

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Friday, May 15, 1970

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might have leave to make a short statement?
MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Minister have leave? (Agreed.)

STATEMENT

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the other day during my tour of the Pilot Mound area, I had occasion to visit and open the Pilot Mound Dairy. This afternoon there will be a distribution of their dairy products in this House. I want to say that already they have shipped 40 tons of cheese to Calgary, Alberta, and I just want to make this point and remind members that we are moving ahead in Manitoba.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the first break in many long days of very unpopular statements being made, and I hope that the Minister and some of his colleagues find some more good news to inform the people of Manitoba on soon.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank the Minister for his statement and to say that we are certainly happy the cheese factory is going ahead out there, and could the Minister tell us if this cheese factory was initiated and promoted by the present government?

MR. USKIW: I think I will say, Mr. Speaker, that the work has been done some time ago. I want to also say that there were additional things that were done by the new government, namely, the incentives that were provided for the farmers that wanted to get into the manufacture of milk business.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, coming also from a dairy area, I thought it might be interesting for the Minister to know that I read a very nice slogan yesterday coming into Winnipeg, and these people were dependent on the milk business and their slogan was this: "Our business depends on udders."

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): I'd like to inform the members here that in the town of Souris we also have a new cheese plant and I hope at some later date that I can bring you in a sample of that good cheese too.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, since cheese plants in Manitoba are being mentioned, it's only fair, I think, to mention two other cheese plants that exist in this province that also turn out excellent products. One at Arborg, Manitoba, the cheesemaker is a person who was brought here from Australia, so that his talents were brought here from afar, and the other cheese plant is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye at Grunthal, and I'm not sure if they make green cheese or not but it's worth mentioning, Sir.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, since other members are taking advantage of the situation, might I say that the best cheese plant is in my constituency, and they make the best cheese in Manitoba, at Winkler.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I think it's all right to have free enterprisers on this side but I see the Minister of Mines and Resources has joined the crowd. He has three packages on his desk.

MR. SPEAKER: I don't believe that the honourable member has a point of order, because I see a similar accumulation of cheese packages on the side of the Opposition.

MR. BEARD: I rise to complain we have no cheese factory in Churchill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, honourable members of the House have been kind enough to indicate that they would permit me to ask that you call Resolution No. 11 on Page 6.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before I do that, may I introduce the guests that we have with us this afternoon. I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 45 Grade 6 students of the Yellow quill, Crescentview, Powerview and Elkhorn Schools of Portage la Prairie. These students are under the direction of Miss McCreary, and their chaperons, Mrs. Pressey and Mrs. Gair. These schools are located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

And 60 Grade 11 students of the Gordon Bell High School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Chopek. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Wolseley.

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd)

On behalf of the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you here this afternoon.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed that Resolution No. 11 be called? (Agreed.) On the proposed Resolution of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I want first to thank honourable members for making it possible for me to proceed early this afternoon since I will be leaving fairly shortly and this is the last opportunity that I would have under the rules to speak on this motion and the amendment, and I appreciate the courtesy that has been given to me.

Mr. Speaker, I've already had occasion to speak on the occasion of the prior amendment, which was adopted, and I don't intend to repeat what I said before except to indicate that this government does support the principle of tax reform, tax review and tax change, and that we welcome the fact that the Federal Government did produce a White Paper whose approach in general is what we think correct, and which is reviewing and has made proposals which must be considered. We've indicated that we are in accord with the general principle of the resolution itself in that it indicates that there are certain features in the Benson White Paper which are very good, very important; others which would be acceptable under certain circumstances and others which we think are not workable, and in that direction we are in support of a general proposition of the resolution.

I indicated earlier that I had proposed to make an amendment to this to bring it more in line with the generality rather than the specifics outlined there, but I was not able to catch your eye, Mr. Speaker, until we had two amendments put in ahead of the Resolution, and therefore under the rules I couldn't bring my amendment. I am still in this procedural difficulty that I can't really bring in the amendment I would like to bring in until we dispose of the amendment that is now before us. So I'd like to direct my attention to the amendment as amended - that is, the amendment of the Honourable Member for Riel as it is now amended - and indicate the extent to which I cannot agree with it. Then I would like to indicate the kind of amendment I would propose to bring after we deal with the amendment before us now so that members of the House will know what my plans are.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that in referring to the Benson White Paper, we have had a great deal of discussion in the country and in this House. I would have to assume, and I don't recall all that was said by the Honourable Member for Riel when he introduced his amendment, but it would appear from the wording of it that his group is in support of the resolution, which I think is somewhat contrary to the Conservative Party's approach to the Benson White Paper. The impression I have is that the Conservative Party would like to see the whole White Paper killed and buried. But I'm assuming that the members in this House representing the PCP Party would support the resolution as amended, and I'm hoping that the PCP Party will also support the amendment which I propose to bring after we deal with this. And I might say that this is a very important matter that is before us, and I agree with the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. The need for radical change in our taxation program is recognized, I believe, everywhere except amongst possibly the national or the members of the national PCP Party, but generally it is recognized that it is important and that tax measures must be related to today's social and economic climate.

I would consider that the radical change that takes place in tax reform and in all these measures, is a form of peaceful revolution, and I use that expression advisedly because I think members would like to share with me a quotation of a statement made by the late John F. Kennedy, a former President of the United States of America, who was quoted to have said, "He who makes peaceful revolutions impossible makes violent revolution inevitable." And I think we must be prepared to bear in mind that that statement has a great deal of depth to it. If we don't recognize the need for peaceful revolution and make it possible, then inevitably we will be led into the area of violent revolution. John F. Kennedy said that, and I think that there is merit in what he said.

As a matter of fact, while thinking about what he said and listening to the Honourable Member for Pembina - and I'm indeed sorry he's not here, because this morning he spoke of the earlier President of the United States of America, the late Abraham Lincoln, and recognized the contribution he had made to the world and quoted him with great support. And as he was speaking, I thought of another quotation that I remember well enough to be able to quote it, which

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) the Honourable Member for Pembina might ponder over too. I wonder whether or not he would support that, although I relate it of course to the United States scene rather than the Canadian scene, and members who hear the quotation will recognize why I relate it to the United States rather than to Canada. But Lincoln said, and I believe it was at his second inauguration when he made his inaugural address, and I'm speaking from memory - I jotted it down to jog my own memory; I'm pretty sure that it is exactly the way he said it although one word may differ.

But this is a quotation that I was reminded of, listening to the Honourable Member for Pembina: "This country, with its institutions, belongs to the people who inhabit it. This country, with its Constitution, belongs to those who live in it. Whenever they shall grow weary of the existing government, they shall exercise their constitutional right to amend it or their revolutionary right to dismember or overthrow it." And I thought that the Honourable Member for Pembina might have had some interest in hearing a quotation from the same person whom he praised so highly this morning.

Coming back specifically to the amendment of the Honourable Member for Riel, I would want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that what the amendment does is delete one paragraph from the preamble, and I don't recall an explanation for it having been done, but the paragraph deleted by the amendment reads:

"WHEREAS it is desirable that the people of Manitoba, through their government, make known the views of Manitoba on these proposals."

Now, I can't quite understand why that would have been deleted and it is possible that the honourable member didn't mean that to happen as a result of his amendment, but reading his amendment carefully I believe he did so, because he did say, "be amended by striking out all the words beginning with the last WHEREAS," and that of course eliminated that last WHEREAS. And he replaced it with another WHEREAS, with which I'm in accord, and that is that "wide ranging basic social implications are involved in addition to economic factors." I agree with his statement but I don't agree with his replacing it with a statement which I think is equally important. And that's one reason why I don't want to support his amendment because I don't think it should have been deleted.

The other reason I don't want to support his amendment is that he says that there should be, as a result of a study proposed, the presentation of a non partisan recommendation of the Federal Government. I think that's absolutely impossible. With all the discussion that has taken place, Mr. Speaker, it is, I think, a hopeless task to bring together the wide divergence of views that have been discussed on so many aspects of tax reform and taxation so that a non partisan recommendation will ever come about that could be made to the Federal Government, and I previously indicated that I don't see any value to saying that it shall complete its report no later than July 1, 1970, because I pointed out that on June 5th and 6th the Ministers of Finance of all the provinces of Canada and of Canada are meeting in this very building; and may I at this stage pause for a moment to thank honourable members whose caucus rooms may be somewhat disturbed by the fact that they have agreed to give up the use of them for that two-day period, and I want to thank them for their consideration for the purpose. -- (Interjection) -- Neither the caucus members pay rent nor do the Ministers of Finance. This is what the Province of Manitoba is doing in recognizing that the Ministers have agreed to come here and spend their money here whilst they are staying here, and we will get good return even in dollars.

MR. BEARD: Get all you can.

MR. CHERNIACK: But they will be here on June 5th and 6th, which of course precedes the proposed completion of the report, and I assure honourable members that matters won't be settled by the discussions that take place on June 5th and 6th and it would be a pity if the reports were indeed completed before discussions in the country had not taken place.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I propose to vote against the amendment. Firstly, I don't agree to the deletion of the last paragraph in the preamble proposed by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. I think it belongs there. Secondly, I don't agree with the possibility of a non partisan recommendation coming about by July 1st, and therefore I might indicate that after we deal with this amendment I propose then to bring in an amendment which will have the effect of accepting the principles of both the resolution before us and the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for Riel, but taking out from them those features which I think are undesirable, and that is actually pinpointing certain aspects of the Benson White Paper that are good, or pretty good, or not so good, or bad. I think it's better that we approach it in committee

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) when it is referred to the Committee on Economic Development, a broad field within which to study not limited.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would propose to oppose the amendment and then bring in the amendment along the lines I've already suggested.

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

MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Souris-Killarney, that debate on this matter be adjourned.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: It was brought to my attention that there is another group of students with us this afternoon - 40 students from Golden Gate Collegiate, under the direction of Mr. Collins. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek. On behalf of the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly, we welcome you here this afternoon.

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Morris. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This resolution, Order for Return, which has been brought to the Assembly by the Honourable Member for Morris, is one that has been debated at great length, has been amended, and has had much attention by the members of this Assembly. And of course the debate, Mr. Speaker, hinges around as to whether or not the honourable member has the right and authority to submit an Order for Return of this nature, and possibly now we have resolved that debate. The wording of the resolution may be of an acceptable nature to the government and one whereby the honourable member can get some information which he has been wanting for some time. And I'm not going to go into the pros and cons of the debate that we have experienced in the House on this resolution, Mr. Speaker. I support the resolution and the views that have been expressed by the Honourable Member from Morris and hope that the House will give him the information that he is requiring.

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

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Well, Mr. Speaker, I doubt very much if anyone would have expected that I would allow this resolution to pass without first having a few remarks to say on it. For the past month and a half the government have been -- I want to say that my remarks are -- I'm going to try to be as non-controversial as possible. I simply want to point out to the government the error of their ways in the hope that eventually they will see the light and come around to the point of view that information required from this side of the House will be granted without the kind of circus that we have gone through on this particular Order for Return.

For about a month and a half, the government, instead of just simply saying, "The information is not available; we're not going to give it to you," what they've been attempting to do is to create the impression that they're going to give me information, at the same time trying to hide it from me, and it's a rather difficult thing to do - and the government will find that out. Either you give information or you deny it, and what they've attempted to do is to have the best of two worlds and it won't work. Now, I suppose that this attitude is brought about by the statement made by the First Minister about open government and how much they were going to provide information for members of the Opposition, and then finding themselves in the position where they have not been doing that, have attempted to cover up their activities.

MR. SCHREYER: We improve by degree only.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, improve by degree, the First Minister says, and I might add that the degrees are very slow in coming around. In fact, if I were to make any comment it would be that if there is any movement it is in the opposite direction; it's getting more and more difficult to get information.

MR. SCHREYER: Will you permit a question?

MR. JORGENSEN: There -- you see, there they go again. Instead of giving us the opportunity, Sir, of getting information, which is the right of members on this side of the House, no sooner are we on our feet, no sooner do we attempt to make comments in this House

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd) than they are on their feet asking questions. They are the ones that seem to need the information so badly. But in fact it is supposed to be the government that is answering questions but they continue to do this. I have never known the occasion where anybody could get up on this side of the House, make a statement or a speech and be critical of the government, which is our right, without having the boos and the interjections and the questions from that side of the House. The only exception to that rule, Sir, the only exception to that rule, Sir, was when the Honourable Member for Churchill spoke this morning. The honourable member castigated the government in such a way this morning that one would have thought it would have raised a chorus of protests from honourable gentlemen opposite. But what happened? They sat there . . .

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Youth and Education)(Seven Oaks): We respect him.

MR. JORGENSON: Yes, the Minister of Education says, "We respect him." I'll say they do. They fear him, because you see, Sir, you see, Sir, what happens here is that you never know when they can use him and they want to be sure that they don't alienate themselves to the point where they're unable to get his support. You can never tell when the Honourable Member for St. Boniface will go in another direction or the Member for Rupertsland may veer off the straight and narrow, and so they want to make sure that they have reserve troops that they can call upon.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I hope that it is the intention of the honourable member to relate his comments to the motion before us.

MR. BEARD: I agree with you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. JORGENSON: Yes, Sir, that was my intention. However, you will have noticed, Sir, that I got diverted and I am glad that you brought me back to the point that I want to discuss. Now, Sir, we have had, prior to the calling of this session, a great deal -- this government has shown a great deal of promises. As a matter of fact, Sir, we have been deluged with the number of promises, so many that you'd wonder if they would be ever possible for them to fulfill them. Now you're finding that they're finding it difficult to implement those promises and particularly the one about open government, giving information that they said they were going to give the House, and they're trying to back away from that. But I . . .

MR. SCHREYER: Will you permit a question?

MR. JORGENSON: I want to say, Sir, that their idea, apparently their idea of a political platform is something like a streetcar. You know what the front step on a streetcar is, Sir. That's something that you get in on, it's not something that you stand on, and that is what they're using their political platform on, Sir. We've been set upon a veritable tropical fertility of promises with a Saharic aridity of performance on the part of this government. Sir, there was one other incident that I must recall to the attention of the members of this House, the question of kick-backs; the question of kick-backs and how they were so much opposed to kick-backs when they were on this side of the House, indeed when they were on that side of the House, and then it wasn't very much long after was it, Sir, that the . . .

MR. BOROWSKI: Do you want to hear about some?

MR. JORGENSON: It wasn't very long after that the President of the NDP Party in Manitoba made the announcement that, "Ah, we're going to accept donations from business. They're not going to be very big; they're going to take only \$500.00." See, from their point of view it doesn't hurt to become a little bit pregnant. Five hundred dollars isn't much. It's not going to contaminate them. But you see, here is what happens. Here is what happens when they find that they cannot keep their promises.

Now, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, of course, wouldn't expect me to allow this opportunity to go by without commenting on some of the statements he made when this matter was last before the House, and I want to apologize to him for not being here. I knew he was going to speak but I happened to be tied up at that time and could not get away, and I want to apologize to him very sincerely, because I would have enjoyed hearing those comments. I read them in Hansard and I, well . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Did you like it?

MR. JORGENSON: Well, Sir, I'll tell you - he asked me if I liked it - I'll tell you what I was trying to do. I was trying to find something that would refute the arguments that I presented before this House, and I was disappointed when I came to the end of his speech and found that he hadn't refuted anything. Apparently his purpose in interjecting himself into this debate was simply the same reason that he rose a few weeks before that, when he took after

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) the Member for Lakeside. Apparently he is the big gun on that side that is intended to do the counter-battery work to silence members of the Opposition. He is the one that is -- whenever a member gets mad on that side of the House, whenever somebody starts asking questions or criticizing the government, they turn on their heavy artillery which comes from the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. Well, Sir, all I can say is that if that is their heavy artillery, we don't need to carry on any counter-battery work. It isn't gun powder that we need to silence the honourable member, it's insect powder.

MR. SCHREYER: Will you permit a question?

MR. JORGENSEN: Now the Minister of Finance when he -- no I'm not going to permit any questions. I like to be able to go through -- you know, Mr. Speaker, in this Chamber every man has a right to contribute to a debate and every man has a right to enter a debate if he so chooses, and this is the purpose of debate. But the honourable members opposite seem to think that their role in this place is simply to interject when everybody else is speaking. If they want to speak they have a perfect right to do so, and I realize that on this occasion they're not going to be able to reply because I believe this time I'm correct in assuming that I'm closing the debate, which I wasn't last time. I got fouled up. But that's all right. It gave me the second opportunity which I don't regret at all. In any case, the Minister of Finance, when he regretfully announced that he was not going to be able to accept this, tried to create the impression, Sir, he tried to create the impression that we somehow or other -- and I don't know how he got that interpretation -- were attempting to criticize the civil service, and Sir, that was not the point at all. That was not the reason for putting this on the Order Paper; it was not the reason for asking the question.

What I have been attempting to do during the course of this Order for Return is to point out the absurdity of our system of getting information in this House. It is time wasting; it is inefficient, and it doesn't provide either the government or the members of the Opposition with the proper machinery in getting information as quickly as we want it and the kind of information that we want. Hopefully, Sir, when the Rules Committee makes its report before this House, there will be an opportunity to make changes in the rules that will enable a member to get information without going through this procedure that we've been going through on Orders for Return. I might add, Sir, that the Orders for Return, such as we have been practicing in this House, in this Chamber, were established at a time when there was no Hansard in this House, when there was no record of questions being asked and answers being given. That has now passed. We have a Hansard; the information can be communicated to the House without having to engage in debate. And I think, Sir, that if we will adjust our rules in keeping with the changes that have taken place in the House in the past ten years, both the Opposition and the government will be able to carry on their function in a much more efficient way to the satisfaction of not only the members of the House but to the public at large. And I hope that when the changes are being debated in this House that we'll take into consideration the necessity of changing this system, which I think is time wasting and useless.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I rise on what I believe to be a point of privilege. The Honourable Member for Morris has closed debate and therefore it's not possible for me to enter into the debate. My point of privilege is this: that I believe the honourable member said in the course of his remarks that we had made a number of promises that we were unable to keep, and in particular that we had promised more open government, more information, and that we were not keeping that promise in this particular respect. And my point of privilege is that I can show it in written form, that when we undertook to provide more open government, I registered three caveats, one of which was, "Matters pertaining to internal administration and personnel relations therein." So how can the honourable member accuse us of not keeping a promise? It was clearly put forth in the first place.

MR. CHERNIACK: May I ask the member a question?

MR. JORGENSEN: No, I won't accept any questions. As far as I'm concerned, the debate is closed.

MR. CHERNIACK: It's a question which, if answered, will give the honourable -- (Interjection) -- Oh, if the honourable member doesn't intend to answer questions I won't ask it. So I did have the last word after all.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I had hoped to be able to respond to this adjourned debate when the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose was in the House, but unfortunately he's not here and I notice that this matter has been once stood and therefore my name will not appear on the Order Paper if I don't speak to the question at this moment.

I wanted to indicate to the honourable member, and did indicate to him privately, that I was very much impressed with the amount of work that he has done relative to research concerning the causes of difficulties in Lake Winnipeg and the difficulties that have plagued other Manitoba lakes relative to the pollution of mercury, and I also wanted to indicate that I would attempt to make the fullest availability of any information to him, and I wanted him to know that he would get the cooperation of my department in this connection - and I believe that he has already received this notification.

However, Mr. Speaker, the Order for Return in the form in which it is presented would require several people several months to gather the data, and I wonder if, knowing that, the honourable member would still want us to have that kind of time and effort spent to answer these questions if there is an alternative way in which he can get information that he wants. And it was my hope, Mr. Speaker, that the House would support the rejection of this Order, and I hope that with the concurrence of the honourable member - if he doesn't concur, of course he can bring it again - but I was only rejecting it because I rather suspect that there are answers to my honourable friend that can be obtained without going through the procedures which are requested here.

There are more than 250 lakes, Mr. Speaker, that have been fished commercially at one time. For each of the hundred of lakes and for each of the years 1940 to 1970, a table would have to be prepared and it is estimated that it would take a couple of people several months to gather the data as requested. Since 1956, the Fisheries Branch has kept records which may be readily drawn upon, but even to obtain the data from 1956 to present, would take one person two to three months. If the honourable member is particularly interested in the mercury problem, this could be answered by changing the Order to read "lakes licensed for commercial fishing in southern Manitoba." This would include all waters presently known to be contaminated. It is estimated that one person could obtain the information requested for the southern lakes from 1950 on in about three weeks. Now, this being the case, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that my honourable friend would, first of all, see just what information will be available to him from the Department of Mines and Natural Resources on a voluntary basis. If other members are interested in the information, which no one has yet indicated, but if that's what he wants, if he wants it for the public record, then there will be no impediment as far as we are concerned distributing copies of the information that the honourable member gets to other members of the House and to the press if he likes. But I would ask him not to require us, and I must, in these circumstances, ask the House to reject the Order as it stands, merely because I am not certain that the expense that would be involved in compiling the information would justify the advantage that is to be obtained.

Now if my honourable friend will determine on his own, through consultations with the staff of the department, that this is what is needed, then I suggest that the honourable member can rely on me that I am very willing to cooperate, but I don't at this point wish to be required to fulfill the kind of onerous responsibilities that are required to be undertaken by the department in fulfilling this request.

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

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, 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 Fort Rouge. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have received a reply to question number one and also have an offer from the Honourable Attorney-General to examine the files in his office regarding this case, and since this opportunity has been afforded to me, I would ask leave of the House to withdraw this Order for Return.

MR. SPEAKER: Has the honourable member leave?

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, once an Order of this kind has received introduction and is the property of the House, I think members are entitled to the information. I was interested,

(MR. FROESE cont'd) once the Order was placed, I was interested in the replies as well, and I think they should be made public then.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I take it that the honourable member does not give leave. If that is the case, then the government will have no alternative but to vote against the Order for Return being filed, but I'm sure, quite positive, that what is being made available to the Member for Fort Rouge will be made available to the Member for Rhineland, and on that basis would he not reconsider and give leave to the member to withdraw the Order for Return?

MR. FROESE: Yes, on that basis I will agree to have it withdrawn.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: Private Members' Resolutions. Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable Member for Rhineland. Resolution No. 13.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us has to do with lowering the legal age in Manitoba for all purposes. The basis of the request is that the voting age has been brought down from 21 to 18, and also the age in order to be a candidate for election to this Assembly has been brought down from 21 to 18 as well. On the basis of that, the resolution requests that the matter of legal age be reduced from 21 to 18 for all purposes.

Now in speaking to this resolution, I certainly have reservations on the resolution before us. I am not opposed in principle to lowering the age but I think the step is too large and too fast. I think reducing it from 21 to 18 is too much in one step. We know that this will affect the matter of wills, of deeds and so on, and also that these people will then be held responsible under the law, and this is the point that I wish to raise, that we know that the young people can very easily be enticed to make purchases. At that age they'd like to get hold of as many things as possible, anything that is to their liking. Just take a young boy to a showroom, an automobile showroom with all the new cars, boy oh boy, it's a hard time keeping him back. He'd just like to buy them all for that matter.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): How about his father?

MR. FROESE: Well, the father is accountable and he knows full well that if he buys something he'll have to pay up or put up, and so up until now, a young boy under 21 - well, then, if he bought it, the person making the deal or the seller was responsible. If he couldn't collect, he certainly couldn't collect under the law, and I think this was a protection and it is a protection, and I think it's a protection that parents in this province value and that we should not just consider lightly. I think this is a very important resolution. We know that the government intends to bring in a bill once this resolution is passed to that effect, so I think we should give it very careful consideration.

We know, too, that the young people will be under terrific pressure once this change is brought about. We know that the various salesmen that go from house to house, from door to door, to try and sell, and how many people get caught that way? Not only young people, but adults, and we have heard this in committee when we were discussing legislation of that type to prevent such things. How many adults were taken? And now if we subject the young people to this, certainly we will have many more cases.

Then, too, we find that young people are more subject to impulsive buying. Their resistance has not been built up and they're easy prey. Just take a boy to a show room, as I mentioned, and let a salesman give him a pitch, and boy oh boy, I think you could sell a boy of that age a car very easily, and once that debt is imposed or is made, then he has to live up to that contract once the legal age is changed, and I feel that we are lowering it too much. I think if we did lower it by a year, or at the most two years, I would support the Bill, but bringing it down to 18, I just cannot go along with it at this time. Not only do we have that situation today, but we know that many young people in trying to acquire an education, a university education, they are getting into debt and some quite heavily. In order to get your degree from the university, this means that you attend three years, probably four years, and you can run up a sizeable debt during that time, and while the Federal Government and the province is making some of these loans interest-free so that the interest doesn't accrue too much, nevertheless the principal amount is there and this can run up to three or four thousand dollars quite easily.

Then, if two young people like that marry, this means that the debt is doubled when they get married, and they could have a debt right there of seven to eight thousand dollars. Then lower the voting age, and the young boy probably would have bought a car for three or

(MR. FROESE cont'd) four thousand dollars, so that he would have a debt of ten or twelve thousand dollars quite easily, if the legal age was lowered, and I think our young people would be getting into debt far too fast and would find it very difficult to ever get out of that situation, because once they get married there are other expenses. There are the numerous other things that have to be purchased - furnishings, appliances and your living expenses as well. So I think we should make very careful consideration of what we are doing just now.

Another thing that comes into the situation is that if you lower the legal age, this would mean to many parents that you're releasing them of their guidance and their protection, and I don't think many of our young people have reached the maturity at that age where they should not receive guidance from their parents, that they might think that, "well, I'm of age, I don't have to go according to my parents wishes any more; I'm free to do as I will and I will not be guided by what my parents might say." And as a result, this could also contribute to a certain amount to delinquency.

We know from experience, too, that financial institutions take care in allowing young people to go into debt, that they will not accept some of these contracts as a result because they cannot be taken to court, but once this comes into law, this means that lenders will advance the moneys more readily and therefore we can also figure that our law courts, our courts will have many more cases to deal with, and I think we all know that in many of these courts there are backlogs today, very substantial ones, so that this could also mean that we would have to appoint more judges, and this would increase the cost of government. It is not just a small thing that we are considering here. It will have a chain reaction and it could certainly mean a great many more things than just lowering the age of majority, as the B. C. Bill is called. British Columbia passed legislation this year where they passed a bill called The Age of Majority Act, where they lowered the age of accountability from 21 to 19, and I certainly think that they have gone the limit, that we should not go any further than 19. In my opinion we should just reduce it probably one year in a given year, then probably have a gradual reduction.

Then, too, I just wonder whether the young people really want this. Do the young people of this province want this lowering of age of accountability. -- (Interjection) — Pardon?

HON. PETER BURTNIAK (Minister of Tourism & Recreation)(Dauphin): Do you want it in B. C. ?

MR. FROESE: I couldn't hear you.

MR. BURTNIAK: Do you want it in B. C. ?

MR. FROESE: Well, in B. C. they took the same action as we did. They lowered the voting age and as a result this came about. I don't know whether the young people in British Columbia wanted it. I don't know. Just recently my colleague here, the Honourable Member from Portage la Prairie, spoke to a classroom of students and he asked the question, and quite a percentage of the students did not want it. Then he asked them to close their eyes and vote again so their neighbouring classmate would not know how they were voting, and the number opposing it increased very substantially, so that not nearly all the young people of this province are asking for this or are even in favour of it, because they too know that once they are accountable under the law, they will have to face certain situations that they are now protected from. And I feel that our young people are enjoying this protection and that we should think twice before we take too big a step in this direction.

I say that I am not opposed to lowering it but I would certainly like to see it lowered in a more gradual way so that we would see what the reaction would be, because if we lower it from 21 to 18 I think we will find situations will change in many respects because of this.

Mr. Speaker, these were some of the points that I thought I would like to discuss under the resolution. I will have more things to say when we will be dealing with the Bill that will be brought in following the passage of this resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I always find it interesting to hear the songs of that trumpet of Conservatism from the south and to listen to my honourable friend, although I must say I find it somewhat difficult to follow his arguments as he just presented them to the Chamber, because he seemed to be both for and against the lowering of the age of majority in the Province of Manitoba. He talked about lowering the age in stages, and I got the impression that he was talking about going from 21 to 19, and then I suppose a following or a successive stage would be reduce it to 17 and soon, because he did talk about stages and he did seem to favour 19.

MR. FROESE: I did not mention 17 and I certainly would not be in favour. I think one year at a stage would be sufficient.

MR. DOERN: But the honourable member did seem to support a reduction. Perhaps he couldn't go as far as 18, which is extreme, but he could go to 18 1/2 or 19 which is a middle position. I think, Mr. Speaker, when he was talking about some of those smooth-talking salesmen who lurk around every corner, I know he was, in the back of his mind, thinking of my honourable friend the Member for La Verendrye, who undoubtedly no person who comes into his establishment can leave without buying a Buick, and I suspect that he was thinking of somebody like him.

Mr. Speaker, a few months ago we passed what I considered to be a significant piece of legislation and that was the lowering of the voting age, because I think in the history of the political process and so on, this is one of the final steps in the sense of the extension of rights to people, and the measure that we are now considering is unquestionably logically consistent, so that if one supports the principle, as this House did, that young people at the age of 18 should be given the right to vote and should also be given the right, logically again, to stand as elected representatives, then it would seem to follow that the other rights and privileges should also be a part of that package. And of course we know that we will shortly be dealing with a measure to reduce the voting in municipal elections to 18 and I think there's no doubt that the federal House of Commons will very shortly reduce the federal age to 18. So that undoubtedly is the trend. But even if it's a trend, of course it doesn't mean that all members would support it or that all members should just be swept in the tide, but we are now considering a measure which would include, I suppose, such things as the legal right to marry at 18 without your parents' permission. I don't know the exact statistics but apparently a fairly significant number of young people 18 to 21 are married.

MR. BARKMAN: Some wait a little longer, too.

MR. DOERN: And then of course there are other questions -- some wait a little longer, yes. Then there's the question, of course, of the driving age which I think is something that some honourable members could also consider as a part of this package, whether in fact a reverse trend should be taken and instead of lowering the age, some members might argue that the driving age in fact should be raised to 18 because of the importance of that responsibility. Well, my honourable friend from Rock Lake shakes his head and he obviously indicates that he is with it and he would not go for that measure.

The question of wills and contracts and legal action and so on, it seems to me that young people are, I think, in general as responsible as their elders. They certainly aren't getting a very good direction from their parents because my honourable friend from Rhineland is worried about young people buying cars and going into debt and finance payments, but I'm sure that if the average adult in our community, if his affairs were made public in terms of all his legal obligations and his financial obligations, the average person is in hock for a considerable amount in this day and age. Most people are paying \$15,000 and \$20,000 mortgages on their house. They owe two or three thousand dollars on their car; they owe for their washing machine, their television set and so on. It's a part of a system. -- (Interjection) -- Well it depends on, you know. Were they talking about single women or finance dealers or what?

MR. DESJARDINS: Well you'd be in the hole too . . .

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I think the most controversial, the most controversial part of this bill might be the question of the drinking age, and we have seen that in other provinces that the age of majority has been extended, and I think that it would be valuable in passing this resolution and in actually bringing about legislation, if there was some careful study and some careful scrutiny made of the experience in other states like the United States and other provinces such as British Columbia and Saskatchewan, and perhaps in Britain, to see whether there is anything that we can learn or if there's any information that would benefit us in terms of enacting legislation when and if that should arise. Because I imagine that, although in principle most members would support this resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, some would feel that there are degrees of urgency. Some would say now is the time to bring in the legislation and others would say that, well, I am for this in principle but perhaps there is no pressing urgency.

Mr. Speaker, this whole question, I think, is connected with the basic attitude that honourable members have towards young people in our society, and I believe that when we come to the question of youth, that there are certain advantages on this side of the House

(MR. DOERN cont'd) compared to my honourable friends opposite. And I think that one of the reasons for that is that so many of the members on this side of the House were active or are active in the public school system; that to a large extent many of the members on this side of the House are younger members and work with or have worked very closely with, in particular, the teenagers and the younger people . . .

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. DOERN: Certainly.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Does the honourable member not feel that somebody with teenage children or a gang of kids around the house most of the time does not have any close relationship with youth?

MR. DOERN: Well, I will answer my honourable friend in just a moment. As I said, I believe that the fact that so many of us on this side of the Chamber are younger and have spent a number of years dealing with young people, I think gives us a certain advantage, and I'll give you an example. From my own experience as a typical university graduate, when I first entered the teaching profession I found it very difficult to communicate with my own students because you first of all develop, as a university student, a certain attitude and a certain vocabulary, and then when you're put into the classroom shortly after that it's very difficult to be able to communicate, and I think that a lot of the members opposite who will argue on the basis that they are parents and that they have teenage children and so on, would feel that they have a natural advantage, and all I can say as an observer, as one who has been in the classroom, I think that first of all that communication is not necessarily there, and secondly, I think that when we have come to various social issues before this Chamber and listen to the kind of arguments and the postures of some of the members of the Opposition, then I would think that they do not understand young people, their own children, at all. Because I believe, and I will give some examples of this.

I don't think it's good enough to say that the grounds for understanding young people is that you were once young or that you talk to your children. I get the impression from listening to some of the members in this Chamber that they talk to their children all right; they tell them what to do; that they also tell them what to think, and I would suggest to you that you may feel, you may feel that that works, but I suggest to you, I suggest to you that if you think that your children do exactly what you tell them to do and if you think that they think the way that you do, then I think you should sometimes speak to teenagers who aren't your own children, talk to them about their own problems, talk to their teachers and talk to their guidance counsellors, and I'm sure. Mr. Speaker, that if you were able to engage in this debate and if you were able to speak on the problems that your own students come to you with, their problems in terms of their academic life and their personal life, one of the biggest single factors is the total lack of communication. And I don't just mean words, I don't mean words coming back and forth across the dinner table. I mean about vital communication, verbal and non verbal, because -- I'm afraid to explain that further because my honourable friend might be thinking of something other than what I am.

MR. DESJARDINS: You're lucky I'm not your Dad, I'll tell you that.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, a lot of these problems I think come to us as teachers on evenings like Parents Night, where teachers talk to parents and parents finally get the message that their own kids are in trouble and that they are unable to -- they want to know, many times, what they can do to assist their own children and quite often when you're talking to somebody in high school, what can you say? What advice can you give? Because you can't change a pattern that's existed for 10 or 12 years. It's really at that time too late.

Now I want to talk about some of the examples of attitude. I listened with some shock perhaps and anger at the comments of some of the honourable members here on questions like youth hostels and so on. All they think about when they think about young people, is they think about people who have long hair and beard and fellows who maybe wear motorcycle jackets or people with flared pants and so on, and they have an aversion, an aversion which is often visual based on the principle that if they look different then they are different, and "they're not following me." Well, . . .

MR. WATT: That's ridiculous. Try raising a family.

MR. DOERN: Let me give you this example of youth hostels. We raised the question of youth hostels, the Honourable Minister of Youth and Education proposes a modest measure to

(MR. DOERN cont'd) establish a youth hostel. Now I don't know if my honourable friends here have ever travelled, but I think that in Europe, in Europe there are something like 3,000 to 4,000 youth hostels and it's an old, established type of operation where young people can go to one of these places. There are, I think, over a thousand of them in Germany alone. They can check into this place at 9:00 or 10:00 o'clock at night; they pay 50 cents or whatever the charge is; they sleep in the place; they get up early and they leave. And it's just as simple as that. But we raise this type of a measure here and everybody who opposes this measure talks about all sorts of horrible problems, all sorts of horrible images that they conjure up. They say, "I'm for youth hostels only don't build it in my constituency." We get that typical type of argument.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal with another question - it's an 8-hour speech that I have and I don't intend to say other than a few words on this topic. We've heard all sorts of snide comments from certain members opposite about rock festivals and John Lennon and all these various questions. Some of my honourable friends have no idea whatsoever about what a rock festival is or what any of these new trends are. They just recoil in horror. They have all sorts of horrible images. They have no idea of some of the current happenings of the 1960's and the 70's. And they probably went through the same thing when they were younger, too. They probably had the same basic arguments with their parents.

Mr. Speaker, we've talked about, we've heard comments about rock festivals and so on. For instance, there's one being sponsored by the Centennial Corporation and some of the members have exhibited all sorts of reactions to this. Well this is a very common occurrence. It happens all over the States. There's one being put on at Niverville a week Sunday, starting to get dangerously close to my honourable friends in the good southern part of Manitoba. This is put on by a bunch of young people. There are a number of these festivals going to be held in various parts of the province outside the Metropolitan area. Manisphere is putting one on on July 1st, and later on in August there will be one by the Centennial Corporation. A woman phoned me up, I remember, -- (Interjections) -- an older woman, an older woman, and she was all upset about the fact that she said there was going to be a love-in in Assiniboine Park.

MR. DESJARDINS: Did you invite her?

MR. DOERN: So I said to her, "Look lady, I said, "Don't think of it as a love-in," because I could see what she was thinking about. I said, "Just think of it as a concert."

MR. BEARD: That's a new name for it, eh?

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say just a few words.

MR. DESJARDINS: That's enough.

MR. DOERN: And then I'll go directly back to the topic. We've heard comments from the Member for Rhineland on John Lennon. We've heard a few comments from the Member for Brandon West, and the Member for Pembina, of course, and I could speak at some length on all the questions connected with that invitation, but I don't think that this is the time. Perhaps another time . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh no. Do it now. Let's get it over with.

MR. DOERN: But I'd just like to make a couple of points to demonstrate some of the errors, I think, of people who have taken a position on some of these question. The Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce, for example - I think it was that organization - put out this magazine "Fourteen days" to sell I think - what? 140,000 copies in Manitoba and I suppose beyond - and one of the events that they feature in here of course is a photograph of John Lennon and his wife because although . . .

HON. PHILIP PETURSSON (Minister of Cultural Affairs)(Wellington): Oh no. Oh no.

MR. DOERN: Oh no. Although some of my honourable friends might think that this is very dangerous stuff, the people who are one of the biggest boosters of this province and of this city, they themselves feature as an interesting event the rock festival and of course the fact that Lennon, who is probably the greatest musician of the 1960's, might come to Manitoba. Yes, the greatest musician. Well, I hate to say to some of my own colleagues that Beethoven is dead. Perhaps you're not aware of the fact.

And I would only make these other brief points. We've heard about people with long hair. We've heard all this horrible stuff about these people. Some of my honourable friends don't even know that Lennon himself, who is of course a real popular person with young people, he himself has chopped off his hair, and I think that now makes him acceptable to some of the members opposite. One of the greatest points, Mr. Speaker, that has been misunderstood

(MR. DOERN cont'd) by many people in the public - and I only mention this in passing; I mention this as an example of misinformation connected with young people - there is a great how-do-you-do made about these lithographs that Lennon had printed. And I'd just like to point out one thing. That was clearly an instance of erotic art, there's no question about that, and believe me, if you saw some of those lithographs, they guarantee it would make your hair stand on end, there's no question about it. But those were lithographed and I'd like to point out that that is an artistic form and it is not a photograph. And many people got all excited about it, talked about the fact that these were photographs -- something like ten dirty pictures for \$4.95 -- had nothing to do with that whatsoever. It was a . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh let him continue please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I've been listening to the honourable member very intently. I hope that he will eventually relate his comments to the motion before us.

MR. DESJARDINS: It was just getting interesting, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, if I may on a point of order. I thought you were rising, Mr. Speaker, to ask the honourable gentleman to table the documents to which he was referring, and in case that was not your decision I would ask him to please table the documents.

MR. DOERN: Well I would be happy to table the lithographs but they sell for \$1,200 a set. I'm afraid that I don't have a copy of them, but I would . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Twelve dollars a set. How many in a set?

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, my comments are really on the general topic of youth and some of the objections of members of the Chamber who have many times in debate - we've never really got into the subject but they have hinted and demonstrated their attitude in a few sentences and I personally, of course, take issue with some of those comments which in many cases I thought were unfair and uninformed and were made in a rather snide way.

My point is this on that general issue, that to understand the attitudes of young people and so on you have to communicate with them. And when it comes to things like music although some of my honourable friends would undoubtedly favour as singers Bing Crosby and Charlie Chamberlain and Gracie Fields and Rudy Vallee, these are not, I hate to say this, but these are not the idols of young people today. Mr. Speaker, my point is this: that some of the visual things that are offensive to older people are simply changes in style, changes in life style which have gone on all through history and that these should not be barriers between people of different generations, but I fear that they are.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I would say that the members of the government in passing legislation on the voting age and those of us who have spoken in support of this particular resolution and so on are demonstrating a confidence in young people. I also would say that I speak in favour of the resolution but I think if and when actual legislation is brought in then I think that such legislation should also bear in mind the experiences of other jurisdictions and other governing bodies and that we should have the benefit of that experience when we are actually moving into legislation.

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

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the member a question? If we pass this resolution does this mean that we could have judges 18 years old sitting on the bench?

MR. DOERN: I have to resort to my legal counsel but they seem to indicate that's possible.

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

MR. McKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. After getting that fatherly lecture from the Honourable Member from Elmwood on what a parent and what a teenager is all about I could not resist the temptation to move into the debate this afternoon. I humbly submit, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable member should join his colleague from St. Matthews and get married real quick. Get married real quick. And then after you've raised a family then come back and tell me what you found out. And some of the things then will be a lot different than what you said today. -- (Interjection) -- Oh, yes. I agree.

This is the most amazing lecture I've ever heard for a long time, Mr. Speaker. This great Member from Elmwood gazing across here at us old fuddy-duddies who don't understand young people, who don't understand what it is to talk to boys and girls. Hogwash! Hogwash! I've been associated with young people since the day that I arrived in Manitoba. I've been with

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) them in the sports field; I've been with them in church; I've been with them in music; I'm with them all the way and I have -- well some reservations on this resolution in the field such as the Honourable Member from Thompson raised the question, possibly in the courts where there are some limitations that maybe have to be placed on young people, but I think this is an excellent resolution and I think we can support it -- with some limitations in certain fields. I doubt very much whether some of our young people at 18 can handle some of the capacities of life where knowledgeable experience is needed and the courts would be one example possibly where we would have to put limitations. But, nevertheless, it's very hard for me to -- we don't understand social change you know, the old Tories don't understand social change. Do you remember last year we amended the resolution on lowering the voting age? -- (Interjection) -- Certainly, certainly. Do you remember the amendment we put on? Remember? This is the old -- (Interjection) -- That's right. But he's trying to tell me today Mr. Speaker, and I can't buy that statement, that the teachers are the ones that the young people have their trust in, teachers are the ones that give them the guidance that they need and make the young people what they are today. I can't buy that in shape or form. Because I'm a parent, I've raised three children in our family, we went through the teen-age life, I can rock, I can roll, I can do anything that you want, or what young people want me to do. I can enjoy John Lennon. I think, as he said, he's one of the finest, most talented musicians that I've had the pleasure of listening to in the last ten years. No argument. No argument at all. That's not the debate in this subject. I think our young people in this province today are capable of everything that we ask of them. They're not going to let us down. I have no illusions or I'm not afraid about any of the 18-year-old people in my constituency in any shape or form. Therefore I support this resolution with some limitations. I don't know how we can put regulations with it, or limitations, but I think it's an excellent resolution and I will be supporting it along that theme.

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

MR. PATRICK: Ayes and nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. Has the member support? Call in the members. Order please. We are dealing with the motion of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Allard, Barrow, Beard, Bilton, Borowski, Boyce, Burtiak, Cherniack, Desjardins, Doern, Einarson, Fox, Gonick, Gottfried, Graham, Green, Jenkins, Johansson, G. Johnston, Jorgenson, McBryde, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, Miller, Molgat, Moug, Patrick, Paulley, Pawley, Petursson, Schreyer, Shafransky, Sherman, Toupin, Turnbull, Uskiw, Watt and Mrs. Trueman.

NAYS: Messrs. Craik, Enns, Ferguson, Hardy and F. Johnston.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 3; Nays 5.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

On 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 Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned the debate for my colleague from Ste. Rose.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Industry and Commerce -- and I'm sorry that he's not in his seat today -- when he moved this amendment I was not in the House either on that occasion. But I made a very particular point of reading his comments subsequently because I consider this resolution to be a very important one insofar as the actions that are going to be taken by the government with regards to implementing the TED Report. These are the basic recommendations of the TED Commission for the organization for development in Manitoba. So the views of the Minister to me are most important in this regard. So I've made it a point to read carefully what the Minister has to say, and I'm pleased to see that on two of the points the Minister agrees. He has already implemented, as my resolution indicates, one of the steps recommended by the TED Commission. In his speech he accepts, in principle at least, that the government is considering the other two and may proceed on them. Certainly his references are favourable. He indicates an understanding of the importance of the subject.

The discussion seems to turn around the third point, Mr. Speaker, where the Minister feels that the government has taken the action recommended by the TED Commission, and that is with regard to the appointment of a high level advisory council on Economic Development drawn from the private sector, and here is where there appears to be a difference between the attitude of the Minister, the government, and what I take it was the recommendation from TED, what I believe is the right action for Manitoba.

Now I have to say at the very outset that it is with some reluctance that I speak on this subject and that I have some hesitation in going into it in this way because it could be taken by some as reflection on an individual, Mr. Baldur Kristjanson, and it is by no means, a reflection on that man, because I have a very high regard for that individual. I can't say that I know him very, very well but what I do know of him I have a high respect for the man and in fact, consider him to be a friend. So it is with some reluctance that I have to say what I am going to say, because it might be inferred that I have some doubts about his abilities and I want to make it very clear that that isn't the point.

My concern is that he is not in fact free of the government, because when the government announced that it was establishing the economic development advisory board, and this is in a press release of the 14th of November, the government then announced that Mr. Baldur Kristjanson who had been the former chairman of the Manitoba Economic Consultative Board and the former deputy minister of Manitoba's Development authority, was going to be the chairman of this new advisory council. But the same day that this press release came out, another press release was issued and its heading is "Triple Appointment for Kristjanson." "Doctor Baldur Kristjanson, well known Canadian Economic Advisor, will have three separate but allied functions in the development field with the Manitoba government. Premier Schreyer said that in addition to being the chairman of the New Economic Development Advisory Board, he" and I've put in the numbers here 1. "Will be retained as special assistant and economic advisor to the premier; and as well he becomes 2. "a Member of the Committee of Cabinet on planning and priorities." There, Mr. Speaker, is where I feel the government has moved away from the recommendation of TED, and that in fact Dr. Kristjanson -- and I repeat, I want to make this abundantly clear, this is not questioning his capabilities -- it's questioning the fact that he is not free from government, that he is in fact, an employee of the government; and in a very, very special capacity, because he is the special assistant and economic advisor to the Premier. In another capacity he's a member of the committee of cabinet on planning and priorities, the key, to me, economic functions within the government. Yet this is not what the TED report had in mind, because they make it very clear that this committee, this Economic Advisory Committee should be free from government. There should be an outside body looking at government, looking at the various government bodies, and this is where I think that the action of the government is not in line with what TED recommends.

Well now the government could very well say but we don't agree with what TED recommends. We think it should be done differently. Well if that's the point the government wants to make then I'm prepared to debate that one, but so far, that is not what government has said. The Minister simply stated that in his view the government had accomplished what TED was recommending. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that the TED Commission was right in suggesting that it should be a totally independent body from government. I think in the government's own interests, and I said this in my original speech, that I recognize how difficult it might be for government, how difficult it might be to have a completely outside body scrutinize its activities

(MR. MOLGAT con t'd.) and possibly come out with suggestions which government doesn't like, somewhat like what we get in Ottawa in the Auditor's-General reports, and we see what reaction some Ottawa ministers have on the subject. And yet, Mr. Speaker, if it's going to function properly I think it is desirable that it be a completely independent body and I think we are placing Mr. Kristjanson in this case in a very difficult position, if we are asking him to do two different functions. 1. Be the economic advisor to the Premier; be a member of the Planning and Priorities Committee and then suddenly take an entirely independent attitude, an entirely new hat, go over on the other side of the room and be in a position to discuss dispassionately the actions of government, in a sense his own actions. I don't think that you can ask a man to do that. I don't think you are putting him in a position where he can perform that function. I think it's just not the way that the man can operate.

Secondly, I think that regardless of what the report comes out as, people on the outside who want to question it can then turn around and say well you know it's not an assessment really of what's going on because the chairman of this committee - and again with no criticism of the individuals or of the other people on that committee - but how can you say to people on the outside who may want to be critical, well here's an impartial assessment, and they turn around and say yes, but the chairman, the body, is your economic advisor, the man in your Planning and Priorities Committee. I just don't think, Mr. Speaker, that it's going to wash and I don't think it is going to perform the job that I'm sure the Premier wants, and I'm sure is good from the standpoint of government itself and of the people in the province. So I would urge, Mr. Speaker, that the government reconsider this situation and that they take a good look at exactly what TED does recommend, and that is a completely separate body from government. And I repeat, I know, I know that government at times will say it's very difficult to accept some of the statements made; and yet in our system of government I think it is desirable that we do have these completely independent bodies there as a constant check on what government does. And painful as it may be, and I'm sure difficult as it is for the Ministers in Ottawa to accept what the Auditor-General has to say, I think from the standpoint of the Canadian public that it's desirable, and I think from the standpoint of Manitoba, and in this long run, the standpoint of the government itself, the assurance, their own assurance, their satisfaction, your satisfaction Mr. Premier, that someone independent of you is assessing what is going on from an economic standpoint, where you yourself will know and hear someone who is speaking for what he believes - no question that he's been involved in it, he's looking at it from the outside - and you'd get a better report, one that would be more useful to government, more useful to the public. So I urge the government to reconsider the situation.

So, Mr. Speaker, I regret that I cannot accept the amendment proposed by the Minister in this case because I think that it is missing the point recommended by TED, the point which I think is right. I urge the members not to support the proposed amendment by the Minister of Industry and Commerce; I urge the Premier to reconsider the situation in the light of the best interests of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I am prompted to say a few words in this debate because of the arguments put forward by the last speaker, the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. It is true that the way in which the Economic Development Advisory Board is constituted, that the form and manner of it is somewhat different than was recommended in the TED Report. We don't consider that to be a serious error in itself because the government has taken the position relative to the TED Report that it is a useful and handy document, but is not a Bible that is to be adhered to only upon pain of committing heresy - that is if one departs from it.

We have seen fit to establish first of all a standing committee on economic development. That was one of the principal recommendations of the TED Report. We have done that. We have also set up this economic development advisory board. The TED Report recommended that it be drawn from the private sector. Well I believe I can say that it is drawn from the private sector, with only one exception. The reason for that, I don't mind being candid, is that we felt it would be more useful, more expeditious to have all of the documentation and preparation of different necessary paper work involved, to have it done by someone who has access to staff within the government structure. Now the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose seems to think that because one person on this advisory board is not in the private sector, even though the other six are, that it makes the entire advisory board incapable of rendering independent advice and I think that he is stretching logic a bit far when he makes that argument.

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.)

However, I do concede this much that it may well be that the triple function which Dr. Kristjanson is performing now, may impinge more than is necessary on his independence when he acts in his capacity as Chairman of the Economic Development Advisory Board. Therefore, the government will give serious consideration to perhaps making arrangements to have Dr. Kristjanson serve exclusively on the Advisory Board and to have someone else serve on the Planning and Priorities Committee of Cabinet.

I must say that there has been no question since Dr. Kristjanson has assumed his duties but that his responsibility as Chairman of the Economic Development Advisory Board has taken foremost priority, and it's only in an ancillary sense that he has been acting in the other capacity as economic advisor to the office of the Premier and to the Planning and Priorities Committee. So we will consider seriously the advisability of making certain rearrangements so that he can serve exclusively on the Economic Development Advisory Board. Now that perhaps should go a long way, if not all the way, in satisfying the apprehensions of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. If that is the case, Mr. Speaker -- well I have already given the assurance that we will look at this seriously.

But I can't resume my place, Mr. Speaker, without making one further point, and that is that I think we make too much of a pretense oftentimes when we set up a board, agency or commission and say that that particular board, agency or commission is quite independent of government, of the cabinet and of government, because we all know that in the course of their duties many administrative agencies, the heads of them, the chairmen and some of the members, that they do have intellectual - what's the expression? - they do have intellectual intercourse with members of the government, between members of the government and members of the administrative board and agencies that are supposed to be independent. I'd be very surprised if most of the appointments made by previous governments to board and agencies have not been of men whose approach, whose philosophy of government, economics and administration has been, you know, very close to that of the government of the day, and who would really expect it otherwise. So to say that because a person happens to be serving a particular function within the government structure, that makes him incapable of giving intellectually honest and independent advice when he is on an advisory board is difficult for me to appreciate that argument. I'm not saying that people who are appointed to administrative boards and agencies have been instructed by previous governments to make certain decisions and come to certain conclusions, I'm not suggesting that at all, but I am suggesting that there is enough interplay of ideas, there is a great deal of communication back and forth so that the thinking of government of the time is reflected by the thinking of those who have been appointed to boards and agencies and their decision making.

I don't think that much more need be said, Mr. Speaker. I know that the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose did not mean his remarks to be really taken as criticism so much as the offering of advice as to what alternatives might be preferable to that which we've followed.

However, I would like the Minister of Industry and Commerce to be able to peruse the remarks just made by the honourable member and others who participated in the debate and I assume that someone would want to adjourn this particular debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose and the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance in amendment thereto. The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, in his absence, can we have this matter stand? (Agreed.)

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. George in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We won't go into the resolution as proposed by Mr. Barkman, I don't think that we will go into the necessity of explaining the financial position of agriculture at great length. The resolution as proposed where, to quote it, Mr. Speaker, "many farmers will be unable to pay their bills and taxes, and the situation is already having a serious impact on the economy of rural communities and will adversely affect the entire provincial economy."

(MR. FERGUSON cont'd.)

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the message is getting home to the urban populace and businessmen that there is something wrong in the country. It has taken a considerable amount of time. However, by the Member from River Heights's statement this morning that there are 5,000 more unemployed in Manitoba than there were last year, I think this is quite an indication that things are starting to catch up, the lack of spending in the subsidiary industries connected with agriculture, your fertilizers, fuels, repairs and this sort of thing, it's really starting to build up.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the shortage of cash, in my opinion, is caused by two basic reasons. One is over-production of grains in the world market and the other is the inability of our selling agencies to cope with these conditions. Our world trade in grains hasn't really declined this much. It's gone down considerably, but our marketing system just hasn't kept pace with it, and until we adapt a more flexible and competitive marketing system, we still will not be able to compete in the world marketplace. Our business of price setting on our products, our inflexible attitude to world conditions, it seems that by the time we've arrived at the point where we can make a deal, why someone else has made the deal and we're standing out in the cold again. Now, the prices that we're receiving at the local level, the producer's level, for wheat and coarse grains, even without our expensive marketing and handling system, puts us in a competitive basis with just about any producers in the world.

Now the Member from St. George was quite interesting. I think possibly it would have been a little bit more to the point if he'd stipulated exactly what our Minister of Agriculture has done since he became Minister, and a list of these, I'm sure, would have been quite enlightening to us, because in his absence the other day, the Member for St. George brought out the LIFT Program at great length, the benefits of it, and how the Minister had gone to Ottawa and asked for a \$12.00 payment instead of \$6.00. and even on the Minister's own admission, why this was going to bring no money into Manitoba. The weather being as it is, if he has one more week of wet weather, I think possibly he'll have himself bailed out. It might be just quite a thing that's coming up.

The Attorney-General . . . a little bit and his big pitch was further cash advances. The Minister's in his place today; I think he's quite aware of what cash advances have done, and he must have his tongue in his cheek a little bit when he suggests further ones, because I think he's quite aware that in many cases cash advances have not been paid off, further ones have been added, and another one from the Provincial Government I don't think would -- it might be a short-term gap, but I don't think that even on this basis it's going to prove too much, because immediately a product is sold, one half goes to pay it off and it's just a kind of a backward way of doing things in my estimation.

Farm debt to date totals at a quarter of a billion dollars, so I don't really think that increased credit is going to do this much more. I think we've got to get on the selling end of things, get a little impetus going again to grow the products and get them out on the world market.

Another little interesting sidelight here is this matter of flood damage. We have considerable amount of grain in my constituency that has cash advances on it. It's now well on its way to being washed into Lake Manitoba, a lot of it. I'd like to know whether the government owns a half of it or whether the farmer owns it all or just what's going to happen here when it comes to a settle-up, because when the cash advance was taken, it was taken in good faith and through no fault of the farmer this product has been lost, and I would just like to be a little clearer on this, if the Minister has any indication or any information that he can give on that. Mind you, this is one other possibility that the Minister can consider, if the government wanted to nationalize the farms, I think if they took over the cash advances they would be pretty well advanced towards doing this.

Now, as I've stated before in the House, Mr. Speaker, I'm still fully in favour of the marketing of coarse grains on an open market. The Minister doesn't agree with me but I can't agree either that an orderly market is one whereby you have no quotas, grain - particularly coarse grains - are moving at a price of as low as ten cents a bushel for oats, forty cents for barley. I can't consider this is an orderly market. I'm still quite sure that if it was on an open market with a quota system to ensure equal delivery to all producers, that it couldn't be any worse and it might be considerably better to at least get us into the world feed grain market.

(MR. FERGUSON cont'd.)

I believe that an overseas storage of wheat to enable us to guarantee delivery of our wheat at any time, regardless of labour unrest, might be another step. I believe that if we had increased handling charges and decreased storage charges it might give the grain companies a bit more initiative to get the grain moving instead of filling their elevators up and then sitting back and drawing storage on them.

Now I haven't a great deal more to add to this resolution, Mr. Speaker. I've attempted to present a few thoughts to the Minister. I think that's all I have to say at this time. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to dwell at any length on this particular resolution. I understand that members on both sides of the House engaged at some length on this motion last week while I was away - or this week, on Tuesday, while I was away in Rock Lake.

I simply want to answer some of the points that were made today by the Honourable Member for Gladstone. He mentioned that because of the seriousness of our rural economic situation, that we have increased our unemployment figures. There's no doubt in my mind that this is probably related, but I do want to say that there is one other factor which he has not admitted to or has not looked at, and that is, the idea of unemployment was really introduced by the Government of Canada a few short months ago as a means of controlling inflation, and that in fact it is the Government of Canada that says we should have and must have unemployment, and that they are directing the economy in such a way as to create unemployment purposely.

Now I want to say to my honourable friend that Manitoba took a very strong position on the issue of inflation during the conference that was held in Ottawa on February 16 and 17th, at which time I was present and assisted in making our position known. And our position was as follows, Mr. Chairman, that we did not agree that all of Canada ought to pay for the price of inflation simply because all of the areas in the country did not contribute to the inflationary situation that we find with us today; that essentially inflation was a product of certain parts of Canada; Ontario probably was the greatest offender in this particular respect; and that it would be unfair to ask provinces such as Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, the Maritimes, to pay a price to try and cure the ills of inflation. So we said that while we agreed that there was a problem, that while in some areas you must have restraints, in other areas which are not contributing to inflation we must have injections of capital to make sure that we don't overly dampen the economy in those respective areas. In other words, on the prairies we should be involved with some substantial capital input on the part of the Federal Government and should not curtail any projects that they had in mind for this particular region; and in particular because of the agricultural situation, that we should have recognized that there should have been some opportunities provided in some other way to offset some of the income imbalances.

The Member for Gladstone took issue with the position that was advocated by the Government of Manitoba on additional cash income for the prairie farmer, the grain producer. He took issue with the idea of the province going into a cash advance measure, a supplementary cash advance program to that of the Federal Government. I want to say to him that I don't at all accept his logic. He stated that he didn't think that our proposal was serious; that it was made with tongue in cheek. I want to say to him that proposals are not usually taken down to the Federal-Provincial Conference with tongue in cheek; that this was a very serious proposal. It was directed to draw to the attention of the conference the need of the prairies, and to indicate to the Government of Canada that the Province of Manitoba indeed was willing to assist the government in meeting that need, and that we would want some co-operation from the Government of Canada in any program that we would entertain to try and bring some dollars into the pockets of prairie farmers. This is indeed a genuine proposal. It still stands, Mr. Speaker, and we are prepared tomorrow to carry out that proposal if at all we receive some assurance from the Government of Canada that they will co-operate with us in the collection of funds to repay back the advances that were provided when the grain is sold. So it is not a tongue in cheek proposal; it is one that we're prepared to carry through.

The member also made a point about the open market as being the best system through which grain could be sold, feed grains, and he illustrated two points to justify his position. One was that oats apparently are selling at ten cents a bushel and barley at some forty cents a bushel, and while this may be true, Mr. Speaker - I don't know that it is; I know that barley

(MR. USKIW cont'd.) prices are very low and the forty cents mentioned was maybe accurate - I've never heard of oats selling at ten cents. -- (Interjection) -- All right, members opposite say that it has been the case. Well, that only proves how wrong my honourable friends opposite are when they say that an orderly marketing system is bad to handle the sales of feed grain. That only proves that they are wrong in their argument, because we do not have at present an orderly system of marketing feed grains, as my honourable friend ought to know. Since 1960 the orderly system of marketing feed grains has been abolished.

MR. WATT: Would the Honourable Minister permit a question?

MR. USKIW: I sure would.

MR. WATT: Is there an orderly marketing system of marketing wheat right now?

MR. USKIW: Yes, I think that you might say that there is an orderly system of marketing wheat under the jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board. The fact of the matter remains that because feed grains are not now under that jurisdiction, that we have feed grains selling outside the board at the prices mentioned by my honourable friend from Gladstone, and nothing in his argument supports the position that he has taken, and that is that the open market is the best way to handle grain, because that is what we have now in this industry and that is why we are selling oats at ten cents a bushel, and he ought to admit to it.

MR. FERGUSON: Would the Honourable Minister permit a question? If you suggest, as you're suggesting, Mr. Minister, that you have complete control over feed, seeds and everything else, I'd like to ask, how would you police this?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, for years, for many years there has been no problem in operating the system that has been set up to handle grains in an orderly fashion, and the system is The Canadian Wheat Board. The problems arose only in 1960 or '61 when the regulations were relaxed. It is only since then that we got into the kind of dilemma that we have before us today, so my answer to my honourable friend is that we must restore some order into the marketplace along the lines that was proposed in our submission to the Government of Canada, to the Standing Committee on Agriculture, when they were receiving briefs on the question of marketing of feed grains, and that is that we have a board system, that the board system should be much more flexible than it was in the past, that it should recognize the various needs of the different sectors of our agricultural industry, whether it be in eastern Canada, western Canada or the prairies, and that it have a multiple pricing system, so that we can take full advantage of the livestock industry, to supply their needs to make sure that the market is not taken away from us by competition from international quarters, that we pool our returns; that even though we have a multiple pricing system that we pool our returns to give the best average return to the producer that is available on the market, and that is the only sensible way in which we can market grains, Mr. Chairman. It has proven so over the years, and I only point out that it's time that we recognized this and again set up machinery that would make sure that we don't bring chaos to the agricultural community because of our lack of initiative or fortitude, and this is the case right now, Mr. Chairman.

I think that's pretty well it, Mr. Chairman. I don't intend to repeat the arguments that were made in the House on Tuesday. I want to thank you.

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

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Flin Flon, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution No. 14, on the proposed resolution of the Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this resolution for my friend the Honourable the Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my honourable colleague for holding this adjournment for me for awhile. I do want to make one or two comments in connection with the resolution and I'm sorry that the Honourable Member for Portage is not here this afternoon. But I want to assure him and, through him, the people who are alive to what is happening in the transportation field, that is in the railway transportation field, that the government is concerned with what is happening in the rail transport industry.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I've had two or three meetings with representatives of

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) the Canadian Pacific Railway and also the Canadian National Railway as well, in respect of the removal of agents from many of the towns and villages in Manitoba as the result of automation setting in, to use that word, in the railway industry and that of course is applying also to agents at many of our towns and villages in the province.

I have been assured by the railway that, particularly the C.P.R., that in their opinion, the services rendered to the communities will actually improve with the change in the system that they contemplate, and which, of course, Mr. Speaker, as you are well aware, will have to be approved by the Railway Transport Committee of the Canadian Transport Commission.

I have also had discussions with Mr. David Jones who is the Chairman of the Railway Transport Committee section of the Transport Commission, and I have been informed by the C.P.R. in respect of the impact on the personnel that eventually there'll be a comparative few number, maybe a half a dozen or so, with relatively short periods of service that may be adversely affected, but it is felt that they would be absorbed into other aspects of railway operation without the loss of jobs.

The resolution before us, Mr. Speaker, says that there is no firm assurance given that these employees will be protected by either pension rights or equivalent job offers in other positions within the C.P.R. system. The Vice-President for Western Canada of the Canadian Pacific Railway, Mr. Allison, assures me that such is not the case, that there are rules and regulations protecting pension rights, and in many cases employees who are transferred will be able to carry with them their salaries. On incumbency rates the jobs that they have may call for a lesser amount of money being paid to them on a weekly or monthly basis as the case may be, but they will not lose money as a result of the transfer. This type of change of customer service has been applied in many places in Western Canada already and the consumer services operation seems to now meet with the general approval of the communities being served.

I also have been given the assurance by the railroad, again in this particular case the Canadian Pacific Railway referred to in the resolution of the Honourable Member for Portage, the House Leader of the Liberal Party, I have been assured by the Railway that they would be more than pleased to meet with the Economic Development Committee of this House at the first opportunity that the committee meet if a request is made.

Reference is made in the resolution to April 20th. Of course we've gone beyond April 20th now, Mr. Speaker. I want to say though and inform the House that representations have been made by the government and myself to the Rail Transport Commission for an extension of the time limit for representation and the date now at the present moment has been extended until May 29th. I have also had assurance from the Chairman of the Rail Committee that further extension would be granted and we would be able to make representation at a future date if it was so desired of doing so.

I have also been assured by both the railway and the Railway Transport Committee that there will be full consultation in the communities before any change is made. I understand from the railway that it is their intention to have available personnel who would be prepared to meet with Chambers of Commerce, town and village councils, or municipal councils, to explain their full plan on request, so that everyone is well aware of what is transpiring.

I have also been assured by the Chairman of the Transport Committee that no action will be taken on representation by the railway until the Transport Committee has had a full investigation insofar as the ramifications of any change or any removal of the agents in the respective communities. I must say that, and I'm very pleased to be able to say, Mr. Speaker, that I have received very favourable and courteous hearings from both the Railway and the Transport Committee and I want to assure this House that as far as the government is concerned, that it is very cognizant of the effect on the economy in some of the villages and towns affected and we will continue our efforts on behalf of our communities in Manitoba. And of course in saying that we also must recognize that there has been a change in the transportation field, that many of the services for which agents and telegraphers and the likes on the railway are now no longer required and we have to recognize change.

I have been informed by the Railway officials that where agents are removed from the towns insofar as the providing of services may be concerned, that there is an open line free of charge through the media of the telephone system for the importers and people who require services of freight and express in their communities. So, Mr. Chairman, again I say that we are very cognizant of what is happening in the rail field in Manitoba and we have had, as I

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) indicate, many conversations and discussions with the principals concerned.

Mr. Speaker, because the resolution in its present form is not up-to-date I want to suggest an amendment which is not basically of course in opposition to the general principle of the resolution, but one I think that would tidy up the same for the consideration of my honourable friend the House Leader of the Liberal Party and also for members of the House. So I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources that the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word "study" in the operative part of the resolution and then, Sir, the resolution would read "therefore be it resolved that the whole question be referred at once to the Standing Committee on Economic Development for thorough study". It omits reference to the date, and I give the assurance of the House that any consideration of the committee will be received favourably, or at least the Railway is prepared to go before the Committee to ask any questions.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, could I be permitted to ask the Minister a question on the resolution? I'd like to adjourn the debate, but the question was, why he didn't leave in the preparation of a submission to the Transport Committee after they've done that study there . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Well if I may, it's a little unusual . . .

MR. McKENZIE: Never mind. I move, seconded by . . .

MR. GREEN: I think the Speaker wishes to read the motion . . .

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried. (May I suggest to the Honourable Minister he refers to it as the 15th line. It may not always work out that way.)

MR. PAULLEY: Yes. All the words after the word "study" in the third line of the operative paragraph of the resolution, Mr. Speaker. I'm sorry that I didn't have that . . .

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

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

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

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the amendment to this resolution, and before I carry on I just want to say on the amendment - Whereas although 61 percent of the persons who must resort to alternative care such as nursing homes are supported by social assistance and are exempt from hospital and medical insurance premiums, the remaining persons do not benefit from such insurance and all must contribute to their ability substantially more than for hospital care. I take this to mean that because they are paying their own way in a nursing home this is much greater cost than they would be paying if they were in a hospital under the hospital care and the balance of the amendment is to request the Federal Government that the people that are in nursing homes come under a hospital plan the same as if they would be in a medical hospital.

Mr. Speaker, I can't oppose such a resolution as that. There is no doubt that I think everything should be done for people that have to be in the care of a nursing home. There is no doubt, and I think the Honourable Minister who made this amendment realizes also there are many people in hospitals that nurses can only take care of and would be better off in a nursing home where there is probably less cost than in a medical hospital. But I must say that again I rise to state that there are times when I believe there are some emergencies and some considerations should be made in different situations and I think this is one of them.

Here we have a situation, and I haven't worked out the cost, but we're talking about 39 percent of the people in nursing homes that are paying their own way and they are still paying their hospitalization. I hasten to add that if they had to leave the nursing home for any reason to go back into the hospital, there would then be the cost of the hospital, but there aren't that many go back in the hospital and I think that there should be some arrangement if they did have to go back into the hospital for a short while, that that could be taken care of too. I don't like to get personal in this respect or bring something that is close to me into the House, but the Honourable Member from The Pas mentioned a situation that is close to him the other day and I say this - that my mother is presently in a nursing home where there has to be such care. She is perfectly fine mentally, she had a small stroke awhile back and she is not able to walk unless assisted and she must have this care. She pays her own way. She doesn't ask anybody for any help financially in any way, shape or form. I might say she pays more in that nursing home than people who do receive help from Care Services, but that doesn't bother her; but the

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd.) fact still remains she does pay her own way and there are many people that do the same thing. And really the amount of money involved here to relieve those patients that are in nursing homes paying their own way, from the expense of the hospital premium, is not very much to ask the government to seriously consider at this time without waiting for the Federal Government decision. The Federal Government decision is one, as I said, I have to agree with, because these people should have this help.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, that for that 39 percent of the people that do have to be in nursing homes, and are paying their own way, I don't think it's very unreasonable to ask the government, or have asked the government to consider the advisability of very seriously, of eliminating the hospital premium to those few.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I just want to obtain clarification if I may from the Member for Sturgeon Creek. That last words that I heard him say were that they should eliminate the premium but the motion as amended calls for the people in these homes to be under the hospital insurance plan. Is he suggesting that both take place, or one or the other?

MR. JOHNSTON: I'm not sure. I guess I did leave it confusing. I tried to say that I agree with your amendment as far as working with the Federal Government that the people who require this care should be helped under the hospital plan. Right. Now I wouldn't presume that I was to ask that - I don't think many people would ask if they were receiving the care for nothing, they might pay their hospital premium, but the fact that they are not receiving their care for nothing, possibly until this can be put through with the Federal Government I don't think it's unreasonable to ask the Manitoba Government to waive the premiums.

MR. GREEN: I would just like to ask another question. Having gained that clarification, I take it that everybody rich or poor, should be entitled to the assistance of the hospital plan, that my honourable friend agrees with that proposition? He doesn't believe that the government should just come in and assist the needy but they should assist everybody who is required to receive nursing home care?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the Minister may be working me into a Medicare ability-to-pay situation here that we have been arguing over for quite a while. Your question is that

MR. GREEN: The needy ones are now receiving care.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: That's right. The needy ones are now receiving care.

MR. GREEN: And we are saying it should go to everybody and you have just agreed with that, at least that's how I understood you.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: No, you are saying that you're going to the Federal Government . . .

MR. GREEN: To have them included under the hospital program which would mean that everybody would receive it.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Well, I think if everybody received it, the care that you're asking the Federal Government to consider, they should pay their hospital premiums. Right?

MR. GREEN: Right. That's what I want to know.

MR. BILTON: I had no intention of getting into this debate but the Minister by questioning prompts me to bring forward my thoughts . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I believe I interrupted one of the other honourable members who you had recognized. I have no objection to my honourable friend participating . . .

MR. BILTON: I regret if I have interrupted some other . . .

MR. GREEN: . . . but somebody else has received your eye.

MR. BILTON: I was going to be very brief anyway, Mr. Speaker, but however . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I'm not aware of what the intention of the Honourable Member for Rhineland was. Does the honourable member wish to speak at this time?

MR. FROESE: Yes. Mr. Speaker, my remarks will be brief too, but I think the resolution before us is a very worthy one and one that we should give consideration, because we have a very good example in our neighbouring community of an elderly couple - the wife is bedridden and has been for years and at certain times she will be removed to the hospital. During this time the pension cheque comes to the husband and this helps them to provide the necessary funds for their living expenses in their home; but as soon as she is removed to the nursing home they are expected to make payment to the nursing home and the cost of it is actually more than the pension cheque. That means that there's that much less for the husband to carry on and have the necessary means whereby to pay for living expenses, and you have a continual

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) swing back and forth; at times she is in the nursing home and then she has to go back to the hospital. So I feel, too, that for the chronically ill, for those that have to be cared for in this way that we should make it possible since we already have a Medicare program in this country that it should be extended and expanded to take in cases of this type. I certainly commend the Member for Fort Rouge for bringing the matter forward and having discussions on this point.

The party concerned has contacted me repeatedly whenever they had to move and it's not easy to get accommodation of this type for these people. It is very difficult in fact, there is always waiting lists and as a result these people have to contend with this difficulty as well as with trying to get the necessary means to pay for their living expenses as well. The gentleman concerned here finds it very difficult because as soon as she's taken to the nursing home then he has to pay the cost there and then there's not enough money to pay for living expenses, and by the time he might have social allowance brought forward again the thing might change and so you have a continual disruption here and this makes it very difficult for people of this type. I certainly would commend this resolution to honourable members.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, before you put the question, I would like to say a word or two if I may for the clarification of some of the points that the Minister brought up. I certainly appreciate the effort made by my colleague from Sturgeon Creek; I think he explained the thing very very well indeed. I find that in my own constituency with a senior citizens' home, until we get an extended care home there is quite a difficulty and there is quite a problem when these folk require some medicare or care that requires a little medical attention they are put into the hospital, and as you know, Mr. Speaker, the high cost of hospitalization these days is being watched by administrators and if it's only the ordinary care that they require it's a problem with the administrators to do something about them.

The point I'm trying to make, Mr. Speaker, having risen, the ability-to-pay complex came into it and what immediately comes to my mind is a person of whom I have knowledge, who is quite capable of paying her way at the moment, and possibly could do for 18 months or two years, pay the high cost of nursing home care that she is receiving now; but her mental worry, Mr. Speaker, is what is going to happen to her when those funds are gone. She wonders if she would be put out of this home, which she as I say is quite capable of paying for a little while longer; and I would suggest to the government in its wisdom if it would inquire into this matter, get the thoughts of the administrators of these nursing homes where these people are paying their way in the savings that they have created over a lifetime which are fast running out at the high cost it is for them to stay in these homes, and they have nowhere else to go, and their concern, Mr. Speaker, at this particular time, is that as and when these funds run out what is going to happen to them, and if something could be done one way or another to relate it to them in a general way that as and when that time comes that all will be well and the province will take care of them. I think this is one of the problems that the old people are suffering with and is a big mental worry to them at this time, and I would ask the government in all sincerity to somehow or other look into this problem with a view to creating a feeling of contentment in the twilight years of these people that need help now and will to the end of their days.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Gladstone, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Rhineland and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Osborne in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, in the honourable member's absence, I would ask that this stand. (Agreed.)

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek. Stand? (Agreed.)

On the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Churchill. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

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

(MR. GREEN cont'd.)

Mr. Speaker, the next resolutions are all - none of them have yet been introduced. I wonder if the House will agree could we go to Page 11 of the Order Paper and take the Private Bills. See if there's anybody here to speak to those. (Agreed.)

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 36. Adjourned debate on second reading on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Logan. Bill No. 36. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. GREEN: Stand? (Agreed.)

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. Bill No. 64. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. GREEN: Take some time on it, Leonard.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this debate for the Honourable Member for Rhineland. I'm not sure if he's ready or not.

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

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

MR. GREEN: Look at the House, Mr. Speaker. The only member who is here is Bill No. 75. I wonder if we can go to Bill No. 75.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 75.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, that Bill No. 75, An Act to amend . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON presented Bill No. 70, An Act to validate By-law No. 656 of The Rural Municipality of Langford and By-law No. 1997 of The Town of Neepawa, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, this is merely an agreement between the Town of Neepawa and the Municipality of Langford. The airport was purchased in January 1969 by the Town of Neepawa. The agreement is that the runways will be tax free, the undeveloped land will have an agricultural rate, and any business development that takes place will of course be on a straight business tax rate. I think this pretty well explains it. It's quite a brief agreement and this is the contents of it. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member says there are agreements. I wonder if these agreements are by resolution or what.

MR. FERGUSON: By resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 75. The Honourable Member . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I understand the honourable member wishes to have this matter stand, Bill No. 75; which means that . . .

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker could we have the Souris Bill, the Member for Arthur's brought up?

MR. GREEN: Yes, go back to Bill No. 48. The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT presented Bill No. 48, An Act to incorporate the Souris Golf and Country Club, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, the bill was introduced in the House in my name because at that time the Member for Souris-Killarney was in hospital. I think with leave of the House the Member for Souris-Killarney would like to explain the bill.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, it will just be a very few words. The purpose of this bill here is that this golf club at Souris has been in existence for about fifty years at least. Many of the shareholders of their club have either died or moved away and in order to qualify to have a liquor license in the dining room it is necessary that they have a certain percentage of their shareholders vote in favour of it. The only way they could qualify with the Liquor Commission was to form a new company and this is the company here which they are forming to

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd.) corporate this Golf and Country Club under active members and the members here of the incorporation are stated in the bill. For many of you that have been in Souris this is one of the most beautiful golf clubs and I hope that many of you during Centennial year will get a chance to play a round of golf at this club. I am having either the solicitor for this bill, for the Country Club, or a member of the Country Club come and explain this bill when we go into committee.

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

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, can we call Bill No. 36 now - apparently the member is back.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Logan. Bill No. 36. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I just have a few comments to make on this bill. I firstly wish to express perhaps congratulations to the organization, the Manitoba Sports Federation, because I think that certainly -- (Interjection) -- okay, I'll try La Federation Manitoba et Les Sports . . . how's that? It is a known fact, Mr. Speaker, that it's pretty difficult to get the kind of money for sports and recreational activities in our community as is necessary and required. In fact, it's quite difficult. We all know that where you have better facilities, better recreation facilities our youngsters have a better opportunity to participate and as a result they have a better opportunity to make progress. I'm sure it's a known fact that many of our stars are better athletes, they're better because they had an opportunity to participate in and have facilities, that some of the lesser ones did not have those same opportunities.

I know that in some other parts of Canada, for instance in Ontario, they are much more advanced in the way of facilities than we are in Manitoba. I'm told that in almost any town with a population of 25,000 they have as many as two to three covered rinks with artificial ice, and for instance in Winnipeg this is far from anywhere near that point. Even in St. James-Assiniboia we have one covered rink for some 70 to 75,000 people which is a far cry to what some of the people have in some other parts of Canada.

I think this organization which is strictly voluntary, there'll be no help or money paid to any of the executives on this organization, their purpose is strictly to promote sports and recreation which is tremendous and I think this whole House should extend its compliments to this association. Now I know that they'll try and raise money through various means and perhaps if they got some expert advice and expert coaching staff well these will have to be paid and that's the whole purpose why they wish to raise money. I know one thing that they have in mind is perhaps the lottery system will be, after our centennial year is finished, maybe the lottery system can be run by this organization strictly to support all kinds of sports, it doesn't matter what field it is or what area. I think it's most encouraging to this House and most encouraging to most people in Manitoba that there are people like this that are prepared to give their time, and not only time, I know it will cost - whenever one gives time, it costs you money and you have to make sacrifices and there are these people. So I'm certainly in agreement and I know that many of our youngsters will have better opportunity to participate in many of the sports activities that they would probably not have if it wouldn't be for this organization and I wish to offer it all the success that we can.

I should also like to point out that this organization, what it really has in mind, is to be able to have more instructors in our recreational area which is something that we do not have at the present time. I know that there has been great concern in the last few weeks because the Federal Government was thinking of withdrawing some of the funds for the amateur sport, and if this is the case, I feel it is most unfortunate.

The other point, Mr. Speaker, that I don't think this House should pass the opportunity to make mention of, one person that we all know who has passed away, and that is Dr. Frank Kennedy. I know he was a friend of everyone in this House and has done a tremendous amount for sports in this city. I think his latest contribution was the Manitoba Bisons winning the Canadian football champion for all of Canada, which I know at that time, very few people believed that the Manitoba University could have done it, because they have only been in that sports area for only a few years while some of the Eastern colleges have had football competitions for many, many years. They have more resources, much more money; they have had stadiums and they have been in operation for many years and I think great credit should be given,

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.) because I think Dr. Kennedy was instrumental in having football at the University of Manitoba and with his coaches who I am very personally familiar with because the whole coaching staff at one time has been with the Winnipeg Blue Bombers and I think that great credit should be given to those people. I think that the late Doctor Kennedy was a friend of sports in this province. He was the driving force in the University of Manitoba in establishing the physical fitness program in the University.

It is also a known fact that Dr. Kennedy was very active in other areas as well. He was a member of the Pan Am American Games Track and Field Committee in 1967; he was the Chairman of the Canadian Amateur Hockey Association. He was also a member of the Canadian Conference on Children; he was a member of the Scholarship and Fellowship Committee of the National Fitness and Amateur Sport Directorship. He was a sub-committee chairman of the Community Chest for youth service. He was a member of the Steering Committee for Recreation Division of the Community Chest and Planning Council. He was President of the Canadian Association for Health and Physical Education and Recreation of the Manitoba Branch and President of the Western Canada Inter-Collegiate Athletic Association as well. It was always said that he was a physical educator first and foremost and I think this is so true of this late Dr. Frank Kennedy; I think he certainly made a tremendous contribution to the Manitoba sports scene.

So, Mr. Speaker, I was certainly in full support of this bill, but I did not want to let the opportunity go by without mentioning the late Dr. Frank Kennedy who I had on many occasions opportunity to talk to him about sport and physical fitness, not only at the University but our schools and various programs throughout the province. I'm sure that, perhaps, some of the other members who were acquainted with this late gentleman will probably have a remark to say about him as well.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

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

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on the assumption that nobody would want to introduce a resolution at this time, I . . .

MR. CRAIK: The Member for Roblin actually did want to -- 22 is very short I understand.

MR. GREEN: Okay. Would you call No. 22, Mr. Speaker. Well we'll have to stand No. 21, the member is not here. So No. 22. (Stand 21.)

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution 22. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, Whereas a dangerous traffic hazard exists at all railway crossings, and Whereas the present light equipment on railroad locomotives may be confused with other vehicles, Therefore Be It Resolved that the Canadian Transport Commission be urged to effect legislation requiring all locomotives be equipped with an appropriate flashing dome light in order to give motorists a distinctive warning of an appropriate . . .

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MCKENZIE: Well, Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple resolution. It's one I think that deserves the attention of the House. It was brought to my attention by the Manitoba Motor League and it's one that they have approved and passed and thought that it should deserve the attention of the House. I don't think I have to speak on it at all. It's well explained. Private railway crossings today, especially in the country and possibly in the city, are a real hazard with the present lighting system on locomotives and we all know what a flashing light will do to draw our attention. So with those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I leave the resolution to the mercy of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

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

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I take it that there is now no disposition to introduce any further resolutions, so if we can call it 5:30, I'll move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture that the House do now adjourn. Everybody have a nice holiday.

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