister of Finance. Is he aware of any communications between the governments of Manitoba and Saskatchewan regarding water diversion from the Churchill into the Saskatchewan system in the province of Saskatchewan?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, with regard to specifics I can't answer the question, but I do know that one of the many alternatives that is being looked at is the Sturgeon-Weir Diversion which would affect waters coming from Saskatchewan into Manitoba. The other diversions also affect water coming in from Saskatchewan so generally there must be some discussions as between the various governments, but specifically I can't give you an answer, as to a specific piece of correspondence.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. In view of the alleged statements of the Premier over the weekend during his northern tour has the Minister anything further to report with regards to compensation to fishermen with regards to pollution?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm still awaiting some information and as I indicated to the House last week I hope to be making a comprehensive statement regarding all of the features relating to the closing of the lakes if necessary, the question of sports fishing and the question of compensation, very soon.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder if he could indicate to the House whether the Department of Industry and Commerce has undertaken this year an analysis and a study of the availability of commercial credit in the province?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'll take this question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to the Minister of Health Services. Last week I asked him a question regarding the provision of nursing home care and extended home care under the Hospital Services Plan and he indicated then that a study has been made and that he would supply the House with figures as to the cost to Manitoba. I wonder if the Minister could tell me when we might get the answer?

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Services) (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, first of all I don't think that I said "had been made" but "was being made", but if I

April 14, 1970.

889

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) . . . said "had been made" it should have been "was being made". I haven't got the report and when I do have it I'll make it my pleasure to let the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose know.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I would refer the Minister then to Page 603 where certainly the indication was that the study "had been made" and a submission made to Ottawa. However, could the Minister indicate when we might have the figures?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, a submission was made to Ottawa but a study is being made by the Manitoba Hospital Commission and officials in my department and so far as the results of the enquiry are concerned, a lot of this is pertaining to the answer that we'll get from Ottawa.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the Minister of Labour. Has the government considered a reduction in the charges made to farmers for workmen's compensation?

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to direct a question to the Minister of Youth and Education. Could he indicate whether the Centennial holiday, May 12th for schools applies to school children only or does it apply to employees of school divisions?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, it's a public schools holiday, in which case of course it would apply to staff as well as students. I can't see what the staff would be doing there if the students aren't at school.

MR. CRAIK: A subsequent question, Mr. Speaker. Could he indicate whether the normal grants to school divisions will be made; and a second part, whether maintenance employees, caretakers and so on, allowance will be made for paying them overtime if they do work on May 12th?

MR. MILLER: With regard to the grants, there will be certainly no effect on the grant structure. This is a holiday that's been declared and there will be no shortage in grants to be paid. Regarding the other question about time and a half for staff, that's a question that I can't answer at this time. I don't know whether it would be needed.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Orders for Return.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY - MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris. --(Interjection) -- I believe it was stood 'til today.

MR. GREEN: The First Minister had indicated he wanted to speak and he asked to have the matter stand. If it's necessary for the debate to be adjourned by someone well we'll do that, but we would like to have it stand.

MR. JORGENSEN: I have no objections to the matter standing if the First Minister wishes that. (Agreed.)

MR. SPEAKER: Order for Return of the Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. GREEN: . . . Mr. Speaker, just by way of response from the government to the Order. We have no objection to answering Items Nos. 1, 2, 4, and 5, but don't feel that we want to make it a policy of answering for somebody else which is the Manager of the Fresh-water Fish Marketing Board. So if the member will agree to the Order being accepted on that basis, it's accepted.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

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

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

#### PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I will now continue my serial speech on the subject. The

April 14, 1970.

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd) . . . second installment will be much shorter than the first, however. I think I had covered most of the ground involved. What really concerns me, Mr. Speaker, is that we not take a position simply that the White Paper is wholly acceptable or that it is wholly unacceptable.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I apologize for interrupting my honourable friend but I was just distracted at the moment that you called the resolutions. It was my hope that we go to the bills first because some of them have to get to committee. If my honourable friend wishes to continue that's all right.

MR. MOLGAT: I have no objections at all if you want to go to private bills, in fact by and large I support that method of procedure in the House.

MR. GREEN: Well then I'd like to go to the bills starting with No. 19 and then right down to No. 26.

#### PRIVATE AND PUBLIC BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris, Bill No. 19. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker we have no objection to this going to committee in order to get an airing of it and more detailed information on it.

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

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Brandon West. Bill No. 6. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

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

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Logan. Bill No. 11. The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I'd ask the indulgence of the House to have this stand. (Agreed.)

MR. SPEAKER: Second readings. Bill No. 13. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN presented Bill No. 13, an Act respecting the 1970 Centennial and the City of Transcona for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, in introducing this bill on behalf of the City of Transcona and the City Council I wanted to also say that there will be some additional amendments forthcoming. However, those can be dealt with in committee. The contents of this bill are the result of a unanimous vote on the part of the City of Transcona to get approval for a project, the approval of the Manitoba Centennial Corporation. After that time they will receive additional monies forthcoming as part of their centennial grant. The intention of this legislation is to enable the city to construct an arena complex which would contain such things as a hockey arena, transfer the Transcona museum, contain administrative offices and also included a senior citizens' drop-in centre. The total cost of the project would be just under \$500,000 which would have financing over a number of years.

Under the legislation for the centennial the city was limited to a one mill levy on the equalized assessment for the years 1963 to 1970 inclusive, and at that time the city built a federal centennial project which was an indoor swimming pool. At this point that project has in fact been paid for and it is now the intention of the city to continue for a period of eight years, as explained in this bill, that levy, and instead of perhaps reducing the burden on the taxpayer by one mill the city proposes to continue that policy which will not add any additional burdens but simply to pursue the previous policy. So I think, Mr. Chairman, that is an explanation of the contents of the bill; it's to continue the present policy to build an arena in the City of Transcona.

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

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I just have one question. What is the total amount involved under the last section of the bill? How much would it amount to?

MR. DOERN: Well, as I explained in my comments, Mr. Speaker, the total cost of the arena complex is figured at about \$487,000 and this apparently would raise something like \$50,000-odd per year, a little over that, and it is projected that this would require about

(MR. DOERN cont'd) . . . eight years. Perhaps \$60,000 would be more correct.

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

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, we're prepared to see this matter go to committee where we can hear from the people involved and get further detail on it.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debates on second readings. On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, Bill No. 5. The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this bill for another member who was absent on Friday. They have no objection to the passing of this bill and I don't feel I have.

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

MR. JACK HARDY (St. Vital) presented Bill No. 22, an Act to amend The Liquor Control Act for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

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

MR. HARDY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I regret very much that I have to bring forward a relationship between what was an extremely successful venture by people, involvement of people, in the very successful Festival du Voyageur in St. Boniface. At the present time probably members are aware that the Act stipulates that an occasional permit shall not be issued in respect of a social occasion to be held on Sunday unless the permittee is a religious denomination and subject to other sections of The Liquor Control Act.

The purpose of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is to allow the Liquor Control Commission to issue occasional permits at their discretion on the Sabbath. I think very very simply that this is in fact the intent of this particular bill.

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

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, while we're dealing with this bill at the present time I think we should also look more deeply into the present Act dealing with regulations as they now exist and administered by the Liquor Control Commission. Because what concerns me, Mr. Speaker, at the present time, and I have before me where the Commission will list in here ten items and they request this one organization to change or update their operations before they can hold any licence, then after a short while of negotiation they come back and state in a different letter minimum requirements, and they say, you comply with the four, you don't have to do anything about the other six. Mr. Speaker, this is nonsense. I mean what's happening at the present time, what if the commission is changed and that board is changed, let's assume in a year's time or six months, will the rules of the game be changed for every proprietor in this city? Will they go back to hotels; will they go back to any operator that's operating a restaurant and say no you can't have a liquor licence because we want you to change your decor, we want you to change your furniture because we don't agree with what you have in your premises. Mr. Speaker, I feel that we have to look and we have to have some guidelines the way the commission's going to operate because at the present time it appears that there are no guidelines. There's no way and nobody knows by what guidelines your commission is operating, and this is what I'm saying. If your chairman and your board changes they can go and change the rules for every proprietor in the city and this is exactly what's happening. You have the proprietor that I'm talking about in Assiniboia, he's been in operation for two years, he's complied, he got his licence, he had no charges against him in the way of minors being in his place. His place is one of the finest and the cleanest in this city; it's publicized in your Centennial booklet how clean it is and what a good operation it is. It's also publicized in some of your tourist guides and so on. Then we have such things as the commission come two years later and the report is that the menu in the restaurant be enlarged to include four or five dishes.

HON. AL MACKLING Q. C. (Attorney-General) (St. James): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the contribution being made by the Member for Assiniboia is relevant to the bill that has been introduced. I can understand his concern to talk about the application



April 14, 1970.

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) . . . of the Liquor Control Commission, but I'm wondering how broad will be the discussion. There will be ample opportunity on my estimates I think to air all of those things and I'll be prepared to deal with them; but I'm wondering whether I'm expected to deal with that in the course of the introduction of this bill or discussion on this bill.

MR. PATRICK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure it's up to you to see if I'm in order. I'm asking for further amendments to the bill and to the Liquor Act because as it exists at the present time, you know, we're chasing people away from the city by this kind of rules really. Furthermore it's a harassment of many business proprietors. I think it's not right to say that any single restaurant should have two or three dishes instead of one. We know that there's many restaurants today that specialize in certain food. It may be a fish restaurant, it may be a chicken or it may be a rib house - you know many of the restaurants specialize in certain - and this is what - on one hand we're trying to promote new businesses, on the other hand we're chasing it away. This is my concern and a great concern in respect to this. Now this person has a tremendous investment invested in the city between the two . . .

MR. MACKLING: May I ask the honourable member a question then, Mr. Speaker, Are you moving another amendment, amendment to this bill?

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I can at this point, I can move it in committee or in Law Amendments, but I am suggesting to the members of the House that we should have more amendments in respect to why we have the bill before us, and I think it's proper to have a debate. I don't know why the Attorney-General is so concerned at me speaking on this subject at the present time, but I am really concerned because this businessman has somewhat of a half a million dollar investment in the city and he's being forced to change his operation after he's been granted a liquor license, after he's been told that your furniture is fine. What concerns me very much is by the chairman of the board saying that we made a mistake in the past. Well, every time that the board and the commission will change it may be a mistake to somebody else. He says, we made a mistake in the past, we'll admit that; we're not going to make that same mistake again and we're going to correct the situation. Well every time you're going to have a new board that may be a mistake by the other board and I think it's nonsense; I cannot see why a specialized restaurant cannot have or serve one type of food, because this is what this proprietor, he specializes in. What's wrong with having -- you have it in all cities, you have it in Toronto or in Ontario, you have the same legislation in Quebec, why should we preclude Winnipeg and say no, no, you can't go into a chicken restaurant or specialize in a good chicken restaurant, you can't go into a rib house or you can't go into a steak restaurant, you have to serve half a dozen other courses too. I think this is nonsense, Mr. Speaker, and I think it's time that we . . . I'm not blaming the commission, I'm not blaming the chairman of the commission, I'm not blaming the government, but I think it's time that we took a look and if they haven't got these guidelines at the present time and if they're not allowed then maybe we should change the Act; and if the commission hasn't got any guidelines perhaps we should give them some kind of guidelines. I'm not attaching any blame to no-one at this time. Perhaps the chairman and the new commission have found themselves in a situation that this is the way they have to deal.

The other point that concerns me greatly is the chairman says there was no complaint from any of the people in the area. It is a family type of a place where the parents take their children to an eating place, it's patronized mostly by families - I understand that 75% is a family type business . . .

MR. DOERN: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. PATRICK: Sure.

MR. DOERN: Were there any complaints from other businessmen?

MR. PATRICK: That's just the point, Mr. Speaker, that I was going to raise. I think it's unfortunate you will find either your board or the chairman is a weak person not to be able to deal because there was complaint from some other business. Just because there is a couple of hotel people on the commission, this is where probably the complaints came from, and I say it's not right - perhaps maybe they shouldn't be loaded on the commission, I don't know. My argument is there was no complaints from the people, there was no complaints from the community except from some businessmen because they thought this was a too successful operation. It's a type of an original restaurant where you can order a pizza with a beer and perhaps this is where the complaint started. Again I'm not saying that the



(MR. PATRICK cont'd) . . . board is to blame or the commission at this time; I think it's our responsibility to look at the Act. It's the government's responsibility to also look at it and if we have to change the regulations we have to change them, but as far as my knowledge is at the present time, as far as I know, they have no guidelines, they have no regulations, and I feel that they should. If they haven't any let's give them some guidelines to operate by and to work by because you can't be changing the rules of the game every year or every two years or every time a new commission is appointed, and this is what concerns me most.

Furthermore, just to demonstrate to you this is what's happening, because in one sheet you have here where you gotta comply with the ten regulations or ten things that you have to change. They come back and say to you, comply with the four, you don't have to do the other six. What happens if this businessman complies with the four, six months later or a year later he'll be approached and they'll say, you'll have to do the other six. So this businessman is going to be continually harassed, I feel he's going to be forced out of business and I think it's completely wrong, Mr. Speaker. And again I want to make it clear I'm not blaming the government, I'm not blaming the commission at this stage. I think we should look at it. If there's no regulations let's make some, let's set some regulations; and if there are regulations that are outdated, too old, because this is not the way it's operated in any other province or any across the line where they have the same operation, have somewhere in the neighbourhood of 1,700 establishments, so let's change the regulations if we have to.

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this bill. I think that what is written in this bill is good, it's something that, I think it was an oversight, it's something that should have been done before, and I think that we had an example in St. Boniface where people really enjoyed themselves and did nothing wrong but apparently they were breaking the law and I think that this is a chance to rectify it.

I also wish to speak on the subject brought up by the Honourable Member from Assiniboia. Mind you I think he was in order because after all this leaves it open to discuss some of the changes in the liquor laws. I don't think the government can say this is anticipating because there was nothing in the Throne Speech. The government might have in mind to bring in a resolution, but I think it is in order to discuss this at this time. It's the first chance that we've had.

I agree with everything that the honourable member the last speaker said except one thing. He mentioned that, I think he's unaware, that this started before the change of government and before the changes in the commission because I was made aware of this, what's going on quite a while ago. I made representation myself to the commission, it wasn't the present chairman at the time I can tell my honourable friend, I think that since the change it seems to me by the article, the same article that the honourable member was referring to, that it is exactly the same thing, exactly the same complaints. Now this article, I don't know if it's the way I read it, or the way the chairman of the commission reported it, but they kept saying that it's an American firm as if this was something wrong. Well, maybe it's just a coincidence, maybe I'm too touchy, but these people, there are a lot of American firms or firms that started in the States, especially in the same line of work, and they have these specialities here, franchises here and I don't think that we're trying to chase these people away. It seems to me when I read it that it mentioned too many times that it was an American firm - this American firm and this American firm. I think that the laws are made for everybody.

Now I agree that we've left, probably the responsibility rests on the shoulders of the people in this House and nobody else because we've always been afraid, this question of liquor has been a political football in the past, it's been afraid and no government, most of the government -- I'm talking about a free vote when we talk about this thing -- and I think that sometime, sometime or other we have to face certain problems and come in with a resolution, certainly that certain parts of it might be free votes, but we have to give directives.

I might say that first of all Shakey's Pizza Parlor were given a license, they were given a license and they build, and it cost an awful lot of money to build a place like that, and while they had this license they started another one because they were very successful, because everybody enjoyed it, they were getting a nice clientele and they were getting letters of recommendation and so on; it was written up like the honourable member said and different reports even put out by this province. So all of a sudden the commission decided that they had made a mistake, this when the second one was built, the second one did not get the license,

April 14, 1970.

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd . . .) never got the license but the man sunk in there maybe half a million dollars, a quarter of a million dollars and all of a sudden he's told that he hasn't got the liquor license, and that could be a real white elephant. There's something else in this that I didn't like, it's true mind you, but the comment was made, I'm not going to try and find it now, the comment that the commission wasn't there to see if this would be viable, if it was good, they were there to protect the public, this is fine. But it's certainly not fair to destroy businessmen, to chase businessmen away either, I think that we have, I agree that we have to give stronger and clearer directives to the commission, these people that are asked to make these decisions, because it is quite important. We shouldn't sit back and be complacent and read an article like this and say, well all right this is too bad, there is nothing that we can do. Because we can do something. I think it is a big mistake, a big mistake to say to a specialty, because this is the style, the people are going into specialty houses now, and to say well all right, one of the main conditions is that you are offering only one course of meal, one item of food. Now you bring --(Interjection) -- why not? That's right. If it's a clean place and if it passes the restaurant act or whatever the act might be called, why should the Liquor Commission be concerned with this? They are saying well all right, somebody else might not like pizza. Well if ten fellows want to go to have something to eat and they want a glass of beer and if they say no, five of us don't like that, we're going to go somewhere else because I don't like pizzas, who's suffering, who's suffering but the proprietor? And it should be left to him. I understand that he's ready to see how it works maybe to introduce another line of food, but why rush him. Why all these rules to say well, all right, the only way is if you bring in sandwiches or if you bring chicken and so on. Let him suffer, let him suffer. If he can't interest enough people, well you won't have to worry about the license, and you won't get the tax either because he'll have to close. Furthermore, pizza, I think they're offering more than one line of food. It's just like if you serving all your food on bread, well he's serving it on some kind of a paste, because they have all kinds of pizzas, I think they have a combination of about 50 or 70 different kinds of pizzas. If you don't like bacon you can have mushrooms or cheese or anything and it's not the same thing at all --(Interjection) -- pepperoni. I can see all the gourmets. -- (Interjections) -- I can see I'm dealing with the Manitoba mosaic now, I hear all kinds.

Well anyway I think that we should decide. I understand that he sent a complaint to the Ombudsman, maybe this is the right place to send it, but we must decide and give directives. I'm also not blaming the commission, nor the former commission, but all this was started before, there was nothing changed by this commission at all, I think that point is not valid at all. But I think it is up to us to decide what we want. I think we want people not to go there to drink, there's a certain amount of food that has to be bought, that's never been a problem, that's never been a problem. And I know that other members of this House have gone to Shakey's Pizza Parlor. I've gone with my children, and I like the atmosphere. Why should I have to sit in a stuffy chair if I can sit on a bench if it has a different --(Interjection) -- I don't know, . . . is the word in French - and if you enjoy this, they have somebody playing the piano and everybody singing, the kids are drinking cokes or something else, and the adults are drinking beer or coke - I know you'd only drink coke. What is wrong with that; why do we have to be so stuffy and so old fashioned? I think that we have to give the directives and I think that this is certainly something wrong; we should look at that.

Now if normally you eat pizza with your hands, why if you get a bottle of beer must you have a knife and fork? I can't see the difference. There's something wrong against the Restaurant Act. If the Health Department is not satisfied, that's different. But when the people apply for a license -- I think this is all they have maybe wine I'm not sure, I know beer anyway -- I can't see why you have to bring in all these things. I defy anybody to find this, I don't find anywhere that you're supposed to have four or five different items that you can serve, I've never seen that. But the big thing, the big thing is that these people were given a license and you say well we've made a mistake it's too bad. Well if this is the case, Mr. Speaker, we've got to pay for our mistakes and we should buy them out, not just close them or force them to close and say well it's too bad we never should have given you a license. This is wrong. Let's be human. We're talking about treating the people equally here. Well we should treat everybody equally. These people came here, they applied for a license, they were given a license, the only complaint was from a competitor; a competitor, pointed a finger at Shakey's Parlor -- why? -- they're too successful, it hurts me, something's got to be done.

April 14, 1970.

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)

So, I hope, and if nothing is done, maybe this is not the right place here. I don't know, in this bill, but I understand there'll be other changes to this Act coming and I certainly intend to have some amendments ready. I hope this can be done here. If the member is willing or if he has other amendments ready, fine. If not, I certainly will have some and I hope that the members of this House will see fit to support this. And then we will give more directives. We're the lawmakers here, we have to accept our responsibility, and we must make it clear the intent of the law. And if by chance it's not clear enough we must rectify it because the policies have to be made in this House not by any board or commission, it doesn't matter by what government they were appointed. I think we've got to accept our responsibility or suffer the consequences, and where there's an injustice being done to these people -- they were allowed to build two places and they have no license and you know that in this day and age that you can't operate an eating place without a licence, or if you can't you've got a strike against you because there's a lot of people that would enjoy a beer with their meal and I think that we should look into this. The government itself should look into this to see what kind of a place it is for once, we're squawking about our children, the families not caring for their children and about the taking of dope and all kinds of things like this; now you have got a place where the family can go, where there's somebody playing the piano, it's a real good atmosphere, where you can go out and have the kids and everybody sing. You're sitting on benches. It's just the same atmosphere as if you were having a picnic. The place is spotless, it's clean - I've looked it all over and I have gone there unannounced, they didn't have time to clean it up I can tell you, not in the time that I decided to go - and the atmosphere and everything is clean. The food is good and the people that don't like pizza can stay out, that's all. So, as I say, I hope that something will be done at this session and that we'll accept our responsibility and correct this injustice. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, in making a few brief comments on this debate I would like to make the point that I'm rather disappointed in the attitude of the Attorney-General when yesterday before the Orders of the Day my colleague the Member for Assiniboia asked a question and the Attorney-General didn't seem very sympathetic in supplying an answer and he said in effect - "this is a matter before the Ombudsman now and let him deal with it." Mr. Speaker, this is unbelievable that a cabinet minister would not want someone to speak on an amendment to the Liquor Act. In fact, he questioned him twice while the member was trying to speak. In my opinion he was perfectly in order. I'm glad to see the Member for St. Boniface got up and spoke freely on this bill. He supports the idea that there should be further amendments and perhaps some direction given to the Liquor Board Chairman. For a citizen of the province to automatically have to go to the Ombudsman to get relief from a decision I think is shocking, when it can't be discussed in this House and members can't take an action when they see an obvious problem that should be discussed and dealt with. So I think that my friend the Attorney-General, who I have a great deal of respect for, I think that he should encourage a debate of this kind and he should take it upon himself to re-examine this law, this is one of his responsibilities, and not force people to have to go to the Ombudsman for relief from a decision or for a law that perhaps should be changed and should be improved upon. And I think that this House should act, it shouldn't wait for the Ombudsman to turn in a report. Aside from that, an Ombudsman cannot give relief or cannot make an adjustment or change an official decision if the decision was based upon law. He can comment upon it in his report to the Legislature but there is nothing he can do. So to suggest that a person should go to the Ombudsman for relief, when in fact he cannot receive relief if the official decision was made under the law and within the law and within the regulations of the Liquor Act in this case. I support the previous two speakers and their contention and I hope that when this matter gets into committee perhaps we could have the Chairman of the Liquor Board come before the committee and give us some of his interpretations and what he thinks of the present law itself.

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

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I certainly support the Bill No. 22, I believe that all people who are holding fairs or anything in our province, who are making application for an occasional permit, if the Liquor Commission sees fit, that they should be allowed to do so.

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd)

I would also like to speak briefly on the other question of the Shakey's Pizza Parlour. I am a little surprised at the Member for Elmwood mentioning competition. I don't really think it's the place for the Liquor Board to worry about the free enterprise competition in this province. If a man is doing business successfully in his area I don't think that if somebody has a complaint it's up to the Liquor Board to tell the man to get out of business or make any suggestion that way. If they have a complaint, go out and do a good job themselves instead of complaining about somebody else. I would say though that everything that has been said I agree with. I'm not going to belabour the subject, but he was given a license. He has operated, he has no convictions, his place is clean, it is not a hangout and it is a family operation of about 70% family operation.

Now what amazes me, Mr. Speaker, is that the Liquor Board went out and cancelled an operation because they didn't have knives, forks, spoons, tablecloths or something of this respect - the list that the Honourable Member from Assinibola had - but they should have gone out and said, let's leave this operation open. We've had two years experience in this operation; we know that people enjoy it; we know that a man sitting in the backyard can say to his family, let's go to Shakey's and his wife doesn't have to get all dressed up; we know that in this operation you have a family situation where people enjoy themselves, and they were given a licence. So rather than say we are going to make them do all these crazy foolish things, after two years of successful operation, where people have enjoyed themselves, the Liquor Board turns around and makes the statement, we are going to close them up. Well I think after two years' experience, they shouldn't have gone out and closed the place up, they should have said - people are enjoying themselves here, let's leave it open, and maybe have a look for more places for people to enjoy themselves. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: Mr. Chairman, I would like to enter into this a little because I think we are entering a field today where we should be in fact, reviewing many of the now antiquated liquor laws in Manitoba. People will say we have reviewed them throughout the past few years but we really haven't dug into the nuts and bolts of it, and I think it is simply because of the political stand that parties take from time to time and the fear when we can hear from the public that there will be a lot of people with many speeches of the blood running down the middle of the highways such as we heard the last time that there was an attempt made to change some of our regulations. But I think the most important thing as far as I'm concerned, is that let's make sure that the laws and the changes that come about bring about a freedom the same for those who pay taxes as for those who do not pay taxes, because we have regulations which look after the people who are operating businesses, hotel people, the restaurant people, those who are allowed to sell liquor are taxed and they're usually in high tax areas and they do contribute a great deal towards the economy of the province, and we have made inroads into the monopoly that they used to enjoy and I feel probably this was right, that there should be more liberal laws as far as liquor and beer and wine are concerned. But I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that in doing this, let's not by-pass private enterprise. Let's not give it to some and withhold it from others, because this is the discrimination that is going on today; and it is rank discrimination when public organizations, when private clubs can get away with more lenient rules than the business enterprise area. So there are two classes of business we call first and second class citizens, I suppose, there's first and second class organizations, but the unfortunate part is that the second class organization is the one that's paying the way. It's paying the shot, both taxation wise and - well in every form of taxation. And continuously, we are allowing opposition to come in and I don't think that the private business such as hotels or restaurants are really saying that this should not be, but they're saying at least treat us the same as anybody else in the province that holds a license. Banquet licences - there were some, many thousands of licences last year occurred, I think it was somewhere around 23,000 something like that, I forget what the figure was. There were only about 8,000 marriages - was it? I know the figure was not . . . they usually say well banquet licences are necessary to get married, and such on, but there was no relationship between the two.

MR. DESJARDINS: You forgot the divorces.

MR. BEARD: Well the Whigs are taking care of those. But I would just point out the two new hotels down here are going to employ some 750 people as they open. Two new hotels and you have 750 people that will be employed. Now the Leader of the Liberal Party says,

(MR. BEARD cont'd) . . . minimum wage. Then maybe we should raise the minimum wage if this is not enough, if that's what you indicate. But the thing is that there is opportunity in the business world. They're ready to accept the regulation, but they're saying make sure that we have one regulation for all, that we don't make inroads into regulations that allow clubs to get away with things that are not allowed in other areas. I think it's just reasonable; if you're going to open up the laws of the country then I think that they should be done on an overall basis so that the tax paying businesses can keep up with the opposition that the other areas are starting to make inroads into.

I think that probably a great deal of the problem comes from the inspectors and the inspections which are made by the Liquor Control Board. Are the inspectors in fact trained to go into a place and properly assess it? Because some man can get in and inspect some place and then say "no, you have to close this licence or I will be advising it should be done, until so and so are done." I know of cases where the inspector has probably gone in and made his inspection within 20 minutes and walked out and there has been discrimination against the operator, and quite often this is a personal one -- or it could be a personal one, I won't say it would be, but it could be. So I think that in some cases the Liquor Control Board go far too far in being very narrow-minded about their guidelines, in using the liquor license as a club to hold over the people that are in fact, business depends to a great extent upon the licence which they have been granted and which the control board can at their own wishes go back and say to these people, you must change. And while the most dramatic one was brought up by the Member of Assiniboia, this afternoon, there are many others that certainly do not warrant the strong arm of the law being laid down just because they have a licence which can be withdrawn within 24 hours or 12 hours, or can be withdrawn immediately, I think this is the wrong thing; I think this is a rule that we don't apply in most other cases. I think the one that should be applying this pressure is the health inspector because most of the things are dealing with things that these other inspectors are not trained to do. Who is to set a policy as to what food should be served or how a particular food should be served? The operator is going to do it and do it as well as he can to make sure that the customer comes back.

But the real point I wanted to make today was to make sure that as we make these changes, that the changes be made so that they include everybody that holds a license that all people be treated the same, and I don't think you will get many complaints then. If that can take place, then it will remove the discrimination against the tax paying business that has now the opposition of many other clubs that are not contributing towards the tax in the communities themselves.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I want to at the outset assure the Minister that I take no issue at all with the Bill that is now before the House. That decision to amend the Act was taken as a result of what took place in St. Boniface during the Festival du Voyageur. But I think it's a proper course of action that he's taking in the light of what has transpired on that particular occasion. I think it is taking on the responsibilities as one should assume those responsibilities in amending the Act when there are obvious weaknesses in the Act.

In the particular case that was mentioned by the Member for Assiniboia, Shakey's Pizza Parlour, I would think that the Liquor Control Board are doing what they are authorized to do and what they're instructed to do by virtue of the regulations as they currently exist. When the new Liquor Control Act was brought into a existence a number of years ago by the then premier of the province, the Honourable Mr. Campbell, as everyone in this House knows, Mr. Campbell had some very strong views about the virtues of food versus liquor. I think that he felt that if any amendments were to be made to the Liquor Control Act, relaxing of the rules and the regulations in permitting drinking, that they should be contingent upon the serving of improved foods, and I think that his intention was carried out by what has happened in this city since the Act has been amended. I think that travellers coming to this city and those of us who live in or near the city will agree that there has been a tremendous improvement in the quality of the food that has been served in many of our restaurants and hotels in the City of Winnipeg. Indeed I would go as far as to say that in travelling across Canada that Winnipeg ranks about second or third in Canada in serving of food and beverages. I think that it's important and I think that the Liquor Control Board have played a very important role in helping to maintain those standards; and I think that they should be continuing to assist in maintaining that standard of service and of food. But at the same time, I don't think that some

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd.). . . . of the regulations that they are currently asked to implement are in keeping with the changes that have been taking place in the serving of food -- and Shakey's is a particular example of a trend in one direction. The argument of the Board that they don't serve a variety of foods is one that I think is ludicrous, although it's perhaps from their point of view appropriate, because if what they interpret as a variety of foods is sandwiches or steaks or the like, well then they're correct. The fact is that Shakey's serves something like 26 varieties of pizzas and in their interpretation that is a big enough variety. In any case it's a method of serving a specialty product that has met with the approval of the people of this city and one that, in my view, should not be discouraged.

I think that the time has come when in addition to the amendment currently being proposed in the present bill, a much more comprehensive review of the regulations of The Liquor Control Act should be undertaken to determine in which of those areas changes can be made that would not -- and I want to emphasize this -- that would not have the effect of encouraging a deterioration in the quality of the kind of food that is currently being served. In fact I think that the attitude should be taken that everything should be done to encourage an improvement if anything. The visitors to our city are normally very much impressed by that quality of food and the circumstances and conditions under which it's served and it's one of the ways that we can get people to come back to the city, and I wholeheartedly agree with the Board if it is their intention to improve, or at least maintain that standard. At the same time, one of the elementary principles of law enforcement is that the law must meet with the respect or at least the approval of the people that are concerned, and in this instance, judging from the number of criticisms that you hear, judging from the complaints that have come in, I would suggest that a review of this aspect of our regulations is overdue.

Now one might raise some questions as to the reasons why Shakey's lost their licence, at this particular time. And I'm not implying anything other than to say that two members of the hotel association on that board might have brought to bear some undue influence, and for that reason I would think that the Minister would be happy to at this time undertake a thorough review of the regulations governing the granting of licences to places such as Shakey's Pizza Parlour.

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

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to congratulate the mover of this bill on bringing about a forward measure to the House and probably one that should have been brought to this House before today. I'm going to be very brief but I'd like to be to the point on one or two items.

First of all, I object to the Commission's using liquor licensing "as a club" as was pointed out by the Member for Churchill. People in this kind of business realize that it's probably the most lucrative part of their business; however, it seems highly unfair that it be used in the way to manipulate businesses into doing exactly what you want them to do. I think that there must be a better way of licensing businesses in order that they operate the kind of businesses that are suitable to our society. I'm one who believes strongly in encouraging moderation and I think it's much more suitable to have people drink beer like men at the arena than sip it out of thermos bottles like mice. I think that drinking -- (Interjection) -- These are a special kind of mice. Mr. Speaker, I just couldn't find a suitable kind of animal without incriminating anyone. I think, Mr. Speaker, also, that events such as the Voyageur ought to be helped, assisted in every way. Events and facilities such as the Pizza Place ought to be encouraged because they bring to our cities a kind of cultural enrichment with which we can do and which is beneficial to us. Again I think that it's unfair to have the Commission use licensing of the serving of liquor as a club and I think that moderation should be encouraged in the proper way and not discouraged as it has been.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, unless someone else wishes to speak I would now move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Finance, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate, second reading. The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Brandon West. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this for the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't intend to take up much of the time of the House. As was no doubt indicated earlier in this debate, the bill before us, No. 26, an Act to validate certain By-laws of the City of Brandon and the Rural Municipality of Cornwallis and to enlarge the boundaries of the City of Brandon, is an Act which has the agreement of both municipalities concerned. I know that the officials of the Rural Municipality of Cornwallis and the City of Brandon have held various discussions over many many months and have arrived at this agreement. Essentially it's an extension of the City of Brandon's boundaries, I suppose in a south and west direction, southwesterly direction, and it essentially involves raw land that will be used primarily for residential property. This is the direction it would seem to me of residential development in the City of Brandon, that is the residential trend seems to be towards the west and to the south to an extent. And unfortunately the city proper does not have as much land as it should have not only for residential purposes but also for non-residential including industrial purposes. And really this is a makeshift item. I support the measure; I support the bill before us, but I'm sure the Honourable Member from Brandon West will agree with me wholeheartedly when we say that this is a makeshift temporary measure.

I would point out that the problem that Brandon faces is one that was well stated in the TED Report, and if I may be permitted I'd like to quote two or three sentences, page 470, of the TED Report when it refers to the limited non-residential tax base of the City of Brandon. -- (Interjection) -- There are many good things in the TED Report, I can assure my friend from River Heights. "However, the City does not have a desirable balance between residential and non-residential taxation. This problem is intensified by the fact that the major part of industrial development attracted to Brandon has located outside the city boundaries and is therefore not contributing to city taxation. The city is not only a retailing and distributing centre for a large area of western Manitoba but it is rapidly becoming an education and government centre for the surrounding regions. In both of these fields the taxes contributed are quite limited." Well the fact of the matter is that the industrial development and the potential industrial development will take place to the east of the city most likely, and to a lesser extent to the south, and of course neither of these particular directions are being involved in this particular measure today.

To quote further from the TED Report: "Antiquated urban annexation procedures do not allow the city to take the necessary steps to have its boundaries extended. The city not only suffers by being unable to exercise adequate land-use control in the urban fringe but also by being unable to take direct advantage of incoming industry through taxation. The city must however provide services to the increased population generated directly and indirectly by these industries." So the fact of the matter is that many hundreds of people are coming to Brandon and living outside the City of Brandon's direct boundaries. Unfortunately, the city as I said does not have the substantial industrial base to provide the many many services that are provided in a universal way, such as ambulance services, such as fire services and so on. And really while I said earlier I have no objection whatsoever to the bill, as far as it goes it's fine, but I submit that this is not a solution to the Brandon boundary situation, to the financial problems that Brandon is now facing; and indeed the limited boundaries do stultify potential industrial development of that area. I hope that by next year that this House will have before it yet another bill, a more substantial proposal which will give Brandon a realistic boundary situation which will enable it to cope with the many many urban problems that are facing Manitoba's second city. And I hope next year when such a measure, I hope, will be brought forth for consideration by this Assembly, that it will have unanimous support from all members of this House. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to express my thanks to my colleague, the Honourable Member from Brandon East, the Minister of Industry and Commerce for his support of this bill. I agree, of course, that this is not intended to be any permanent solution to the problems which the City of Brandon faces in respect to the amount of land which it will require for the future. It does, however, provide an area of agreement at the present time between the municipality and the city whereby an amount of approximately 1,045



(MR. McGILL cont'd.), . . . . acres would be added to the City of Brandon and would enable some planned residential development to proceed this year, and as such I think it will be a decided advantage and the project which is envisioned will add considerably to the residential potential of our city.

As pointed out originally in this debate and again by the Minister, this transfer of property has the approval of both the City of Brandon and the Municipality of Cornwallis and arrangements have been worked out to provide for landowners who are using it for bona fide agricultural purposes and a tax rate will be established by the city to cover those lands which are still in agriculture. So I would hope that this bill would receive the complete support of this Assembly and that it would be passed at this time. Thank you.

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

#### PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: We may revert to private members' resolutions and the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose continue.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, Mr. Speaker, on my third installment on this resolution I hope that I will arrive at a conclusion on this occasion. As I was pointing out earlier this afternoon, I was trying to make the point in this resolution that I don't think it is good enough to simply take the position that one is totally opposed to the White Paper. Because if you take that position I simply think that you're hiding behind that position to really say that what you're opposed to is tax reform. We have to recognize if there's going to be tax reform and more equity in taxation then undoubtedly some people will end up by paying more taxes. I don't think that there's any way out of that. In the process of so doing, my concern is that that does not then harm the long term development of our country, that does not harm the incentive of our people to grow and to develop and to produce, and that our decisions are taken in the light of that situation. Now, what may be good for one part of the country may not necessarily be good for another part of the country because of the different levels of development. And this is where I think there's a major responsibility for the government in Manitoba and for our Committee on Economic Development if we are going to make that committee an active and viable part of development in this province, a major responsibility to look at the whole of the White Paper in terms of Manitoba. I'm not suggesting this is a parochial attitude, I'm not suggesting that we should be in any way dog in the manger, but I think that we owe it to the National Government to tell them quite clearly what the effects would be on a province like Manitoba that has not reached the stage of development of particularly the Province of Ontario and that the changes should not now work to our detriment by comparison to other parts of the country. This I think is a responsibility that we have. It may not mean that we will get everything that we want but surely we have the responsibility to put that forward.

Now I would like to know from the government, Mr. Speaker, is what their position is on the White Paper. There was a preliminary paper put out in the fall and the Minister of Finance very kindly sent me a copy at that time as I believe he did to all the members of the House, I presume that that was the case, and I appreciated that fact. But it seemed to me that the paper really posed more questions than it provided positions of policy on the part of the government. It may well be at that time the government couldn't do any more than that until it had more information from Ottawa, but I think that we now have to move along to the point where we can make some more definitive -- (Interjection) -- Certainly.

MR. CHERNIACK: Could he assist me in getting the answers to the questions that I posed so long ago?

MR. MOLGAT: Well I'd be more than happy to assist my honourable friend in the same capacity as any member of this House. I have no better contact, Mr. Speaker, with the federal authorities than my honourable friend has. I am on the same basis as he is, and to the extent that I can help him I'll be happy to do so, because I can see some areas where the White Paper I think could be very detrimental to us. It may be that once we see it in its actual application it would change, but I think we have to make very clear to Ottawa the impact upon our province. And this is where I think the provincial government must come out with some more precise positions of policy, and my suggestion is that we should refer this matter now, and as I said previously, the matters that I have touched here are by no means all-inclusive. What I was trying to show is that you cannot simply take a yes or a no position, a black or a white position, because I don't think that that exists in the White Paper. I was simply pointing out areas where

April 14, 1970

901

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.). . . . I think we can all agree, other areas where there might be differences of opinion, but that we should come out with a position on behalf of Manitoba pointing out clearly to Ottawa where our province stands on the subject and what effect this is going to have on the future of our province.

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

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak I would move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Arthur, that debate be adjourned.

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

. . . . continued on next page

**MR. SPEAKER:** The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, as corrected, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Rhineland which I am holding.

On Tuesday, April 7, 1970 the Honourable Member for Rhineland proposed an amendment to the motion of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. I have taken it under advisement on Friday, April 10, 1970. When the House reached this motion on the Order Paper, the Honourable Member for Rhineland rose in his place and begged leave of the House to make a correction to the amendment. It is the Speaker's duty to call the attention of the mover and of the House to the irregularity of a motion. May I refer honourable members to Beauchesne 4th Edition 1958, Citation 199 (4). I would have accordingly proceeded had not the Honourable Member for Rhineland taken the initiative to do so, therefore that portion of what transpired in the House was not a debate of the main motion by the Honourable Member for Rhineland but merely a correction of a grammatical error of a proposed amendment to make it read in abstract form.

In my humble opinion, the main motion asks the government to give consideration to a certain principle; the proposed amendment asks the government to give consideration to the implementation of a certain principle within a certain time. Resolutions of this type have not been uncommon in our House. On March 22, 1968 the Honourable Member for St. Boniface moved a resolution calling for the implementation of a medicare program on July 1, 1968, a program which undoubtedly would have called for the expenditure of monies and within the then current fiscal year. See Manitoba Journals 1968, Page 68. On March 18, 1969 the Honourable Member for Brokenhead moved a motion calling upon the government to consider the advisability of implementing a grain-drying program which, if it were to remedy the problem complained of, would have created a charge on the public purse during the then current fiscal year. May I refer honourable members to Manitoba Journals 1969, Third Session, 28th Legislature, Page 82. The Order Paper for today contains a motion of the Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party calling upon the government to give consideration to the advisability of implementing a change in the Foundation Grant formula in certain defined stages, commencing with the first during the current fiscal year.

As I have indicated by the aforementioned examples, and I'm certain honourable members will agree, that although it more generally is the custom not to make specific reference to time in abstract motions calling for the expenditure of money, but on occasion honourable members felt it necessary to indicate a definite date or time limit and such motions were in order. Therefore, in view of precedent established and accepted by this House, I rule the amendment of the Honourable Member for Rhineland in order.

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

**MR. BUD SHERMAN (Fort Garry):** Mr. Speaker, if nobody else wishes to speak at this time I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Riel, that debate be adjourned.

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose and the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for River Heights.

**MR. SPIVAK:** Mr. Speaker, it was really not my intention to enter into the debate today, but I gather that the item stands once on the Order Paper in my name and I would not have the opportunity of speaking again if I allowed it to stand and therefore I will enter the debate and try and make my contribution as best I can.

I listened with interest to the remarks of the Honourable Member from Ste. Rose and to the very brief remarks of the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce, who on this occasion, as he exhibited on other occasions, does not really intend to enter too much into the debate on the affairs of Industry and Commerce, to a large extent I guess because of his unfamiliarity and also because I don't think he personally is very happy with this situation. One I think gets the impression that the problems of Industry and Commerce, the direction and the thrust of Industry and Commerce as it operated before is not really in keeping with his basic activities and basic philosophical position, and we look I think with anticipation to see how he and those who will be involved in carrying out the department's functions will alter and reshape the department to more or less conform with what they believe should be accomplished in connection with economic development.

Now if I may, because there is reference to the TED report, I would like to, just for a few moments, go back to the TED report and deal with items that are mentioned on trends in

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) . . . . . the Manitoba economy starting at Page 20 of the report. It's my intention to read into the record excerpts from the various paragraphs in this section and to try, if I may, to tell a story in connection with the TED report that for some reason appears to be ignored by the honourable members opposite and appears not to be recognized as an indication of the -- the Honourable Member for Elmwood has the TED report and he can follow me very closely as I understand he will be speaking in the debate very shortly.

MR. DOERN: This is like Bible School.

MR. SPIVAK: Now this is not like Bible School and I know that there are those on the other side who would like to suggest this is like Bible School, but I have sufficient faith to recognize that this report probably gives us as good an inventory of where we stood at the time it was written as anything that could have been produced, and indicated for the next ten years the thrust of economic development and indicated the areas of concern for government in the private sector. I'm not suggesting that this alone is the only document to be considered, and certainly a government has a responsibility to be able to say we accept or we reject the various highlights and the various points that have been raised by the report and to indicate that we have no intention of accepting certain sections because we do not believe them to be the case, or we believe that we have policies which can in fact accomplish our objectives or different objectives or these objectives in a different way. The basic problem we've had is that there is a bit of confusion. The TED report is used by the government front benches, and even by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce in dealing with the private bill that was before us, when it suits their purpose, but generally -- (Interjection) -- when it suits their purpose.

MR. GREEN: Why not?

MR. SPIVAK: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources . . .

MR. GREEN: If it says something good . . .

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, when it suits their purpose, but on the other hand . . .

MR. GREEN: Isn't that what you did?

MR. SPIVAK: On the other hand when we get into the mechanism, when we deal as we did in the Committee on Economic Development, it suited the purpose to have the form but not to give it any substance and it was obvious to all those who were present - and we've had this debate and the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is not going to be in a position to deny it - it is obvious that the government came in with a plan to be in a position to turn the committee hearing in a certain way and to get over with it so that there would not be too much of an analysis made of where we were going and what kind of economic development plan would be forthcoming, simply because the government didn't have any plans at that time and I see no evidence of any plans at this point. Now it may be forthcoming, but we'll see. So far, in answer to the questions that have been asked by this side of the House, not by just this party but by this side of the House, it's pretty apparent that, first of all, there is not that much knowledge nor is there anything really definitive being accomplished at this point. There are some of the honourable members opposite who have indicated that they consider members of the department maniacs - and that remark has been made before - and I suggest as well that when you have that view expressed by some or by one and you have a degree of influence on that, then I suggest to you that realistically the concepts that were developed in TED and the manner in which the department should operate are not going to be carried out and we then have to await what the government intends to do.

But in reading the chapter - and my intention is only to read a few sections and I'm going to read them by just taking excerpts from the various paragraphs, starting with the following: "Though Manitoba can be thankful for many of the recent industrial and economic developments that have improved their standard of living and given them a better life than the previous generation had, they are not living as well as residents of the other parts of Canada which have obtained a larger share of the nation's abundance. Therein lies the challenge: to provide Manitobans a standard of living and a quality of life second to none in Canada. Concerted effort and a substantial acceleration in growth relative to other provinces are essential for catching up. Manitoba must attract new people and provide reasons for its current residents to remain. Essentially, the problem is one of job opportunity."

I must say that I am quoting at this point; these are not my words. I am taking it out of each paragraph, but I think the sum and substance of the thrust of the TED report is contained herein and I repeat again: "Essentially, the problem is one of job opportunity. At the heart of the problem is the structure of Manitoba industry and business. A disproportionate share of the province's firms are family owned and managed and offer little opportunity for people

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) . . . . outside the family. A larger population would produce a higher standard of living by supporting larger scale, more competitive industry which in turn would create more jobs. Retention of young, educated Manitobans deserves the highest priority. Two other factors with respect to Manitoba's population are of great significance - the divisions between urban and rural residents and the proportion of Indian and Metis persons in the population.

"Manitoba is no exception to the urbanization trends that pervade Canada, and the forecast is that this trend will continue and will result in fewer agricultural jobs. Success in retaining the employable population in agricultural communities is dependent on the ability to attract industries to these communities. Comparative cost is likely to be the major deterrent but infrastructure development and the amenities that can be provided in rural areas will also influence these decisions. Government policy is a major influence on rural development. Unemployment is at an alarming rate among the Indian and Metis population and earnings of those employed are substantially below national averages. In aggregate measures Manitoba has exhibited increased economic activity as measured either by income or expenditures, but it has not made the advances that the nation as a whole has made in the period between 1961 and 1966."

HON. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Minister of Transportation)(Thompson): Are you going to read the whole book?

MR. SPIVAK: No. The Honourable Minister of Transportation asks me to read the book. The fact of the matter is I doubt whether he has read this and I doubt whether most of the members have read it, and I think it is essential that I at least try to indicate the thrust of what was intended in this report and the reason why the standing committee should have dealt with the substance of the report and we would have at least had the opportunity to have the government express some opinion. You can reject this, you don't have to carry this out, but at least tell us what you are going to do.

Now you have to tell us what you are going to do for one very simple reason. The people in Manitoba want to know whether there are going to be enough jobs for the people to stay here, for their children to stay here. For those who are going to be losing jobs simply because of technology, they want to know that there are going to be enough job opportunities for them to be able to stay in Manitoba. For those in the agricultural community who are going to have to leave the farms - and is anyone going to suggest that that isn't going to happen in the next decade - they want to be in a position to know when they leave the farms that they're going to be able to find jobs in the rural areas in which they live or is it going to be necessary for them either to move to Winnipeg or move out of the province.

And what has to be understood by the honourable members opposite is that there is an obligation and we are at a very serious point in our economic history that the recognition of this fact has to become established and that effort in connection with this, which is going to be a Herculean effort - and I have said this before - it's going to be a Herculean effort to try and create sufficient job opportunities to be able to hold our people, let alone attract the other people. And if you just recall the words I have just said, attracting other people and increasing our population is going to be one of the ways in which we are going to be able to add to the well-being of our people.

MR. GREEN: Will the honourable member permit a question?

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, I would after I finish my few remarks.

MR. GREEN: I'll try and remember the question.

MR. SPIVAK: Well I hope you will. "The trends would lead to the inference that the provinces that were better off than Manitoba have been improving faster than Manitoba and those that were worse off have not increased their per capita incomes as rapidly as Manitoba. As of June 1967, the Canadian economy had been expanding without a significant reversal since the business cycle" . . .

MR. CY GONICK (Crescentwood): Slow down, I can't follow you.

MR. SPIVAK: I must say to the Honourable Member for Crescentwood, my belief is that he has read this chapter over and over again, and as a matter of fact he probably could quote it back to me without my having to read it to him.

MR. DOERN: Are you speaking to the resolution?

MR. SPIVAK: I'm speaking on the resolution, yes.

MR. DOERN: I don't see the relevance.

MR. SPIVAK: The Honourable Member from Elmwood doesn't see the relevance. This is the difficulty with the honourable members on the opposite side, they never see the relevance of anything that I say. However, if you allow me to continue I will make my -- (Interjection) -- no, it's not my difficulty it's your difficulty, because if you would only be able to listen to me and understand the relevance of what I said, you may have. I must say that there are many occasions on which I have had the opportunity of suggesting certain things and I am well aware that the government has acted, and I hope that they will act in this as they have in the past and others.

"As of June '67 the Canadian economy had been expanding without a significant reversal since the business cycle through in March 1961. This represents the longest uninterrupted peacetime expansion in Canadian business cycle history. Tremendous gains made in Canada since 1961 may be observed on all sides. Some of the more significant of these gains include a large increase in our employment; the major expansion of consumer income and purchases; the greatly expanded services provided by government; the greater range in volume of Canadian exports; the growth of productive capacity of business enterprises; the expansion of highways, roads, transit systems, universities, schools and other social facilities.

"Several basic elements lie beneath the unusual strength and durability of this expansion. The first is the buoyant economy of the United States during this period. The second factor contributing to the strength and duration of the country's expansion was said of developments in international trade which favoured Canada. The third element in Canada's changing economic position is the gradual but very definite shift in the country's output from that of a producer strongly oriented to primary products to one in which manufacturing is playing an increasing larger role.

"The greatest responsibility for supplying continued strength to the Canadian economy," and to the Manitoba economy - and those are my own words - "is therefore assigned to manufacturing. The solution for Canadian manufacturers suggested by the council's analysis" - and this is referring to the Economic Council of Canada - "is for less diversification and greater specialization in those products for which the market in the United States is not as saturated or for which Canada has a comparative advantage; more tariff reductions and trade agreements for manufactured products in order to facilitate freer trade. The free trade theory in international economics states very briefly that if there are no barriers or taxes on the movement of goods between countries, each country will be forced to concentrate on those goods on which it has the comparative advantage in the production factors. The changing pattern of demand on Canadian industry have brought about a shift in the focus of employment and output from the on site exploitation of the natural resource state, the processing of materials, the manufacturing and fabrication and the provisions of private and public services."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I could continue. To go on, one of the other more important statements - and I'm going to deal with this in a few moments - is: "The economy of the prairies has traditionally been dominated by the fortunes of a few export products and by the vital importance of transportation links. To develop its natural resources through such products as nickel and copper mining, greater use of the huge power potential of the Nelson River and development of its forest resources, the province has also taken part in the rapidly expanding wheat market which is perhaps the single most significant development of the prairie economy in the sixties." I wonder what will happen for the seventies.

Well, Mr. Speaker, my purpose in reading just sections of this chapter was to indicate to the honourable members opposite that there was an obligation on the part of the government to allow the Standing Committee on Economic Development to have an opportunity to deal at some length with the problems before us and the basic report that was presented here. It's unfortunate that the standing committee was allowed to carry on as it has been; it was unfortunate as well that the committee was called at so late a date before the session, and that the government saw fit only to call it and then basically to wind it up and to have it report.

Now, there may be some who feel that as a result of the Honourable Member from Ste. Rose's resolution that the four items that he's referred to are really the only significant items that the government should be concerned with, but I suggest to you that the TED report contains a number of areas of concern that must be in fact dealt with and so far, based on the statements that have been made by the honourable members opposite in the debates that have taken place and in the committee dealing with the estimates that have come forth in front of us, so far we have no recognition that the kind of priority items that the TED report suggested are in

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) . . . . . fact going to be developed.

The other day I indicated to the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce that we would need 33,000 jobs in the next three years, and I know that there were a couple of executive assistants upstairs who immediately said, where did he get those figures, and they immediately went to work to try and figure out what figures we're talking about. Well of course the figures are contained in the TED report, and there's no argument to suggest that in the past few years the job formation in the province wasn't as high as suggested in TED and therefore the Premier or any other person can stand up and say, well we only have to create 4,000 jobs and we're going to do as good as they did, because what the TED report did recognize when we talk in terms of 33,000 jobs for the next three years, it recognized the need for increased job formation because of the entry to the labour force of so many of our younger people; it recognized the acceleration that's taking place in the lessening of the job formation in the agricultural field and the fact that people are leaving the agricultural community; and it also recognized the very real need for people to enter this province, to be able to help develop and build our economy, and it was based on those positions. It seems to me that rather than try and answer the 33,000 jobs by suggesting that all we have to do is equal what the previous government has done, that a far better answer would have been to say we're going to try and do our darndest to try and equal that.

In order to do that a massive effort in economic development is needed, and of course the one thing that is essentially needed is a degree of stability in our economic development. We really have to know, and these people who are involved in business and the entrepreneurs who are going to make the final decisions that are going to employ people and create the jobs have to know - you know, have to know what the government's intentions are; what really is going to happen. We have a statement by the Minister of Agriculture on the Agro food business and it's really an exciting thing on his part. But the truth of the matter is it comes at a time when there are some people who are in fact negotiating and dealing with the present government in the Agro food field and I think they're very happy today to know that the government has taken this position, because I want to tell you something, why will they invest here? They're not going to invest here, not with the position taken by the government, and they might as well know it now, otherwise we're going to have chaos afterwards in the protestations that are going to occur by those who in fact will have invested and find that the government's position, philosophy, program is in fact declared publicly when there may very well have been indications that the program was going to be exactly the opposite.

MR. GONICK: Could I ask the honourable member a question?

MR. SPIVAK: Afterwards, if you don't mind. -- (Interjection) -- No, I'll tell the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, I'll answer his question too, but if you'll just allow me to complete my address.

Now, there's one other thing that concerns me and this is the argument that's been advanced time and time again by the members of the other side. Well it's not just jobs we want, we want to know what kind of jobs. You know, what you've been responsible for, what the previous government is responsible is for true growth. We're going to have selective economic development - you know, we're going to have selective economic development; we're going to make sure that we're going to create the right kind of jobs. Well I want to tell the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce - and this is not the debate to do this, there'll be other occasions - I want him to start naming the jobs that were formed in Manitoba as a result of the efforts of government that he thinks were the wrong jobs. I want him to tell us, not just in general terms about true jobs, I want him to spell out in specific the jobs that he thinks should not have been formed in Manitoba.

MR. EVANS: Keep your blood pressure down.

MR. SPIVAK: I'm not - my blood pressure's fine - your blood pressure occasionally seems to be a little bit high. I want him to indicate to us not what he's talking about in these, you know, sort of general terms, I want specifics, because until the government is prepared to start to talk about what jobs should not have been formed, then I must say to you that that argument is a bunch of hogwash on your part. And you can talk all you want of selective economic growth, but I'm going to suggest to you that the, you know, the reality of your situation today is starting to become apparent. It's obvious with the way in which you have been negotiating with some firms to try and hold them, with others to encourage their expansion - and no one is quarrelling with that, this is what you're going to have to do. My God, the job is going to be an enormous one for the next little while and you're going to need all the help that



(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) . . . . you can get, and the one thing you have to do is recognize that in order to create the job formation you're going to have to declare yourself, which is one thing that I think we would have liked to have happen, had the standing committee been able to meet and had the standing committee been able to have your presentation in the proper manner.

But there are other things that concern me. There were suggestions in the TED report that the Manitoba Transportation Commission should have been strengthened, but of course we have no transportation policy in Manitoba. We have a Highways Minister - we have a Highways Minister who continually talks about highways but is not a transportation Minister. We have a Minister of Railroads who is the Minister of Government Services and Minister of Labour who really is not concerned in dealing with railroads. We have a Minister of Industry and Commerce who is dealing with air matters, and we've already seen in answer to the few questions that have been asked that he doesn't know what's happening, he's not in a position to declare any policy, and in terms of the departmental people who were working on this, either they have gone or they are going, and I must suggest to you that you have no transportation policy and the recommendations which are vital in terms of the economy of this province are being ignored and there's really nothing replacing except no policy.

We have the whole problem of the consideration of supplying industries with incentive power rates. This is one of the matters that I referred to the standing committee because it would seem to me, and we have to recognize this, that power will be one of the catalysts to be able to develop our existing industry and to be able to attract power intensive industries to Manitoba, and in order to do this we have to recognize that there has to be, as the TED report suggested, a new program, a new program which in fact will give some degree of consideration to supply industries with incentive power rates to come here. You cannot deal and will not be able to attract power industries here without that. We have tax impediments that are involved. We have the whole problem with respect to exploration of the mining industry - and the Premier has already alluded to this outside the House - which the TED report has recognized, but so far it's been in a vague way, not a specific way, that in order to develop the mining and processing industries there are efforts that must be put forth by government and policies that have to be enunciated that so far have not.

We have the whole problem of tourism. The Minister of Tourism is there, and I must say I look with interest to hear what his department estimates will -- what he will tell us on his department estimates. But so far no one, other than giving lip service, has recognized the need to establish the kind of effort in the public sector and the private sector, as the TED report says, for the tourist industry, because tourism will be a great boon to this province in that it will ensure that our existing service industries are going to be able to be maintained, not only the service to our own people but to service all those who will be coming in, and it can very well lead by proper exploitation to additional job formation, because this is the whole reason for the exercise. The whole reason for the exercise is entirely jobs, because without jobs for our people you're not going to be able to enhance the development; you're not going to be able to assist in the development of their human conditions; you're not going to be able to do the social reform programs you want; you're not going to be able to raise the wage level in spite of all that others would suggest; and without the degree of productivity that must come forward and the job formation, it isn't going to happen.

Now, the other item that I'd like to refer to is the Uranium Enrichment Plant. You have a very interesting exercise here. The government really is not concerned with the Uranium Enrichment Plant, and I would say that if we had an opportunity . . .

MR. EVANS: How do you know? How do you know?

MR. SPIVAK: How do I know? I would say to you . . .

MR. DOERN: Are you speaking to the resolution?

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, I'm speaking to the resolution.

MR. EVANS: No.

MR. SPIVAK: Because the Uranium Enrichment Plant -- I'm going to amend the resolution very shortly and I'm going to deal with these items in my amendment. The Uranium Enrichment Plant is an exciting development for Manitoba. Rex Grose was the most knowledgeable person in Manitoba in connection with this, and Rex Grose I can suggest to you was able to put the expertise together, was able to identify this for the north and for Manitoba before other civil servants in Canada recognized this distinct opportunity. And not only that, he was able to hire the consultants who have some familiarity with this and who are going to

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) . . . . . be capable of possibly assisting in the development of this thing provided certain things occur.

And the things that have to occur I've said in the House before, and I'll just repeat them again. There have to be some negotiations between the Federal Government and the Government of the United States; there have to be negotiations between the province and Atomic Energy of Canada; there have to be negotiations between the Atomic Energy of Canada and the Atomic Energy of the United States; there have to be negotiations between the general contractor who will be awarded the contracts in the United States as the general contractor for Canada. We have to recognize, and we might as well recognize now, that the area in which Manitoba will be competing for uranium enrichment plants will be the Province of Quebec, and the Province of Quebec are as in need as any other province for job formation. And we have to recognize whether we're talking 4,500 or 9,000 jobs in this total complex, direct or indirect, that this activity has to be furthered.

Now let me show the evidence I have as to what the government has done. In answer to the questions in the last session, the Honourable First Minister indicated that the consultants who had been hired by the government are now not retained. Well, I want to tell you that if you're not retaining those consultants, I don't know who on that side has any expertise to do this. We have knowledge and we know -- (Interjection) -- Oh, the Honourable Member from Elmwood has. Well, as much as I respect the Honourable Member from Elmwood and I know that he has a wide knowledge on a variety of subjects, particularly the opposite sex, I must say as well that I do not - I do not believe . . .

MR. GREEN: You're just jealous.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, I happen to be jealous, yes I must . . . No, he's not a gigolo. I must say that I do not think he has any expertise on the uranium enrichment and I must say as well that it's not just the question of hiring consultants who have the expertise which is necessary, but the government has not hired them and they've let them go. The Premier said this at the last session. The second thing is that there is no doubt that the Atomic Energy of Canada are not going to be interested in this kind of development, and it's going to be of major importance to have the Premier and all the ministers who can bring their strength to this to try and see that thing happens. And of course the third thing that counts, and the most important thing, is that you're going to have to be able to provide on target, when it is likely that this thing will occur, you're going to have to have sufficient power at the right price to be able to make this development occur. Otherwise, it will not be Manitoba that will gain it, it will be Quebec and it will be Churchill Falls.

And I suggest to you, and I suggest to you that it's a very interesting thing, the Honourable Premier the other day indicated that the matter had been taken out of the hands of the chairman and the general manager of the fund - this was before his resignation - and it's very interesting, he then said that it had been handed over to someone else. Now, I don't know who that other person is. My suspicion is it's Mr. Lorne Dyke, and my suspicion is that Mr. Lorne Dyke is not there to handle it. And if the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce says it's not him then I'd like to know who has the expertise here and who has been consulted in connection with this. And I suggest to you that there is some lip service being given, and I suggest there's been lip service given to a variety of the TED recommendations and there have been some moves that have been made, but not the significant moves that should have been made by this time.

Now the argument does not wash any more - you know, we've gone into this and we didn't have time to do this and give us time and we're going to have our economic development policies, we're going to have this and we're going to have that. As I said before in this House and outside this House, you know, the moratorium is over, economic development cannot wait until the government makes up their minds or hires the new people that they feel will be more suitable and conform with their basic beliefs. Economic development is dependent on a climate of confidence and that confidence comes from a recognition of stability on the part of the government, of direction and of effort and leadership, and that leadership and effort and direction and economic activity has not been given and is borne out by the activity so far in connection with the four recommendations and the other recommendations that I've referred to.

So therefore, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move an amendment and I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Riel, that the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member from Ste. Rose, as amended by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce, be further

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) . . . . . amended by deleting the last paragraph and adding the following three paragraphs after the fourth paragraph:

AND WHEREAS the report of the commission on Targets for Economic Development in addition recommended:

- (a) the strengthening of the Manitoba Transportation Commission;
- (b) the consideration of a policy of supplying industries with incentive power rates of three to five years where significant benefits were to accrue to the province;
- (c) the removal of tax impediments to the development, including easing the burden of taxation on estates that adversely affects small businesses and farmers, provincial tax on building materials and other taxes to ensure that they do not deter continued industrial expansion;
- (d) the provision by government of a favourable environment for exploration in the mining industry in co-operation with the private sector and suggested the following:
  - (1) plan for expenditures on future transportation requirements to fill the present network in Northern Manitoba,
  - (2) recognize the potential need for a major extension into northwestern Manitoba;
  - (3) recognize the apparent need to facilitate the improvement of a railway to Lynn Lake,
  - (4) recognize the possibility of Lynn Lake becoming a much more important distribution and communication centre for northern development,
  - (5) plan for the changing and increasing need for air strips, float planes, bases and public warehouses in remote areas;
- (e) the establishment of both urban and rural indoor and outdoor attractions and the development of a new major resort complex in the Duck Mountain area comparable to any such areas in North America;
- (f) the establishment of a priority in the development of a uranium enrichment plant;

AND WHEREAS the government has failed to indicate any significant plans towards acting on these areas of recommendation;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that given the urgent need for development in Manitoba this House urge the government to consider the advisability of implementing the aforementioned recommendations of the TED Commission.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable Member for River Heights --- I would wish to take this amendment under advisement.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, if it's . . .

MR. SPEAKER: . . . and give my ruling thereon.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, if it's just the numbering of paragraphs that's a problem, I wonder if we couldn't have that straightened out because I would like to address the House. If it's more than just a technical matter then I certainly reserve to the Speaker, but if it's merely a matter of straightening out some numbers then I would like to be in a position of replying to my honourable friend.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, as far as I'm concerned, I'd be quite agreeable to hear the Honourable Minister

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. I don't want to challenge the Speaker's right to take it under advisement if he feels he should, but if it is under advisement I would question whether it would be advisable for anybody to speak when they didn't know what the amendment was or what the motion was that was before them.

MR. GREEN: No, I quite agree with my honourable friend. What I'm suggesting is that if we can straighten the matter out right now by just a word or two that would be fine. If the Speaker feels that that's not what can happen, then I just can't speak and I accept that.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, if I may give an opinion in this particular direction, it seems to me that if you follow that advice nothing but harm will come and heaven knows where it will all end. I think your suggestion is well taken.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I think that sometimes common sense will prevail. If the Speaker has a problem relating to making the word "fourth paragraph" "fifth paragraph" or something of that nature, I'm sure my honourable friend will accede to that and have it done immediately. If it's something of greater substance that can't be dealt with in that way then I recognize that we can't speak and I . . .

MR. SPEAKER: No, it's a matter of greater substance. A question arises in my mind

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd) . . . . . as to whether an amendment of this type in itself is admissible.

The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I know the Honourable Member for La Verendrye was planning on speaking today but he's not in his seat at the present time. Can we have the matter stand? (Agreed.)

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party. The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I'd ask the indulgence of the House to have this resolution stand. (Agreed.)

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

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the House's indulgence to have this matter stand. (Agreed.)

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BUD BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): I beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand, Mr. Speaker. (Agreed.)

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, may we have this matter stand? (Agreed.)

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye. The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. GONICK: Mr. Speaker, we have before us a resolution which sets forth a simple proposition, and that is that in order to combat inflation the Provincial Government make its contribution by rescinding projected price increases of various utilities. And I would like to use this opportunity to say a few words about the question of inflation and what might our attitude be towards inflation as a province. I think there's no question that the projected price increases mentioned in the resolution are somehow related to inflation, but rather I believe -- or are a reflection of inflation, not so much a cause of inflation, and these projected price increases presumably could be rescinded. I am not going to speak on that. This would of course mean that should they be rescinded and should they reflect inflationary pressures on the economy, then the enterprises involved would be forced to operate at a loss and that would be a matter that would have to be taken into consideration.

But I think that the problem with this resolution lies elsewhere and that is whether or not the kinds of changes, the kinds of measures proposed would really have anything to do whatever with combating inflation. In my view they would not. In order to put this matter into some kind of perspective, I think we have to understand that Manitoba is no economic island. It's really a small part of the Canadian economy which in turn is a small region within the North American economy. Somebody has said that we in Manitoba are a colony within a colony and maybe there's some measure of truth in that. We are really merely a speck on the continental North American economy. The total gross national product of this continent is around a trillion dollars. The total provincial product is about three billion dollars, that is roughly .005 of the size of the continental economy. The provincial budget is about \$400 million, which in turn is about .0009 of the continental economy.

Now what this resolution is saying in effect is that with this provincial economy and this budget of \$400 million the provincial government can somehow hope to affect inflation that is spreading throughout the continent, and I think from an economic point of view that's just nonsense. To think that the Government of Manitoba can have some effect on the inflation, which is a continental wide phenomenon, is to have a hopelessly grandiose view of the powers of the provincial government. And I'd go beyond that to say that even the Federal Government, the Government of Canada is not in a very strong position to affect inflation.

I think most economists now are prepared to admit that the inflationary forces affecting Canada today are really transferred from the United States of America. This is certainly what the Economic Council of Canada now admits, and the reality of course is that the United States economy is on a wartime footing, and because we are really in many respects a northward extension of the American economy through our trade and investment links with the

(MR. GONICK cont'd) . . . . American economy, our economy too is on a wartime footing. And that is the source of the inflation that we find in Canada today and in Manitoba.

We all know that wars are terribly demanding of resources and manpower and the war in Vietnam is no exception. Usually wars are financed by raising taxes. That's how the Korean war was financed by and large, that's how World War II was financed, and there's a good deal of sense in financing a war in this way because it reduces private expenditures so that when public expenditures increase the reduction in private spending takes some of the pressure off total resources and some of the inflationary pressures are therefore eased. But Lyndon Johnson was afraid to raise taxes in the U. S. to finance this war because he was afraid that this was an unpopular war and to do so would just increase the unpopularity of the American efforts in Vietnam, so he did not raise taxes to finance the war. The result was that there was a massive increase in public spending to finance the war; there was no attempt to restrict private spending; and even with the immense productive capacity of the American economy there simply wasn't sufficient resources to be able to maintain the economy at stable prices. The result was a substantial increase in the general price level which was transferred to Canada automatically through the trade ties that we have with the U. S. , through the investment ties.

The Attorney-General mentioned that in his view it was the decision of the Bank of Canada to raise the rate of interest which is somehow responsible for the inflation in this country, and with due respect I would suggest to him and to the House that raising of the rate of interest in this country was again as much a response to inflation as a measure to retard it. Any time the United States raises its rate of interest, given the close economic ties between the two countries, we must also raise our rate of interest. And there's a good reason for this, and the reason is that every year we export we are required to send to the U. S. something like two billion dollars in the form of dividends and interest and royalties to pay for past U. S. investment in this country in excess of our trade balance. Now in order to get the funds to pay these extra dollars of dividends, interest and royalties, management fees and what have you, we have to borrow money from the U. S. to pay off the debts of our past borrowing and we do this every year. And of course it's a vicious circle because every time we borrow more funds to pay off back debts this increases our debt in the future and that's what we've been facing year after year. The net result will probably be some kind of balance of payment crisis such as we've had in the early 1960's and which we can probably expect intermittently.

But in any case, our rate of interest is more or less locked into the American rate of interest and I think we have to recognize that. And there was no option, there was no option on the part of the government to lower our rate of interest while the American rate of interest is not lowered. If you want to attract American money our rate of interest has to be higher than theirs, and we have to attract American money because we have to pay for our past debts on American investment. So higher prices and higher interest rates are automatically transferred to Canada through the United States.

Now we're facing a different situation however, and that is that along with inflation we also have recession, a funny, curious combination of unemployment and inflation at one and the same time. And I think again we have to face reality here and understand that this recession is by and large transferred from the United States simply because we are a small part of the North American economic region and any time there is recession in the U. S. it's very difficult for Canada to avoid it.

Now Mr. Nixon when he became President found himself in this inflationary situation and faced a real problem, and that is that American prices were rising so rapidly that American exports were in trouble, the American balance of payments was in trouble and the dollar was strained. There was a gold crisis for a while. So in order to attempt to bring down the price level in the U. S. to save the dollar, he began moderate increases in taxes, moderate reductions in government spending to slow down the American economy. In other words, to deliberately create unemployment and reduce sales in order to bring down the price level. This of course was very quickly transferred into Canada by virtue of reduced orders for our Canadian goods which in turn caused a slow-down in the Canadian economy, and true to form Mr. Trudeau, being an obedient colonial, was very quick to adjust the Canadian budget and was very quick to therefore reduce Canadian spending, government spending, even more severely and to raise Canadian taxes even more than what the Americans have done.

So the result has been a recession in Canada which is somewhat greater probably than

(MR. GONICK cont'd) . . . . . in the U. S. but at the same time inflation has not really been affected. And the reason for that is that, by and large, large enterprises can avoid attempts by government to reduce the general price level, in fact big enterprises usually react to reduced sales by raising their prices to recoup their losses of the reduced sales by increasing their prices, and this is by and large what's happened, and if anything, we've had an increased level of inflation during this recession period. And powerful trade unions as well, seeking to recoup their losses because of increased cost of living, are also maintaining their demands for increased wages. So the immediate result is growing unemployment and growing inflation. Those people who suffer from these policies by governments to restrict spending and to raise taxes and to raise interest rates to deal with inflation are always the powerless people. They have to pay the increased taxes because they can't pass them on to others. They have to pay the increased interest rates because they don't have their own funds for investment and they will have to borrow. The working man in weak industries will be the first to suffer because they will be the first to be faced with unemployment.

So the result is a curious combination of recession and unemployment and inflation all at once. Mr. Trudeau has made it very clear, and we should keep this in mind, that he is quite prepared to see a million Canadians become unemployed if this is what is required to achieve price stability. So until the unemployment rate reaches something like 8 percent - it's already 6 1/2 percent - we can be sure that our Federal Government will be continuing to restrict their federal expenses, will probably raise our taxes once again because they are obsessed with this question of inflation and believe, I don't know why, but believe that it is within their power to stem inflation which really originates in the U. S. The Prices and Income Commission is another, I think, futile effort to gain a voluntary agreement to a policy of restriction which is already doomed to failure.

Now what should our response be to the situation? I think that is what we have to figure out, and I personally would reject the approach presented in this resolution and will offer a different approach. I think that certainly we have to avoid appeals by those who would have us adjust our budget and our regulations to a continental-wide situation. We'd be forcing an unnecessary cost to our people which could have no effect whatever on inflation in the end in any case.

Since the provincial government is unable to deal with inflation in this way, we have to seek alternative policies. I think certainly we should make direct representation to Ottawa and demand that they end their neurotic obsession with inflation and see that the real problem facing Canada today is not inflation but unemployment. This is spreading itself across the country. There are now 600,000 Canadians out of work, and by the time the students hit the labour market this summer this will be up to a million unemployed.

Secondly, I think we have to make plans for the unemployment which is bound to hit the Province of Manitoba. I think we can make provincial plans to deal with that and I would expect that this is what is happening in the Department of Industry and Commerce.

Thirdly, I think we can do something about the higher prices that exist in housing, and this is an area where prices have been increasing faster than any other. We can for example, through our Housing and Renewal Corporation, greatly increase the supply of housing. I think a beginning is being made this year but much much greater effort will be required in the future if we hope to be able to increase our supply of housing enough to have any effect on the price. This would also be a means of maintaining employment during this period of recession which we can expect.

Secondly, I think that we could impose a capital gains tax on profits from land speculation, something which has come up in the House before. We could establish a Crown owned land bank system, again to restrict speculation in land which is one of the greatest sources of price increases in housing.

A Rent Review Board, which is mentioned in the report of the Landlord and Tenant Committee, with teeth, could keep rents from rising excessively. I think we could do some things here in the area of housing which is a very important area and is responsible for some of the price increases that we have been inflicted with over the past few years. And there are ways of keeping down the prices of drugs which I would hope the government is looking into and which is another area of vast inflationary increases.

We could also I think, and I think this should be our approach with regard to inflation in general, seek to compensate the victims of inflation which by and large are those people on

(MR. GONICK cont'd) . . . . fixed income. And here I would imagine that what we could do as a province is to establish an automatic escalator onto the pensions of our senior citizens in addition to the federal escalator. I think this would do something to cushion the inflationary pressures on those least able to cope with them. I think that the important thing we have to grasp as a province is that so long as the Canadian economy is really tied to and is really a small region within the American economy, then we really cannot avoid American generated inflation. All that we can do is compensate the victims of inflation and cut down the profiteering by unscrupulous business corporations and I've named some of the industries where this occurred.

Right now in any case I think the province has to recognize that the major threat is unemployment and not inflation, and we should try I think, to our best ability, to offset the stop-go measures in Ottawa and maintain, to the best of our ability within our own jurisdiction, a policy of full employment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: I wonder if the member would permit two questions? First of all, would you say that the Prices and Income Commission was a fruitless kind of effort; and secondly - I can well agree that employment is a very important thing - how would you go about in Manitoba providing the kind of employment that you are suggesting?

MR. GONICK: Well, in answer to the first point, yes, I have said that the Prices and Income Commission is a waste of time, by and large because the inflation which we are experiencing is transferred from the United States and there is very little that the Federal Government can do to offset that price increase, and the only jurisdiction that the Prices and Income Commission has is with respect to prices in this country. So I think it's a lot of effort which will have no fruit at all.

The second question: how I would try to maintain full employment. I think here again, in the face of a recession which is generated from the United States we can only expect partial success, never full success because we would have to be attempting to offset pressures which are continental-wide. But I think there are obvious techniques of expanding employment and I assume that we will hear from the Minister of Industry and Commerce of some of the efforts that are going to be made, that are being made to expand employment. Certainly one area that I mentioned is of critical importance and that is the area of housing, and housing is a great employer of people and has probably the biggest multiplier effect of any industry and would seem to me to be also an area of critical shortage and would be an obvious area for vast expansion of expenditures.

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

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak at this time, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Riel, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: I beg the indulgence to have this matter stand, Mr. Chairman. (Agreed.)

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the House Leader of the Liberal Party, which I am holding. I have considered the contents of the proposed motion of the Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party and I have also reviewed the Speech from the Throne delivered by His Honour on the opening day of this session. I find on Page 7 of the Votes and Proceedings for Thursday, March 12, 1970 the following reported as contained in the aforementioned speech, and I quote: "Larger appropriations will be sought for education generally, including specific provision for student financial aid, technical training assistance for those who require special effort to overcome basic literacy skills and orientation handicaps. Steps will be taken to provide students 18 years or over with an equitable assistance program for their vocational and/or post secondary vocation."

Although reference is made to certain definite categories of students, it is my humble opinion that the phrase, "specific provision for student financial aid," is of sufficient breadth to embrace a situation referred to in the motion of the Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party. Therefore, I feel that it is anticipatory of a matter contained in the Speech from the Throne to which an address in reply has been agreed to by the House, and therefore I rule the motion of the Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party out of order.



(MR. SPEAKER cont'd)

The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie,

WHEREAS at the last session of the Legislature this House unanimously approved that the voting age in Manitoba be reduced from 21 to 18; and

WHEREAS the House further agreed unanimously that persons of age 18 can now be qualified and eligible to be nominated as candidates and to be elected as members of this Assembly, and if elected, to sit and vote in this Assembly;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the legal age in Manitoba for all purposes be reduced from age 21 to age 18.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, you probably realize and appreciate that during the past few years we have had considerable debate in respect to this resolution, and at that time it was in respect to reducing the voting age from 21 to 18. We have said in this House if one is employed, has an obligation to pay taxes, I believe the taxpayer should have the right to vote and express his opinion in respect to any fiscal policy of any party or any member who is seeking election.

We also at that time made arguments and said that we cannot discourage citizens from evaluating government policy, from effectively embracing the philosophy of any political party by not allowing these people to have the vote. You know that at the last session we did amend the legislation and now people at age 18 are allowed to vote. It was also stated at that time that at 18 a person is beginning to undertake his rightful role in the business community and has some measure of responsibility because his education has prepared him to do so, and as you recall, I believe it was on third reading if I am not mistaken, the Leader of the Official Opposition amended the Act further to have people at 18 not only be eligible to vote but to seek office, stand for nomination, and be able to sit in this House and make law for the rest of the citizens in this province.

Mr. Speaker, if this is so, this is what we have done, then it seems not right to have these people stand for nomination, be elected and to make law for the other people and still not be responsible for their actions. I think it is silly. Let's assume that somebody in a small town happens to be a mayor of a town, he'd have to bring his parents along to sign the documents because he would not be able to do so because he wouldn't be responsible at age 18.

MR. DESJARDINS: More people participating that way.

MR. PATRICK: Yes, that's true, but I think it is time that we moved and made age 18 legal for all purposes. If I can demonstrate a hypothetical argument, let's assume a person is 18 and over the years he has received gifts and has saved some money and invested it. At age 20 he gets married, and prior to age 21 let's assume this person dies. At the present time the legislation prevents him from making any kind of a will. Furthermore, he has no right to say that his estate should go to his children, if he has children, or to his wife, and I think it is time that we looked at this and amend the present legislation so that people at the lower age be permitted to make a valid will. I think that if a person is competent to own assets, vote, pay taxes, serve in the armed forces, get married, certainly he should be old enough and is old enough to make a will or sign contracts.

We must appreciate that at the present time a person at age 18 has much more education than he had many years ago and he is much more capable than the people at his age were other years, and that we also have to appreciate that there are somewhere in the neighbourhood of 40 to 50 countries in the world who have the legal age for all purposes at 18. The voting age in these countries is 18 and it certainly hasn't proven in any of these countries to be a detriment to that country because people at age 18 are allowed to vote and exercise their franchise.

Now during our municipal committee meetings we were confronted with a situation where in some instances a secretary-treasurer in a municipality is under 21, has to be bonded, has to sign documents and he is unable to do so. The municipal committee report has recommended that for municipal elections as well as provincial, that the voting age be reduced from 21 to 18 which will be done in due course - I hope it's this session - but at the same time you cannot have an employee or a secretary-treasurer of that municipality hold that position because this person cannot be bonded.

The second point, we know that many young people today in many important positions have

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) . . . . . to sign legal documents. You have your athletes in various fields, be it hockey or sports organizations, receive pretty substantial contracts. Some are quite high. I just don't know what they do, they probably have to bring their parents to sign the contracts for them and I think it's unfortunate. I think the time has come that we have to look in this area and amend present legislation. I know that a committee, the Winnipeg School Board has had a committee composed of many people. Personnel from social service agencies, school authorities, police and members of the community at large have made a study in depth of the situation and some of their recommendations are that they believe that the voting age, or the legal age for all purposes should be lowered from 21 as well, and I think that they indicated they thought it could be to age 19.

Now one of the points that I make, it's a very strong point, that indifference of the adult community in relation to the use of liquor was given by the study as one of the most serious underlying problems of the whole question, and they state that the arguments in favour of reducing the age where adolescents are sufficiently mature at 18 to have adult responsibilities concerning liquor, and the law should deal with abuse of liquor and not with its use. Also, that the law should conform with accepted patterns of behaviour. Of course this committee has also made some strong points in respect that they were concerned about why maybe it shouldn't be lowered at this time to 18, the legal age. Their biggest concern was that widespread violation of the present law promotes a disrespect for law, and the point that they stressed that perhaps 18 would be too low and they'd like to at that point recommend 19. Well I don't think there's such a great difference. I think that since we've reduced the voting age in provincial elections and we've allowed people to be elected, to sit in this House and to make law for the other people, the other citizens of this province, I see no reason why these same people should not be responsible for their actions.

So, Mr. Speaker, I recommend this motion to the House and I hope that members will take an active part in the debate. I think by demonstrating in connection with not even being able to make a will is just one indication that I think that we have to move in this direction. So I recommend this resolution to the House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Assiniboia,

WHEREAS the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has by letter of 24th February, 1970 made application to the Railway Transport Committee of the Canadian Transport Commission to remove Agents from 57 towns and villages in Manitoba and to remove Caretaker Agents and Caretakers from a further 13 points in Manitoba,

AND WHEREAS this could have a serious impact on the economy of some of these towns,

AND WHEREAS this may seriously reduce the service to the people in these communities,

AND WHEREAS no firm assurance has been given that these employees will be protected by either pension rights or by equivalent job offers in other positions within the Canadian Pacific Railway System,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the whole question be referred at once to the Standing Committee on Economic Development for thorough study and the preparation of a submission to the Railway Transport Committee before April 20th.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, when I first put this resolution into the Clerk's Office, April 20th seemed quite a distance away and now it is nearly upon us so this would require more rapid action than government is usually able to take. The reason for the date is that that is the date that the hearings will be held. So I think that when so many Manitoba communities are affected that there should be provincial government representation there to assist these communities who may wish to object or who may wish to ask for other services from the Canadian Pacific Railway. I think most Canadians have found out by now that what's good for the Canadian Pacific Railway is not necessarily good for Canada. They are running the railway with the profit motive in mind, and there's nothing wrong with that I suppose, but when a huge

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . . . transportation organization such as this has such a direct influence on living conditions of so many Canadians, well then I believe that any action that they may take to improve their operations, government has the right to examine what they are suggesting and what changes they wish to institute and government has a right to speak for their people. I noticed that just last week the Premier of Saskatchewan feels that the people of his province have not been treated as fair as he thinks they should be treated by the railways and he is in effect trying to extract some revenues from them by way of taxation more than his province has received to this date.

There may be a time fast approaching in Canada where the present agreement, if there is such a thing as an agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway, should be scrapped and a new agreement should be negotiated on behalf of the Canadian people because it is fairly well known that CPR received many many concessions in order to induce them to invest in the railway in Canada, but their managerial thinking has changed down over the years and what was given at the time the agreement was made is now being considered in an entirely different light by the management of the Canadian Pacific.

So I think that government has the right and the place to represent people, and in this particular instance we're talking about 57 communities here in Manitoba. So far we only have heard by letter to the members who are affected in these communities and a few civic leaders who may be affected, but because of the size of the communities they may not be able to afford or be in a position to have expert legal advice or expert technical advice that could be supplied by the Department of Industry and Commerce. So I think that the Manitoba Government should act and should enquire into this to see as to whether or not they should oppose some of the changes that the Canadian Pacific Railway are suggesting. And I say again what is good for the CPR may not be good for all of Manitoba in this proposal.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

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

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member isn't here. I would think that the members would probably be disposed to call it 5:30 right now.

MR. SPEAKER: It is now 5:30 and I am leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 o'clock tonight.