

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

10:00 o'clock, Friday, April 16, 1971

Opening prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions.

REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the first interim report of the Special Committee of seven persons appointed to prepare a list of persons to comprise the Standing Committees ordered by this House.

MR. CLERK: Your Special Committee of seven persons appointed to prepare a list of members of the Standing Committees ordered by this House beg leave to present the following as their first and interim report.

Your committee met and returned the following list of members to compose the Standing Committee on Law Amendments ordered by the House:

Hon. Messrs. Evans, Green, Hanuschak, Mackling, Miller, Paulley, Toupin; Messrs. Allard, Barrow, Beard, Bilton, Boyce, Desjardins, Enns, Froese, Gonick, Graham, Jenkins, Johannson, Johnston (Portage), Jorgenson, McGill, McKenzie, Petursson, Shafransky, Sherman, Spivak, Mrs. Trueman and Mr. Turnbull.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion -- (Interjection) -- Sorry. The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, that the report of the Committee be received.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage, that debate be adjourned.

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

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management): Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the leave of the House just to indicate that we want the Law Amendments Committee set up as soon as possible so I trust my honourable friend will be letting this -- or having remarks that he wants to make -- . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Would the Honourable Minister speak up so I can hear him?

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'm just urging my honourable friend, the Member for Rhineland, that we would like to have this committee set up as early as possible and I would hope that he would be ready to proceed with it on Monday.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: I haven't seen the copy of the report. If this is this pertaining only to the Law Amendments Committee -- (Interjection) -- then, Mr. Speaker, I'll forego my remarks at this time and have the motion proceed.

MR. SPEAKER put the question on the motion to receive the report of the committee and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J. R. (Bud) BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre) introduced Bill No. 21, an Act to amend The Optometry Act. (Second reading Monday next.)

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I'd like to direct the members' attention to the gallery where there are nine members of the 6th Company of Guides. The company is under

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd) the direction of Mrs. G. Molgat and is from the constituency of St. Vital. Also in the gallery are nine members of the Ste. Margaret's Cubs under the direction of Mrs. G. M. Empey. These cubs are from the constituency of Wolseley. We also have a 4-H group from Oak Bluff, 14 members. They are under the direction of Miss Debbie Kozak. They are from the constituency of the Honourable Member for Morris.

On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislature, I welcome you here today.

Orders of the Day.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C. (Leader of the Opposition)(River Heights): Well, Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to ask a question but I'd like to ask the question of the First Minister to indicate who my question should be directed to, and this would be in connection with the bilateral agreements, and particularly the bilateral agreement providing for access from Winnipeg to Chicago by a Canadian carrier. Would that be to yourself or the Minister of Industry and Commerce?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I would advise the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition that matters pertaining to air transportation insofar as they may relate to Manitoba's interests are still being handled by the Department of Industry and Commerce and by the Minister as they have been in the past, so that the honourable member should direct his question to the Minister of Industry.

MR. SPIVAK: to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder if he could present a report of where we stand now with the possibility of a direct access from Winnipeg to Chicago by a Canadian carrier.

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

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry & Commerce)(Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I can assure the honourable member and all members of the House that we have had considerable communication with Ottawa on the progress that is being made in the matter. I can indicate that considerable progress has occurred in the last several months. If members wish, I can perhaps provide more detailed information at some future time.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder whether the Minister can inform the House whether he has been in consultation directly with the Federal Minister involved in the last six months.

MR. EVANS: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The First Minister.

STATEMENT

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I should like to make an announcement.

Honourable Members are no doubt aware of the fact that in the past year, approximately, as a result of exploration activity and other work performed by Sherritt-Gordon Mining Company, a large scale copper mine is being readied for production in northern Manitoba in near proximity to Ruttan Lake, and in connection with that resource development I wish to announce that, as a result of negotiations between the Province of Manitoba and Sherritt-Gordon Limited, a new townsite for about 3,500 people will be developed near Sherritt-Gordon's Ruttan Lake mining property under an arrangement that is, we believe, precedent-setting in Canada. The precedent in the townsite development is that the accessible surface property of the mining company in the area will be put on the local tax roll for all taxation purposes just as any other business or commercial establishment is now being taxed in the province.

Before I go on to give further details I'd like to make honourable members aware that the President of Sherritt-Gordon Mining, David Thomas, and Peter Kane, Vice President of Mining, Sherritt-Gordon, General Manager of the Lynn Lake operation, are with us today in the Speaker's Gallery.

May I go on to say that up until now mining townsites have operated under various agreements with mining companies under which certain community assets were provided by

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) the mining company in return for special local tax considerations. The new townsite is to be located near Leak Rapids on the Churchill River, 60 miles southeast of Lynn Lake on the Lynn Lake-Thompson highway now under construction. The public services will be designed to accommodate about 3,500 people. The townsite is expected to have about 600 single family and duplex houses, 165 multiple dwelling units and accommodation for at least 100 single men as well as associated commercial, business and professional enterprises. The development plan calls for the first residents to be located in the townsite before the end of the year.

The infrastructure to support this community is estimated to cost about 7.5 million and will include a school, medical nursing unit, recreation complex, municipal office, public works garage and equipment, firehall and safety equipment, water supply and distribution, sewage collection and disposal systems, street sidewalks and street lighting. At the outset, the province will advance the capital costs of the infrastructure for the new community and will recover these costs by way of annual amortized payments through local taxation. The province will establish a new local government district and a school district with coterminous boundaries which will include both the townsite and mine site, and will appoint an administrator, an official school trustee.

I wish to say that we are pleased with the example of good corporate citizenship displayed by Sherritt-Gordon in the negotiations to date and we feel that the formal agreement that is now in process of being drafted pursuant to this understanding arrived at could well become a pattern for townsite development in new mining areas in the future.

The birth of this new town is an important milestone in the history of our province. The townsite and the mining development which lies behind it will play a growing role in northern development and will add to the economic impetus of the province as a whole, expanding employment opportunities particularly for those now resident in northern Manitoba. The townsite is situated, for information of honourable members, the townsite is situated on a colourful esker surrounded by natural recreational areas. It will be developed through close and continuing cooperation between the mining company and the province. The proposed location is, if I may add a personal note, Mr. Speaker, in very close proximity to one of the most picturesque settings in the province near the Granville Lake, Churchill River area. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the Honourable Member for Riel asking a question?

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): No, I'm just replying to this.

MR. SPEAKER: On behalf of his Leader?

MR. CRAIK: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, we're very pleased to hear the announcement by the First Minister regarding the arrangements with Sherritt-Gordon Mines, mostly because first of all this mining development is very important to Manitoba and of course Sherritt-Gordon is one of the well-established companies in Manitoba that has been a good corporate citizen for many years. It dates back in Manitoba's mining history.

The arrangements that are made in particular with reference to a townsite I'm sure will lead to the type of development which we're all desirous of, where we have local participation by the people through the assessment and the type of assessment of property that has been worked out. The First Minister has indicated that this is one of the first -- I do recall that either a study had been done on an intensive basis in Sudbury not long ago or that arrangements had been finalized in Sudbury to make similar moves in Ontario whereby mining developments and the communities are treated on the same basis as the manufacturing communities in other areas. I think at the same time that the government has made its move in this direction whereby the assessment, full assessment is made of the mine and of the equipment used, that it would be valuable if the First Minister could have indicated the projected assessment, commercial assessment in the area and not just the \$7.5 million investment by the people of Manitoba in the community. If he can do this at this time it would give us considerably more to go on in terms of assessing what this means in the overall picture.

The other factor here is of course that if the government is making a move in this direction where mining communities are assessed as other sectors of the private industrial community are, that they should also consider the implications of the mining taxation policies of the government with particular reference to the very large increases that were made in mining taxation last year which put mining communities at the top of the taxation scale in

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) Canada and was done partly on the ground, and it has always been done partly on the grounds of the fact that they have never been assessed on property on the same basis that other industrial communities have been. I trust that the government in its moves and in the threats that have been made, if I can call them threats, by the First Minister - which I think were possibly denied by him at a later date but nevertheless were printed in considerable detail - to increase the mining royalties taxation by a fairly large significant amount again this year that this will be taken into account, that the mines in this particular case at least are now being put on the same basis as other industrial communities are, because I believe myself that by the time the taxation of our mining community is added up you'll find that through industrial taxation at the federal level and through mining royalty taxation at the provincial level and through industrial taxation at the provincial level plus sales tax, that the mining industry is now at this time taxed at a higher rate, by far, than any other of our commercial communities, and that if the First Minister's remarks made in recent months are a reality, that the mining community can face itself with considerably more taxation than they are now faced with.

Now with particular respect to the announcement made, I wonder if the First Minister or his ministers could advise us of the projected assessment, the commercial assessment at Ruttan Lake. Could he also indicate whether the \$7.5 million includes the cost outside of the townsite such as the road. Has any decision been made on the costs of the road that will service the town, and can he indicate to us what arrangements have been made by Hydro for supply of power to the area, particularly for the mining operation itself and other utilities such as the telephone, although that's of minor consequence at this time.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed, I'd like to offer my apologies to the House for introducing two groups that were here yesterday. I inadvertently received the wrong sheet. I should also like to inform the House that we had visitors from the University of North Dakota, 18 students who just left, and this too was the reason for my apology.

On behalf of the House I would certainly like to welcome them, even though they have left.

STATEMENT (Cont'd)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I didn't realize that the Honourable Member for Rhineland was wishing to reply to the statement which I made -- well, to speak of it. If he does, then I'll take my place; but if not I just wanted to offer an explanatory note to my honourable friend the Member for Riel.

MR. SPEAKER: I must inform the House that under our rules we do not have replies from individual members. If the Member for Rhineland wishes a question, I shall entertain that.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would like to know under what rule you're making that ruling. It's a new practice; it's something we have not had heretofore and I certainly would like to know, and if not, then I challenge your ruling because I would like to comment on the

MR. SCHREYER: I apologize to you for making your task more difficult than it need be. I do believe it's a fact that under the rules only a member of a formally constituted, recognized party can reply to a statement made on motions. The problem is that the Member for Rhineland has always occupied a special place in my heart and so therefore I always tend to recognize him as being able to make a formal statement. Still, Mr. Speaker, I do believe under the rules that the honourable member cannot make a statement on motions except by leave, which is always possible. Anything is possible, by leave, in this Chamber.

MR. SPEAKER: That is true. The Honourable Member for Morris, is it on a point of order?

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): The same point of order, Mr. Speaker. I don't think there is anything - and this is one of the difficulties that I have seen in this Chamber ever since I've come to it - there is no provision even for making statements by Ministers under our present rules and I hope that when the new rules are adopted that there is going to be a special provision, a special rule set out for the making of ministerial statements and those who are entitled to reply to those statements. At the present time I can't

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd). . . . find anything that clarifies this particular point, and if there is such a ruling, Sir, I would like to be able to find it myself.

MR. SPEAKER: For the edification of the members, although we do not have a rule of our own, in our rules we do fall back on the House of Commons practice, and on Page 84 of Beauchesne, Section 91, "It is now firmly established that the Leader of the Opposition or the chiefs of recognized groups are entitled to ask explanations and make a few remarks, but no debate is then allowed under any standing order." -- (Interjection) -- Well, I cannot see how - and I'm not going to enter into debate. I'd just like to make this statement for the record now: how one individual can call himself a party or a group -- (Interjection) -- The matter is closed.

Order please. -- (Interjection) -- I do not see enough members. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: If I may then, I'm not replying, I'm just - by leave, I suppose - indicating to the Honourable Member for Riel who posed a number of questions that the procedure we followed was to have this statement or announcement made to the House. Further elaboration will be given by the honourable gentlemen I referred to, the President and Vice-President of the mining company, by my colleague the Minister of Mines and Resources at a press conference later today, and then of course during subsequent sittings of this House it will be possible to deal with many of the points that you've raised.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: I thank the First Minister for his reply. I think though that my particular questions were with respect to items such as the road servicing the town and the projected assessment which I think are in direct relation to your announcement. Since we won't be present at the press conference we will have no opportunity to ask it.

MR. SCHREYER: I would suggest to the honourable member that a specific question such as that, I would suggest either one of two courses of action: either you can direct them to my colleague during the Question Period later today or next week or to file an Order for Return, written questions requiring specific detailed answers.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, basically a supplementary question. I take it then the Premier will have no objection of filing the documents relating to the negotiations, including the Hydro agreement, with the House.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, at the earliest appropriate time, yes.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health and Social Development regarding the granting of welfare assistance to strikers in Flin Flon. Have any changes been made in the last 48 hours?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health & Social Development)(Springfield): Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Consumer, Corporate & Internal Services) (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, a question was directed to the Honourable Attorney-General yesterday which ought to have been directed to me regarding the availability of bills passed during the last session. I can inform the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge that printing is complete in both the bound form for members and the looseleaf supplements. This has been done within the last while during - I haven't the exact date, but during that period of time when there were other rather important events going on. Perhaps the honourable member would check her mail, commencing with the time of the election call and ending with April 5th - within that time that had been done.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of Health and Social Development. It is pertaining to the sanatorium at Ninette. I'm wondering if the Minister has any definite policy decision made as to the future of the sanatorium at Ninette?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I could try and explain in a few brief words what we are

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd). . . . doing now with the sanatorium at Ninette but I'd prefer taking the question as notice and having a more detailed report.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the same Minister, the Minister of Health and Social Development. With respect to the proposed Seven Oaks Hospital and Clinic combination, is it the intention of the government to ensure that the Seven Oaks Hospital will be a hospital in the full sense of the word and not a minor operation where all treatment cannot be offered?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, this is, as I mentioned a few weeks ago, being negotiated by the Department of Health and Social Development and the Manitoba Health Services Commission and the hospital board itself in Seven Oaks and with all other supporting staff needed for the venture that we want to see in Seven Oaks. I think it's too premature now to give the definite structure of the proposed facilities for Seven Oaks. It's still under negotiation and it's not final as yet.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Then it is understood that it is not settled that it will be a regular hospital in the sense of the word. So my second question is based on a news clipping if I may be allowed to quote. The statement is talking about the set-up of the Seven Oaks Hospital and Clinic and he says: "Some sort of membership fee for the persons the clinic will serve. This could be coupled with a deterrent to prevent clinic members from using medical services elsewhere." So my question is, is this going to be government policy, to stop people from going to the doctor or the clinic of their choice?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, it could be considered by government and eventually either become or not become government policy.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question to the Minister. Would he not be prepared to say that the concept of a community clinic is not really the concept of a hospital as indicated by the Member from Portage la Prairie?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, the concept that we have in mind and are negotiating now, regarding Seven Oaks and other facilities in the province we consider will be unique in North America.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the First Minister would indicate whether the concept he's talking about is not now in operation in Sault Ste. Marie?

MR. SCHREYER: Is the honourable member directing his question to me? If he is, I would say that I'm aware that there are community clinics in operation in Ste. Catherines, Ontario, Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, Cooperstown, New York, and a few other places, but whether or not the operation of these particular clinics will be the same mode of operation and organization followed by any community clinics established in Manitoba is difficult to say at this point in time.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the First Minister would be in a position some time to indicate to the House when it becomes unique to Manitoba as to what we are talking about.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Services. -- (Interjection) -- Well, it will be a new question. On the same topic, is it not true that under the federal Medicare scheme that a person has freedom of choice as to what doctor he wishes to have and wouldn't this be contrary to that rule?

MR. TOUPIN: Unless, Mr. Speaker, the consumer of a certain type of need decides otherwise. They do this in some areas. If you take the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to inform yourself on the structure and the operation of the venture that they have in Ste. Catherines, which is a health unit and not a health and social development centre, you will find out that the choice is left up to the individual consumers of that type of need.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Has this government had any negotiations with the Federal Government in reference to securing grants for their mineral explorations company that they propose to set up?

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

MR. GREEN: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Mines and Resources if the government are taking any action with regards to the situation that has developed along the 49th parallel where the Americans have charged acts of hostility on the part of Canadian farmers, and if any negotiations have taken place with the American government to make sure that this doesn't break out into warfare.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, at the level that the honourable member has put the question, it would appear to me to be a question that could only properly be answered by the Minister for External Affairs who doesn't sit in this House, but I assure you that the Manitoba Government is doing nothing which would result in the escalation of hostilities.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

HON. PETER BURTONIAK (Minister of Tourism, Recreation, and Cultural Affairs) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave of the House to table a report of the Manitoba Censorship Review Board. Copies will be distributed to all members of the Assembly. I don't wish to make any further comment on it except to say that I will be inviting the comments from the members of the House when they read the report before any decision will be made.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the Honourable Minister of Tourism can inform us whether the Review Board's report has been discussed with his colleague next to him, the Minister of Transportation, particularly with respect to the "Minitoban" that was published yesterday.

MR. BURTONIAK: No.

MR. SPEAKER: If gentlemen do not wish to be introduced, they shouldn't rise. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: My question is to the First Minister, Mr. Speaker. With respect to the \$300 million which has been allotted by the Federal Government for the 1971-72 period for special projects to the provinces with respect to regional economic development, in a dollar value, could the Premier tell us what applications have been made by the Province of Manitoba and also the number of them?

MR. SPEAKER: I would suggest a question asking for detailed information of that nature would probably be better as an Order for Return.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: With respect I say this, Mr. Speaker, but usually the Minister indicates whether or not it is suitable for an Order or he can answer it.

MR. SCHREYER: On a point of order, then. I think it's quite in order for you, Sir, to indicate whether or not a question can better be left as an Order for Return. On the other hand, it's open to the Minister to make that suggestion as well. I think it's really open to both the Chair and to the Minister. May I suggest to the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie that I'll be quite happy to take the question as notice and provide that information just as soon as possible.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. McGill, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return -- I'm sorry, from Brandon West -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: No, it is not before the House. This is the one on Page 2 at the bottom. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, I don't mind starting over again. I would move, seconded by the Member for Brandon West, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the following information under the Social Allowance Act, Chapter S160 in the Manitoba Statutes, Section 5 (h) as amended at the last session:

- (1) How many applications for assistance were received?
- (2) How many requests for assistance were granted - male and female?
- (3) What was the total cost of the program to date?

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I did have a tendency to want to have this stand because there seems to be discrimination between male and female here which is not readily

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd).... acceptable to myself. -- (Interjection) -- No, not really.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Minister wish to put it over for debate?

MR. TOUPIN: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: It shall be done.

GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading government bills. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I adjourned debate on second reading of Bill No. 3 for the Honourable Member for Roblin, and I yield the floor to him.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With regard to Bill No. 3, I represent an area which has unorganized territory and municipal government as well, and I find that there are some problems that I would like to draw to the attention of the Minister with regard to the cocktail lounges in unorganized and municipal municipalities, whereby a cocktail license is actually of no value. I can't see, and I've talked to some of those people who are in the business in a town such as Pine River or Ethelbert, and they very very seldom have need for a cocktail license. A cocktail is just something that is hardly ever called for, but at the same time a dining room license seems to be acceptable to the industry there, and if there was some way that the two could be conjoined, where they could have the cocktail license and the dining room work together some way rather than have them separate, I think it would be most helpful to the industry.

The other thing that I was concerned, and possibly this will correct it, where shot liquor could be sold in the beer parlours in the unorganized territory but it couldn't be sold in the municipalities. I could stand to be corrected on that, but that's the understanding that I'm getting. This will correct it.

The other one was that I think that possibly the Minister should try and not compare some of the rural hotels with the city hotels. I think there is quite a difference in the type of trade and the industry in general in both areas.

There was one other matter and that would be the matter of the signatures for these vendors. Apparently a vendor still has to accept signatures in a hotel for the purchase of off-sale beer, whereas if he goes to his liquor store today he is not required to sign. I understand from information that I got that it's still required in the hotels in the country today. There was possibly another question that has risen to my attention, while we are dealing with the Liquor Control Act, and that's the vendor pads apparently must be stored by the hotel man and kept for some six months. Maybe the Minister can take a look at that, which seems to be a problem in some of the hotels.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. In speaking to this Bill on the Liquor Control Act, I want to refresh the memories of some of the members of the House on the legislation that was passed last year. On the promotion of the Member for Rupertsland, we had significant changes made in the Liquor Act which permitted beverage rooms to sell hard liquor by the shot where votes had been previously taken and the qualifications for the operation of cocktail lounges, etc., had been approved by the ratepayers.

At the time of the debate the Member for Rupertsland stressed quite impressively to the House the main reason behind his suggested changes in the legislation. He wanted the average, common working man to be given the opportunity of purchasing hard liquor in an atmosphere in which he was thoroughly familiar. In his argument he stated that there were many cocktail lounges where the average workman would feel rather out of place and he felt that he would be far more comfortable in his beverage room, ordinary beverage room surroundings. This was his argument for the change in legislation, and the majority of the members of this Chamber must have agreed with him or the legislation would not have been passed.

Since that time, I would like to ask the Minister how many licensed beverage rooms have now availed themselves of the opportunity of selling hard liquor where the necessary regulations had been previously met, and I would also like to know how many beverage rooms would like to do this but the present legislation prevents them from doing it because they have not had that necessary vote or maybe they are in an unorganized area where it is impossible to have a

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd)... vote. Are we really dealing with a significant number of beverage room operators who by law cannot operate or sell hard liquor? Is this a significant number, because if it is, or even if it affects only ten or twelve, I think that we have to change the law to cover those people.

But there is one other thing that to me is equally disturbing, and that is when we in our collective wisdom in this Chamber pass laws which we consider to be for the benefit of the, in this case, the common working man, and that responsibility for that law then rests with a certain member of the front bench and he in turn turns this over to his department and the regulations governing the enforcement of that Act are then drafted, and down through the chain of office the implementation of those regulations and the interpretation of those regulations by the various members of his group, I think at times we can find that the original intent of an Act can sometimes be lost in the chain reaction that develops from the original passing of the Act to the final implementation of that Act in the field.

I would like to ask the Minister since this change came about, of the number of licensed beverage rooms which have availed themselves of the opportunity to sell hard liquor, how many of those hotels have been forced through the regimentation of the Liquor Board to make changes in their premises. I would also like to know how much the cost of renovation to their premises has been in order to meet the requirements of the Liquor Board, because Mr. Speaker, I suspect that we may eventually be defeating the original intent of the Act through the rigid specifications laid down by the Liquor Control Board in areas where the market is relatively limited - and I'm talking about small villages and small towns where even a good day's sale in a beverage room is almost a dead loss in another area. The marked difference in the volume of sales is directly related to the number of people that are in that particular area.

I ran into some rather interesting things in my particular area which I think really have no significance whatsoever to the sale of hard liquor, and Mr. Speaker, I fail to see why it is necessary to have arms on a chair in a beverage room in order to sell hard liquor. I fail to see why there are certain credentials set down or specifications set down for the latrines that were permissible to operate as beverage rooms that no longer meet the regulations for the sale of hard liquor.

If my suspicions are correct, I think that there may be places where the regulations laid down by the Liquor Board make the total picture unacceptable in small areas where the cost of the renovations as laid down by the Liquor Board would rule out any possibility of the operator making those necessary changes and having sufficient volume of business to ever recoup his investment. So the original intent that was put into this change in legislation last year by the Member for Rupertsland may very well be lost. If the owner of the establishment cannot afford to make the necessary changes then the common working man in that area will still not be able to buy hard liquor in a licensed beverage room.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these are some of the concerns that I have. I sincerely hope that the Minister can provide me with some of the information that I have asked him for and I hope that we will have improved conditions and those working men that so far have not been able to buy hard liquor in a beverage room in a small area will soon be able to have that opportunity. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, while I am not too well versed in the matter of the Liquor Act and all its provisions, not fraternizing those establishments as some other people might, however this particular bill deals with Section 122 of the Liquor Act which deals with special authority for the sale of liquor and I'm just wondering whether the Minister could give us a few more details. I certainly have no quarrel with the matter of decentralizing control which I think this particular section will do. It asks the local area to authorize this, and where authorization is or has been made, that this would be possible. But I would like to know the number of requests for this particular change in legislation. Is it requested by many groups? Are there a number of applications pending if this goes through? What areas are involved actually. Other members may be more informed on this than I am. And then too the urgency of the matter - I can't say why this bill would have to come in at this particular time - what are the reasons for its urgency?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Attorney-General.

HON. A.H. MACKLING, Q.C. (Attorney-General)(St. James): Well, Mr. Chairman, if no one else wishes to speak I would like to be able to answer those who have addressed

(MR. MACKLING cont'd). . . . remarks to the bill in closing debate. I appreciate the concerns of the honourable members for Roblin and Birtle-Russell. The Honourable Member for Roblin does have within his constituency at least one beverage room licensee, as I understand it, who does not presently have the facility of obtaining a license because of the particular wording of the Act, or the amendment as it was passed in the last session.

The whole spirit and intent of the present Liquor Control Act is as fashioned by this Legislature many years ago, as the result of the very detailed study of the Bracken Commission, is based upon an interrelationship of a number of factors. The sale of alcoholic beverages is recognized as appropriate to be handled under very strict control, governmental control, because it is a chemical comfort which in the hands of some people can produce serious conditions and therefore rigid standards are employed throughout the framework of the Act to ensure high standards of control in respect to the sale and consumption of alcoholic beverage, and this I think honourable members will agree is how it should be. The dictum laid down in the Bracken Enquiry Commission report, and as confirmed by legislation passed many years ago in this House, provides essentially for the principles I have indicated of rigid control and high standard of operations. It is therefore not something that is taken lightly when changes are made in the type and condition and quality of license that is permitted to someone who takes on the responsibility of selling alcoholic beverage to the public.

I appreciate the fact that there is concern that in the chain of command, if you can call it that, or if in the implementation of the legislation that the administrators can modify maybe perhaps the intent and wish of the Legislature in the carrying out of legislation, but I think in this instance the Liquor Control Commission Board and the Licensing Board are cognizant of the very strong wishes of the people of Manitoba that there be high standards and high quality and firm control of licensed premises everywhere in Manitoba. And I think that by and large members of this House have recognized the value of this attitude on the part of not just the present Liquor Control Commission Board and the Licensing Board but the licensing boards that have been extant in the past, and this high standard is demanded I think of this Legislature and we want it to continue.

I do think that the quality of the decor in rural licensed premises need not be to the same high quality or standard, the same rigid standards as they are in highly populated urban areas where the economics certainly could warrant a higher introduction of capital on the part of the entrepreneur, but basically the Liquor Control Commission Board informs me that what they're concerned about is maintaining a quality of premise which is commensurate with the high degree of responsibility which the licensed vendor has and satisfaction to the consuming public. The liquor sale industry is not one of very marginal existence. I think by and large the history of this industry indicates in Manitoba, as it has elsewhere, that there is a relatively high profit margin in the whole industry and the commission, the Liquor Control Commission Board expects that the industry can afford to maintain a high degree of cleanliness standard and quality in the premises that sell alcoholic beverage and I think that's the way that this Legislature expected the legislation would be implemented and the Act would be administered. I think, Mr. Speaker, that that is the attitude that the Commission takes in respect to all of these licensed premises.

In respect to the new licenses possible to those who hold beverage room licenses, this has given the Liquor Control Commission an opportunity to again ensure high standards in beverage rooms and maintain high qualities of service and product. I think this is as it should be; this has ensured a high quality of facilities throughout Manitoba.

The Member from Birtle-Russell, Mr. Speaker, did indicate to me earlier that he wanted some specific information as to numbers involved. I have undertaken to supply him that information and I intend to give those specifics when we are at Law Amendments Committee so that all members will have them before them. My recollection is however, and I stand to be corrected because I'm merely recalling them from memory, is that there were approximately 23 applications outstanding for this type of license that the Liquor Control Licensing Board could not furnish because of the restrictions in the present Act. There have been a large number of beverage room licensees who have taken advantage of the new license arrangements and have upgraded facilities, and I don't think the expense has been anything which they could not reasonably afford on the basis of the economics of their particular operation. My understanding is that everything has been working out extremely well in respect to the functioning of the new licenses.

(MR. MACKLING cont'd)....

The Member has some specific concerns about qualities of decor and facilities, chairs and so on - and I won't deal with the washrooms, I think we want high quality washrooms everywhere - but the attitude towards chairs is simply that I think that most often an armchair seems to have, as it has in this Assembly, much more aesthetic quality to it. There are other factors which I'm sure that the Liquor Control Commission have gone into very carefully, that is you can't crowd as many chairs into a facility as quickly and remove them before the inspectors get there and so on when they are armchairs. I'm certain that those things, those details have been reviewed very thoroughly by the members of the Board who have a concern to make sure that the best standards at reasonable costs are maintained.

I think, Mr. Speaker, with those remarks I hope that I've answered the questions except for the specific numbers which members would like, specific information, and I'll be happy to produce those at Law Amendments Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? -- (Interjection) -- The honourable member has already spoken. -- (Interjection) -- The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Will the Minister permit one question? If your assumption is correct that there is a high profit margin in the hotel operation, then why is there such a high percentage, especially rural hotels, listed for sale at the present time?

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think most people are aware of the fact that there has been throughout western Canada generally in the rural areas a problem in respect to the agricultural sector. There has been in effect a marked economic downturn. The proponents of the federal grain policies indicate that there is optimism now that there is an upturn, and I'm hopeful that with a combination of factors, perhaps with depressed grain yields elsewhere in the world and so on, there will be a renewed vigor in the economics of the prairie rural sector which is highly dependent upon the grain trade. But this is just simply a matter of conjecture. I think it's fair to say that local industry in the rural economy throughout the whole of the prairies in Canada has suffered from a decline in the economic power and purchasing power of the people in the communities and I think this is reflected in many industries, not just the hotel industry.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Minister, I understand that under the present regulations that the liquor vendors in Birch River, if you like, and Benito are not allowed to sell beer. With the passage of this bill is it likely that it will be changed in order that the liquor outlets will be allowed to sell beer by the case?

MR. MACKLING: I would have to take that question as notice. That has nothing to do with this bill, it has no bearing on it at all. The vendor provisions are not in any way affected, the existing vendor provisions in any way affected by this change which deals merely with beverage room licensees. Now if the honourable member wishes me to take that as notice and formulate a question, speak to me about it, I'll be happy to go into it. That's a separate matter altogether. -- (Interjection) -- All right, if you'll give me the specifics I'll be happy to deal with it.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

MR. BURTONIAK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have this matter stand. (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, with respect to second reading of Bill No. 9. I would ask leave of the House to permit this matter to continue to stand in my name, but at the same time permit anyone else who wishes to speak on it at this time to do so.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. With respect to Bill No. 9, the changing in the local government in Metro Winnipeg, there is certainly some concern on the part of the members of this side of the House and I'm sure the people of Manitoba at large. We on this side are proposing or have suggested that we hold a meeting with the members of the various mayors and councils throughout this area which will be held next Thursday, Thursday morning, to listen to their suggestions with regard to the implications of this proposed piece of legislation. Any piece of legislation which is of a retroactive nature certainly must be dealt or viewed with concern. It could conceivably place some elected officials, who have so far been acting very responsibly, could possibly mean that they have violated the Act if it is retroactive. So for this reason, Mr. Speaker, we want to hear the views of all the people

(MR. GRAHAM, cont'd.) . . . that are concerned and assess their expressions on this piece of legislation.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion stand in the Honourable Member for Fort Garry? (Agreed). The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, basically I do agree with lotteries in the province and certainly the last one was a great success. There's one or two items I wanted to point out, is where the bulk of the proceeds from the lotteries in the future will be going. Will it be spread out throughout the communities of the province and what percentages will be, or will it be going into something major probably within the bounds of the city? Also on the percentages that is left in the communities that is picked up by the selling agents, I think that this should be increased, because once you've gone through a community with tickets worth \$2.50, if that is the price they're going to stay at, it has a damaging effect on other projects in the community because once somebody has spent \$2.50 on a ticket they position themselves where they almost have to say that they're not prepared to buy another \$1.00 ticket on an automobile raffle and you could have community clubs or legions or service clubs that are carrying on another project that won't be quite as successful had the lottery not been carried on at the same time. The percentage that was left in the communities last time, I think that our area could only find about \$700.00 left with us on the sales that took place out there between the community clubs, service clubs, etc., and I think that this has to be increased in order that there is a better result for each community that participates. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, I have no objections to the basic lottery itself.

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

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak at this time I would move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Government bill. The Honourable Minister of Youth and Education.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Youth and Education)(Seven Oaks) presented Bill No. 13, an Act to amend The Public Schools Act (1), for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Youth and Education.

MR. MILLER: Mr. — (Interjection) — Dispense? Gladly. Mr. Speaker, this bill is really to provide for increases in support under the Foundation Program. The details, or most of what this bill purports to do has already been known to school boards and to councils because the Act made it necessary that this information be made available because of the late start of the House.

Basically it provides a grant of \$12.00 per pupil for the purpose of providing to pupils the authorized textbooks which they now receive, but as well it will give to the school boards the flexibility within these amounts to purchase such additional items as library and reference books, filmstrips. These things were not under the textbook grant before. In fact I think it will open up a much wider range, a whole range of instructional materials which school boards can now purchase under this grants formula. It replaces the former one which, as I say, restricted the actual use to which this money could be placed and limited it to a list, a prescribed list of authorized textbooks. This provision will of course apply to both the unitary and non-unitary divisions just as it did in the past.

Another section in the Act is a provision for amending the Foundation Program regulations to provide for the general per pupil grants. Most grants are tied to a specific area such as teacher grants or maintenance or supplies, the provision of a certain service; these are general per pupil grants. It is the intention of the government to provide in the unitary divisions a per pupil grant of \$18.00 for 1971 and this is over and above all the other grants obtainable under the Foundation Program at the present time for general education purposes. Now this of course should mean the school boards, hopefully, and in many cases have already indicated, this will mean a reduction in the special levy because this will mean an increase that they receive under the Foundation Program.

Included in this bill is also the provision for increasing the amount payable by the province under the Foundation Program in the unitary divisions from 70 percent to 75 percent of the total cost of the program and the consequent reduction, naturally, of the municipal share from the present 30 percent to 25 percent.

(MR. MILLER, cont'd.)

There's a provision to increase the exemption rate on farm and residential property required to raise the municipal portion, that is the 25 percent portion of the Foundation Program, to an amount greater than the present differential of 24 mills. As a result, it would mean a drop in the levy on property of farm or residential from the present 9.9 mills to 8.4 mills. Again, as I mentioned, councils have already been notified of our intention to introduce this bill and it is one of the bills which we have asked, and we have hoped, that members opposite will allow to pass very quickly so that the school boards, the councils can establish their budgets and can strike their mill rates and not hold up the tax bills unduly or unnecessarily because they are all really banking on receiving this money. They're anticipating it, and to the extent that we can facilitate the passage of this bill it will help all municipalities to complete their budgetary processes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I realize that it is important that this bill go through at the earliest possible date if it's going to go through and therefore I'll make a few comments on it at the present time.

As the Minister of Youth and Education has indicated, there have been announcements of changes, particularly during the course of the recent by-elections, that indicated that the Foundation levy would be changed and a reduction of 1.5 mills on the residential and farm property would take place. On the other hand, it's been suggested that also -- it was announced previously during the course of the by-election that a grant of \$18.00 per student would be made unconditional, and in addition to that a \$12.00 per pupil grant made for textbooks and other requirements; and similarly, that the changes would be made in the sharing program of the Foundation Program of 30 - 70 to 25 - 75.

Mr. Speaker, all of these changes may well have some value, but I think it should be pointed out that the government is making considerable political hay out of giving increased support to the Public School System and I think it's high time that probably we got some facts and figures on this rather than just the rosy statements that have been coming out.

Now first of all, the reduction in the Foundation levy is exactly the same course of action that the government took last year. What the government does not point out when it does this, is indicate the saving from the Provincial Treasury that this allows the government to pull off, and when the reduction takes place in the Foundation levy of 1.5 mills, it means that for every dollar that this saves on the Foundation levy, it saves the Provincial Government out of its Treasury 2 1/2 dollars under the 70-30 cost-sharing scheme. Now as a result of this last year when the government made its manoeuvre to reduce by one mill, it meant a saving from the Provincial Treasury on that contributory basis of something of the order of four to five million dollars. I can only assume that unless the minister can provide better information, that by reducing the Foundation levy, that under the cost-sharing program this doesn't necessarily reduce the over-all property taxation bill because it reduces the amount of money that the Provincial Government adds through the 2 1/2 multiplication so that it would appear that it ends up about even by the time the government has paid 75 percent of the Foundation Program and put 25 percent onto the Foundation levy.

It means, Mr. Speaker, that you end up almost back where you start when you do this, but the government has been very politically wise. I guess you might say, to make it look like they're reducing the taxation on property. At the same time they're going to increase their percentage of the Foundation Program; they're going to make grants for textbooks of \$12.00 per head, which already were being made almost to that tune through direct supply of textbooks rather than dollar supply; and by the time you add it all up, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to suggest that the amount comes that the government pulls out \$6 1/2 million and puts back in 6 1/2.

If they had left the Foundation Program the way it was designed, to take the dollars from the "have" areas and put them into the "have-not" areas, they'd have ended up with a more equitable way of financing public education, because when you lower the Foundation levy it's an easy political way out but it's a wrong move in providing equity in financing education because it means that the people that are in the "have-not" school divisions like Seine River, the small schools where they have a low student count per room, is not going to benefit on a "per pupil" type of payment. What they benefit from is a high Foundation levy that takes the assessment basis of the high assessment areas and distributes that money through the Foundation Program to the "have-not" areas, and the government insists on weakening this basis by making it appear that they're lowering property taxation but they're not. What they're doing is indirectly - I could say directly transferring part of the cost, the increased cost for

(MR. CRAIK, cont'd.) . . . education onto the special levy because education costs do not go down. Despite what anybody says, the growth rate, the natural growth rate in the public system is almost constant every year and it can run up to about 10 percent a year in any given school division. Now there's no way, unless the Minister can tell us what percentage of the total cost of education are going to be covered by their new policy, because I submit, Mr. Speaker, again, that the three changes that have been made, that the Minister has just pointed out, leave us just about where we were and that the tax bills, when they come home, are going to be about the same or a little worse than they were before.

Now, we're at the point of a bill, we've had announcements over the last six weeks, a month about what the government is going to do - lowering of the levy, increasing of per capita grants, but nowhere have we had an indication of the amount of dollars that is going to be infused into the Public School System and that's all that counts. All of this is political folderol to this point. Now give us some facts. The per pupil grants on textbooks are not what they're made out to be. They got free textbooks before they came under the Minister's estimates. — (Interjection) — About ten, about \$10.00 if you figure it out. There's 240,000 pupils in Manitoba and the figure last year on grants was around - for free textbooks - was around \$2 million, so it's eight to ten dollars so it's not a substantial increase. Part of the supplies that they got have been added in and it's not a gift of \$12.00 per pupil. Most of it was there before with free supply of textbooks and other supplies.

Now, to make a positive suggestion, if I've been critical of the government in really doing nothing in this field, if they had left the Foundation Program with a substantially high Foundation levy it would have allowed them to increase the Foundation items such as teachers' salaries which are now behind by four years, textbooks, supplies, administration grants. All of these have not been reviewed since 1967 and the government has been in power through two sessions now and has done absolutely nothing to remedy the outdated Foundation Program. Instead of that they've taken the money that normally has gone into updating these items to make political hay out of them, to make it appear that they're reducing taxes when they're not, and to make it appear that they are giving grants on a per student basis which makes it worse for the "have-not" areas rather than on the classroom count basis, and as a result we are ending up in a worse position in the Public School System, particularly in the "have-not" school divisions, than we were in before.

Now I'd ask the Minister if he possibly can, if he wishes to refute the figures which I've given, I'm glad to accept and he has more adding machines that I have, so I again say that I think that he's talking about taking back and giving back around the order of six or eight million dollars in total - and he can correct me if I'm wrong.

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

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member from Brandon West, that debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour)(Transcona): May I be permitted, just before the question is put, we do not desire to prevent the honourable member from speaking but may I ask that if at all possible that she and any others who desire to make contributions do so at the next time we meet in order to expedite the passing of this bill. As the Minister of Education pointed out, it is most desirable to have the funds available for the school boards as quickly as possible. We have no objection to this adjournment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, may I tell the Honourable Minister of Labour that if there's any attempt on the part of the government to force closure in connection with the debate at this time, that this time he's going to resent it very much and we . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I don't think there was any intent. There was only - and I'm not going to enter the debate. The motion before the House is to adjourn the debate.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. MILLER presented Bill No. 14, an Act to amend The Public Schools Act (2) for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, this bill is intended to open another avenue to the formation of unitary divisions in Manitoba. It does not - and I hasten to say this - it does not give the Minister or the Lieutenant-Governor in Council the power arbitrarily to declare or to force the creation of a unitary division without an expression of opinion by the resident electors. As a matter of fact, I think it places more responsibility for the formation of a unitary division in the hands of the residents.

Up to now there has only been one method by which a unitary division could be formed, and that was by means of a referendum, or a vote. This required a proposal being approved by the Minister, then published in the Gazette, and then presented to the resident electors and voted on. It required that the proposal be advertised, that returning officers and other necessary officials be named, arrangements made for their remuneration and so on, and unless this could be made to coincide with the regular election dates it meant all of these arrangements had to be especially made at extreme expense.

So I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the amendments being introduced are far more flexible, they provide the flexibility, and are an efficient method by which citizens can express their opinions. Instead of a referendum upon which the Minister acts, it is proposed that the Lieutenant Governor in Council be given the authority to declare divisions unitary if it is satisfied that a majority of the resident electors, either by their own acts or through the acts of their duly elected school trustees, favour and support the establishment of a unitary division.

I'd like to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that the responsibility for forming unitary divisions still rests with the residents of the proposed divisions. No attempt is being made to erode that responsibility or, perhaps even a stronger word, to erode the duty of these elected people. An attempt is being made simply to make it easier; to facilitate the method whereby the residents can express their wishes and for the Lieutenant Governor in Council to react and to act upon those wishes, once they are expressed, in order to make available for the students and the parents alike the increased benefits they derive from unitary status, and to do this as rapidly as possible. It would require that a majority of the district boards, representing a majority of the students under their jurisdiction and also representing a majority of the resident electors in the proposed division, have to indicate to the satisfaction of the Lieutenant Governor in Council their desires. Of course it will still provide for the usual method that existed up to now. Also at any time by a vote, whether it's during the normal course of normal fall elections, the majority of the resident electors by indicating that they favour the formation of a unitary division, that too would be and could be accepted as an indication of the wishes of the people in the area.

Now this too, Mr. Speaker, and I am not saying this in order to invoke or to suggest or imply in any way closure that the Leader of the Official Opposition seems to be concerned about; my remarks are not made for that purpose at all. My remarks are simply on this Bill (2) -- if I might, Mr. Speaker, without interruption, Mr. Speaker, may I please have the attention of my colleague. I'm simply asking that this Bill (2) be facilitated because in this case, too, there are two divisions which can be, if this bill passes, can be and would qualify to be declared unitary divisions.

If this is done, and done rapidly, they can be declared unitary divisions, they can establish their budgets, finalize their budgets on that basis, knowing full well that it's retroactive to January 1. It would not hold up the school board budgets; it would not hold up the local councils, who are simply waiting now, not knowing which way to turn. So therefore I ask, not because we want to invoke closure, but simply to make it possible for the people in the areas to get on with their business, I ask that consideration be given to have this bill moved forward as rapidly as possible.

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

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, before I adjourn debate, could I ask a question of the Minister? Just what divisions were you speaking of when you mentioned that there were two or three divisions that would be able to comply?

MR. MILLER: There are two divisions that have indicated. One last fall, the division of Mountain, indicated by a . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: I hope that the Minister speaking now does not mean that he is closing this debate. You know, asking questions on second reading of a bill is a rather tricky position to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The point is noted. I would suggest the Minister save his remarks for afterwards. If the Honourable Member for Rhineland does wish to debate the point -- (Interjection) -- By leave?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, the question put to me was that he would like to have the answer before he adjourns debate. I recognize that I cannot speak again and I'm simply responding. If the member would ask me privately, in which case I am not closing debate, I'd gladly do so.

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

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, that debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): . . . request of him that he . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The request has been made. The question before the House is the adjournment.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet) presented Bill No. 18, an Act to authorize the payment of Special Emergency Grants to Farmers, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I think that members opposite have had some knowledge of what is contained within the proposal. The announcement was made some time ago pursuant to a letter that was sent to Ottawa asking that they entertain the idea of a cost-sharing program, or a cost-shared program, that would provide a major injection of money into the pockets of our prairie farmers. I don't think that I have to remind honourable members opposite as to the need of our rural people. I think that anyone looking at statistics of the last two or three years would agree that there is indeed a very serious economic situation in the countryside, and indeed one which cannot be dealt with in the short term, and that what we are merely proposing here is some sort of a measure that would help tide things over for a short period pending a long term solution to the problems of the prairie region.

I want to say that it is not my opinion that a dollar an acre up to \$100.00 is going to solve anyone's financial problem. I want to say that the proposal here is merely designed to stimulate similar activity at the federal level on a much larger scale, and I may indicate to the House, Mr. Speaker, that in August of last year, in fact I believe it was a letter of August 7th and another one of August 10th which I wrote to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture for Canada suggesting that the province of Manitoba would be prepared at that time to go into some sort of cost-sharing arrangement, and of course we have had discussions and negotiations ever since and we have had various proposals put by both the federal and provincial government, so that this has been an on-going thing and what we are doing here is simply making good our commitment to the Government of Canada some months ago that we would be prepared to inject some monies into the pockets of our rural people in order that they may use it in whatever way they wish but in order to alleviate some of their cash shortage.

I think that if you look at some of the statistics you will find that arrears in their loans are piling up at a very substantial rate both in MACC and FCC. I think you will notice a very substantial increase in tax arrears in Manitoba, and I would suggest that the \$4 million which we are providing under this measure could go some way in helping our farm people reduce their tax arrears if that's the way they want to apply the revenues. So it's not really a grandiose scheme. I think that we cannot deal with the problems of agriculture in this way; we must have programs of price supports or what have you, such as has been proposed by the Government of Manitoba through my office to the Government of Canada in the last couple of years, and, in particular in the last year. At this point, Mr. Chairman, I don't think I need to

(MR. USKIW cont'd.) elaborate; I simply am trying to illustrate how we arrived at this program, and hopefully we will get some measure of support from members opposite and hopefully we can get this measure passed quickly so that we can get this kind of financial assistance into the hands of our farm people in time for their seeding operations. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rock Lake, that the debate be adjourned.

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

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Logan, amended by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Minister without Portfolio.

HON. RUSSELL DOERN (Minister without Portfolio) (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, last night I was attempting to demonstrate from an analysis of the events occurring in the debate on the government's proposal for reorganization, that although there were individuals and are individuals who are opposed to the government plan, that there was organized resistance in the form of opposition political party spokesmen and municipal mayors in particular who were attempting to generate concern on the part of the public, and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the opposition laid a trap for itself, because they were so impressed with their own arguments and their own sounds at some of the public meetings that they convinced themselves and deceived themselves into believing that the public was against the plan. Consequently, they responded with plans of their own and made all sorts of outrageous suggestions, and I think have put themselves in a very difficult position.

For example, there was a belief that if the government dared go to the people in St. Vital, which had had a very raucous meeting when the Honourable Minister responsible for Urban Affairs appeared, they thought that should that happen, should the government dare call a by-election in that area, there was no doubt that, based on the public meeting, that the government would lose, and I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the results of April 5th have demonstrated that that was patently false and that the government received a mandate in a seat that was formerly held by the Conservative party.

Mr. Speaker, if one were to study, as I did, the newspaper reports of the debate as it started on December 23rd and as it has gone on up until the present, you can easily classify the areas of support for the plan and the areas of resistance. I have already mentioned that the City of Winnipeg, Metro, and the City of East Kildonan supported the plan. In addition to them, the two daily newspapers in this area, the Winnipeg Free Press backed the government almost daily in terms of the one-government plan. It took a little different tack when it came to the by-elections; it took a little different slant when it came to certain statements of some of my colleagues and some of the actions of the government; but it almost never wavered on the issue of the government white paper of the government proposals. Only at one point, when the new leader of the Liberal Party came out with his plan, right up until that point they were 100 percent behind us, but all of a sudden we had the Asper plan and then the Free Press was you know, racked with conscience in a moral dilemma of whether they -- (Interjection) -- they have no conscience -- well, they were perplexed by a decision as to whether or not to support the government, which had a kind of different philosophy to their own politically, on an issue that they believed in or whether to support the proposals of the Liberal leader, and if you read that particular editorial you will see how they wavered and supported and lightly criticized it. They just couldn't -- they couldn't bring themselves to condemn the leader of the Liberal Party.

In addition to those sources, Mr. Speaker, there was endorsement for the plan from the Downtown Business Association of Winnipeg, from the Canadian Union of Public Employees, and from diverse sources such as the Director of the University of Winnipeg's Urban Institute, Professor Lloyd Axworthy.

I was speaking last night in part to my friend the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek and I intend to give more evidence or more details of some of the concerted drive on the part of the Opposition. I think it was legitimate. I think it was legitimate and I think that the Opposition party had a right to do that. What I say they failed at was that when a mirror is held

(MR. DOERN cont'd.) up to them to show that the main resistance was their own resistance, then they find it very hard to believe.

Who opposed the plan? There were individuals, of course, like Robert Smellie who was the former Minister of Municipal Affairs and who headed the Boundaries Commission. He was out there campaigning against the government plan; and Elswood Bole, who was a former executive director of Metro. And then, of course, there were the various mayors, who were very active. Some of the suburban mayors. For example, the Mayor of West Kildonan - not only did he continually issue statements from his own chamber, but he had a little touring company and he followed around the public meetings -- (Interjection) -- Yes, that's right; he is a former candidate. He's -- I believe what was once known as the Liberal Party of Manitoba, 1867 -- no, I'm talking about Mr. Yanofsky. 1867 to 1971, I believe, are the dates of that party. And, Mr. Speaker, that gentleman went to various meetings, sent out pamphlets, made press releases, and appeared time and again to question the Honourable Minister responsible for Urban Affairs. In St. Vital there was a great deal of activity on the part of Mayor Winslow and his council and -- (Interjection) -- I'll try to explain that to my honourable friend, who also made a prediction about the mill rate which I think was totally inaccurate. He made a wild prediction of an 18 to 20 mill increase, forgetting the Metro levy and forgetting a few other things in there. He added it up and got a grandiose figure and released this shocking news of a shocking tax rise on the part of the public.

Mr. Speaker, I challenge the right of the municipal politicians who believe that they alone speak for the people of their area. I think that the people who are elected from the areas of suburban Winnipeg and Central Winnipeg equally speak on behalf of their constituents, and of course the members of the federal House also speak on behalf of them.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member for Rhineland have a point of order? Would you please state your point of order.

MR. FROESE: Yes. He claims that the municipal people can't speak for the people in their area. The Minister of Education just brought in a bill where they are supposed to do this very thing.

MR. SPEAKER: There is no point of order in that statement.

MR. DOERN: . . . on this, I think I said that we have an equal right to speak on behalf of the municipal areas. I don't know if my honourable friend is listening to me or not, but we have an equal right. It is the municipal mayors who have contended that they speak for their areas and I say that the MLAs speak for those areas equally, if not more so. And when the Mayor of St. Vital says that he speaks for St. Vital, that's fine, but so does the MLA for St. Vital speak for the citizens in his area.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to detail some of the activities of the opposition parties in regard to the debate. The Liberal party was not too active in the debate but the House Leader did make some comments on Hydro and, as I said, my good friend the MLA for Assiniboia did not make any public statements that I am aware of, so I would hope that, being a man of some objectivity and independence, that we might count on his support for the government plan when it is voted on in this House. But consider how active - consider how active, Mr. Speaker, the Conservative Party was in this debate. At every public meeting they appeared and at every opportunity they made statements, and I say they have a right to do this. But then they said, "Look at all the resistance to the plan." And at least half the resistance, at least half of it, was their own. For example, their provincial President, Graeme Haig, was critical from the first day and repeatedly spoke against the plan. Mr. Ted Bond from St. James Progressive Conservatives, he made public statements. Olga Fuga, who I believe is a member of that party, made statements. The former Attorney-General, Sterling Lyon, was at a meeting and made statements. There was the famous leadership contest when the two honourable contenders were going around the province - I have more to say about them - they were making statements. The Mayor of Charleswood and the MLA for Charleswood, he was touting a 19 to 20 mill increase. I'll leave that up to my honourable colleague to tear that one to shreds. The Whip, or the former Whip, the MLA for Fort Garry, he announced a new plan, charged the government with gerrymandering, charged the government with creating a second Legislature. What a terrible system, the Legislature, the parliamentary process! And then he tells about the centuries of development and how great a system it is and then he deplores the fact that we might have that sort of system, and political parties - horrors - could get involved in urban government. In addition to him, the MLA for St. Vital - he appeared, naturally, to debate

(MR. DOERN cont'd.) with my colleague. The MLA for Fort Rouge, she wanted more data and she charged that there was gerrymandering going on. -- (Interjection) -- Oh she did too, though.

A MEMBER: Did she?

MR. DOERN: Sure. And the MLA for Sturgeon Creek, well he decried the high cost of the 48 councillors and the high taxes and all sorts of other things.

MR. DOERN: So, Mr. Chairman, -- (Interjection) -- No, you can speak.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Will the Minister proceed and not ask the audience to participate.

MR. DOERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, one of the activities, though, that I personally take exception to was some of the comments of the Honourable Member for Lakeside and the now Leader of the Official Opposition, who really attempted to go out into parts of the province when they were campaigning and to put the argument that this plan really was going to be at the expense of the rural taxpayer, and the Leader of the Liberal Party as well, and I really think, Mr. Speaker, that that was a deplorable tactic. I think it was definitely untrue. The suggestion was made that the people in the Metropolitan Winnipeg area were going to in effect be subsidized by the rest of the province on this plan. -- (Interjection) -- Oh, good heavens. Well he looks into -- he has other hobbies and that is checking out brother-in-laws -- not brother-in-laws, best men at weddings, and for that reason my best man, his identity will not be revealed until some 20 years from this moment. I suggest that some of the honourable members read this document on the place of Greater Winnipeg in the economy of Manitoba, to find out whether in fact it is true that the Metropolitan area is subsidized by the rest of the province or whether a lot of the revenues from the area don't, in fact, go for other programs which benefit people in the north and on the farms and in the towns and the villages.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister has five minutes.

MR. DOERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So the Tory leadership candidates went out and the Leader of the Liberal Party went out and they sounded the alarm throughout the province, and what was the response? Nothing. Because, Mr. Speaker, if you were to examine the. . .

A MEMBER: What do you mean, nothing? They were defeated.

MR. DOERN: Well they were defeated, that's true. That was some indication of their success. If you were to look at the newspapers, the weeklies and the dailies throughout the province, including the fine paper known as the Swan River Times - Star and Times, if you look at those papers, Mr. Speaker, and look at the editorials, and look at the coverage, and look at the concern on the part of the people in the rest of the province for this plan, there was only four or five papers out of some 32 that I checked, on a regular basis that had any coverage whatsoever. And I don't think it's surprising because I think the people of the province realize -- (Interjection) -- No, I couldn't find -- I couldn't find an editorial in there. . .

MR. BILTON: Give me time.

MR. DOERN: Give you time, right, and give you some stories as well. Mr. Speaker, I couldn't find really any opposition to the government plan, and I think it's not surprising because I think this is a bill that is designed to strengthen the government in the Metropolitan Winnipeg area. And surely it's not a case of a conflict all the time - you do something for one part of the province, it hurts the other. Surely we can go forward on various fronts at the same time and I think this is what is being done.

Mr. Speaker, I only have a few minutes left so I wanted to make a few general comments to some of my honourable friends opposite. I was amused and interested with the speech of my friend the Member for Assiniboia because he learns his political science from a dictionary, and he spent some time looking up the word "liberal" - which has a small "l" I might point out, not a large "l"; there's quite a difference - and he looked up the word "socialist" and he looked up various other words, but I want to tell him that the words that he should look up and the words that he really should focus on are not in the dictionary. There's no mention of the New Democratic Party, there's no mention of the words Manitoba New Democratic Party, and there is no listing of a Schreyer New Democrat, for example. None of these terms are in there. And it is these terms that my friend should focus on and not look for old slogans or old explanations.

Mr. Speaker, I also wanted to comment on the speech of my honourable friend the Member for Rock Lake, who was highly concerned about this dreadful document that the

(MR. DOERN cont'd.) university published. Mr. Speaker, if you look at it, the first thing you realize, it is not a regular publication of the university. It's called the Manitoban and it's obviously one of these corny spoofs that comes out every year by the engineers, and they drafted something with a lot of four-letter words, and you know, boys will be boys. We've all heard dirty jokes; some of us have seen -- (Interjection) -- I beg your pardon? -- (Interjection) -- I think the law applies to students at the university but I think this was an extra-curricular activity and that there were not funds on the part of the university that went into this. There are numerous . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister's time is up.

MR. DOERN: Could I have another minute to conclude, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? By leave.

MR. DOERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker. No, Mr. Speaker, he will not get leave and I want to rise on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Member for Morris disagrees.

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . adjourn while they carry on in their caucus.

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

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR (Virden): Mr. Speaker, I would first like to congratulate the mover and the seconder. While their contributions were short, I did feel fairly effective, and I'm one who believes in the old few lines Lord Montgomery told the House of Lords last week, "There's nothing worth saying that can't be said in ten minutes, and I really believe and follow that, or maybe that's the excuse because I never intend to be an orator. Also, I would like to congratulate the two new members, the one of which I have met. The one from St. Vital I have not yet met and I am sure I look forward to that occasion. Also the new additions to the Cabinet, to the former Speaker, and I wish him well in his new portfolio; to the new Minister, who I had written down here "without wife or without portfolio" and I believe maybe it would be proper to delete the first regarding his wife. They tell me he does now have a wife. In any case I wish them well. And also the new Liberal Leader who has problems. Where he has his caucus I don't know but I wish him well in his intent. My new Leader also.

But the big point, Mr. Speaker, is congratulating you. You were a year ago Whip of your Party. Today I look at you with a lot of respect; you are now the Whip of the entire Legislature under whose responsibility we work and serve, and I do hope you have the intestinal fortitude to wield that whip and cut deep when it's necessary, because in recent months or years we have seen the prestige of this House maybe at times lower, and I think your authority can keep it up where I believe the public respects us as its members. And in the last few moments waiting for the moment to rise, there was a lot of thoughts going through my mind, this being my eleventh session, and I'm now looking at my third new Leader. I don't know whether this is what we want, is a Leader every time we get up and get in trouble, but however that seems to be one of our routes, but it's not alone. I'm also looking at my third Premier.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: They come and go, don't they?

MR. MCGREGOR: And I think, when I look over there, I think very much and feel very much for the government backbencher, because that is a frustrating time, and believe me, I remember when I entered and had to sit where the Honourable Member for Flin Flon sits. But also, Mr. Speaker, you are my fourth Speaker and this would almost sound like bragging as a bit of a veteran, but as I look around there really isn't many things that were here when I entered - it was after the '62 election. But all the affections of this House would go for naught if it wasn't for one gentleman behind me, Mr. Sly, that works those switches, makes the whole operation work. He was here from day one and when he was befallen with a little ill health we sorely missed him, and I see the addition, the authority of someone sitting beside him undoubtedly being groomed for the day that he may be absent and have someone that really knows what the switches are all about.

I'll just give you a small rundown because I do feel a bit responsible as a rural member. In comparison to a city member our life, our responsibilities and our duties are so much different, and I heard the Leader of the Liberal Party refer to one day in the House we get a remuneration, and really and truly I think the public accepts this as a reality and I look -- honestly, if there's a moment of easiness it's our term in the House, but the workload is when you're in your constituency, when the huge mileage is building up, and just to give you an example and certainly one that I could substantiate with names, and that it be directed to the

(MR. McGREGOR cont'd.) Minister of Education and Youth and also to the Minister of Social Services in this regard. This was a Sunday night. Someone phoned up for an appointment and I said certainly, at 7:00 o'clock. Well, they came. Someone -- this was a parent, and I spoke to the Minister yesterday and I haven't got his reply, a parent of a handicapped person who is struggling very hard to make her own in the world. This was a Miss Gould, and when I see his answer I'll know how to handle it. But in these cases, while we're willing and ready to criticize the welfare payment, in cases such as this there can't be enough alleviance given people who are struggling and need just a little bit of help to be independent. I think in this regard the Minister will not find any criticism when it's given in this type of thing. We see other exaggerations, somewhere in the paper that I read and take, welfare recipients -- "a proud welfare recipient for 21 years." Well that type of attitude, I think somewhere we have to help our Minister, and with his new rules and regulations coming, maybe; and he will have the support from here.

And in my kitchen at that same time was a parent, a Mr. and Mrs. Bonn, of a handicapped, a retarded child; and in my rumpus room was a farmer from between my home and Virden. And someone says we go home on a weekend to relax! Maybe the city boys do but the rural people do not, and that's not, Sir, I beg you, exaggerated.

I see the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs was making a contribution last year and we were sitting in the Agricultural Committee in Virden and some, oh, a reference to if I'd been involved with, do they cross railway tracks or something - I really didn't know what they were aiming at, but anyway, the Minister said, "Well really, Morris, what you said at the House last year, it really wasn't right, was it?" And I used probably some vulgar words and I said I sure as hell was, and I was going to give him a photostatic copy. Anything I say I live through. Well I did listen to that one anyway.

However, I hope the Ministers of the Crown will listen attentively because I don't intend to tear at them but only explain as it's been explained by my constituency, and I do think I have one of the finest constituencies. I think the Ministers, whatever stripe or political colour, are controlled by their deputies and their staff, and it's something -- and right or wrong -- all right, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources may laugh, and I'll tell you an incident that happened and it's quite possible it could happen here. A particular group of women married to a group of middle -- medium-price people, and they wanted to do something, so they decided to get together and look into the welfare situation in this particular city. They were intelligent people and they did a little thinking before they walked into the thing. The first person they picked was an ex-pilot from the last war, and he had been on welfare since the war. He went into an office and the hitting of typewriters got on his nerves and he was a nervous wreck. Since then he was drawing this big pay. They got to him and talked to him intelligently; that man is drawing \$12,000 a year today. They went down and made a real record; in 23 interviews they had 19 of those working, not forcing, not belittling them. So they thought they were really accomplishing something. They went to the Minister wondering if they couldn't get a budget of \$6,000 for a girl and a filing system, to keep track and continue this, but obviously the welfare workers were a little concerned and got to the Minister before they had got to the Minister and he turned them down. So they went to another party who phoned the Premier of that province and said, "John, are you interested in saving a few bucks?" He said "Absolutely." He said, "Would you have coffee with me?" So they had coffee, the gentleman explained the situation what this group was doing, and undoubtedly he overruled his Minister and that office is working and they're still contributing in the right way of cutting down finances. -- (Interjection) -- Yes it was. It was a western politician that intervened. But these are examples that a Minister can get trapped into, into bureaucrats down the line that he thinks he's respecting their judgment, but not always rightly so.

The next one that's a problem to me is Rivers. Rivers is basically sort of -- has over the history been a Liberal town and you people are in government - and I wish the Premier was here this morning. I have discussed this with him. There are several groups there within the Rivers area, not exactly confiding in one another, and I'm on the outside of the government in power in Manitoba and not necessarily in complete . . . with those groups so I really don't know, and I don't expect everyone to open up the letters to me because everyone has the right to secrecy, but I will make known that I have no desire for the credit of things that go there, nor in any way interfered with the credit of this government or the government in Ottawa, but get things there irrespective of who gets credit. I'll gladly give it to the government here if

(MR. MCGREGOR cont'd.) they can do this, because I think when politics gets to that grind, that we're not really serving our province, our nation, or that part of the country that we try to represent.

Now to the Minister of Highways, who seems to get most of the headlines as we go along day to day, but I would like to bring one point up and I spoke to him this morning about it - I may get in trouble; I've been in trouble before - regarding a telephone truck that was going about its business - an Indian, and may I say one of the finest Indians, a Christian, non-drinker, non-smoker, a good family man, a good farmer. This truck did not make the stop sign, hit the Indian's truck, killed his wife, killed his brother-in-law, and he is handicapped for life. He is in the process of quitting farming because of this. The settlement that he got from the insurance or the courts - so I guess I'm criticizing the courts and that's -- (Interjection) -- a telephone truck, and the settlement was some \$10,000 and the thought that came to me - and this is fairly old - it would look at the outside that the Indian is not getting as fair a break as the white man. The Minister might want to jump to his feet. I'm not certain - it looks that way to me, to be quite honest, and while we can't help him if the settlement is final, and I understand it is, why are we carrying 100,000, 500,000 liability? I could only have 10,000 liability. Thinking someday I might kill two people I'm only going to get . . . or my insurance for that -- so this -- (Interjection) -- May of 1969, I believe that's the figure. I haven't got the file on it.

Well, that's just one of those things and, as the Minister is well aware, I had a delegation in about a year ago and either I was in a bad mood or he was. We got a pretty rough reception, I thought. However, I told the delegation to give time, don't get excited, because certain things happen. I had a meeting with the Minister, had the same delegation come in; he listened to them very well and he opened up his bag of tricks and showed them where the millions and where could he get the millions to do these things, and I say to the Minister that's the type of reception I like to hear when I took the trouble to bring my delegation in, to listen, and also if he can't or he doesn't promise, but I appreciate on those too. The latter one was the one -- in fact, I would have to be maybe divulging a confidence. He even said something pretty good about the Virden member and this I always like because that don't come even very often from over here. -- (Interjection) -- Well thank you, Mr. Minister, but I do not want him to forget Highway 41 which was what that delegation was all about; 259 is that little chunk of blacktop, very necessary to join the many miles of blacktop in Manitoba with the blacktop in Saskatchewan, and everybody knows the base is bigger and better in Manitoba, the road will be better but there is that 5.2 miles that's very urgently needed for our tourists - 41. If you go north for any more ponies please go down 41; you'll never get home with your ponies. I'm sure they'll be shook off.

Now Mines and Natural Resources. Again the Minister, or his department, is in receipt of a letter from the local mines group in Virden and the oil people, and while the major exploration in Virden was going on, the drilling companies were bonded until the well was either capped or in production, but in recent years with a flood-back program there are many oil wells that are barely showing a profit and they're closing some to flood the water back with the result there's been a lot of exchange of oil wells, and apparently there's no bonds. When that thing costs money many people just walk off and leave it; the surface is left in a pretty bad condition. Sometimes there is machinery there that has very little sale value that can be claimed, and there has been, but really what is necessary is a serious look at the legislation, and maybe what was suggested, the rebonding this transaction, I don't think that is necessary if the threat was put that their rights would be denied if this isn't cleaned up.

I see by the Throne Speech re the forming of an exploration company, and really I don't look at this so critically, how far it will go. We can't really read into that, but if we look fairly in the past, and spending part of my life in northern Manitoba, at the moment what is controlled by government, really the north is controlled by the three bigger interests, the Hudson Bay Mining, Sherritt-Gordon and Inco, and whether it is that someone is doing a planned program on this there may be some benefit, and probably I'm sounding like a government member and I was just saying this morning that I don't know what kind of an individual I am. When I sat on the government side I sort of looked to the Opposition as some good things and really, I sit here and try to give credit to the government for things that I believe they are right in; and I don't know, maybe I'm right or wrong, that's the way I see, that's the way I think, and I guess they'll have to live with me or do whatever they would like to do with me.

(MR. MCGREGOR cont'd.)

Regarding education, I listened very closely to what the Member from Gladstone said and I certainly agree. We've watched really expensive schools, with a lot of deluxe frills, and maybe with the right guidance from the Minister these could have been cut down and our costs cut down, and I will refer what I said in moving the Speech from the Throne in March, 1968, and I'll just repeat: "We have seen tremendous strides in education and I am now wondering, can we afford any more? How much more can we afford? And really, I think the same now. We can go too far. And I'm married to a school teacher, and believe me I got hell because I said that.

Now regarding agriculture, being on the committee and really enjoying our trips throughout rural Manitoba, and we certainly -- some perhaps have said we played politics and I fear to some extent we did. We had two different beliefs in any case. If they consider that playing politics I guess we were guilty to some extent, but every Minister looks at things and it again is in the guidelines, and I'm sure if the Minister takes advice from economists, his thoughts are probably right, but if I could give you a diagram or a pyramid type of thing, and say speaking of the grains, cereal grains, rice, etc., the world trade that goes through the world is four billion bushels and that's a lot of bushels, but the world production is what? 52 billion bushels, I believe, and this sounds like restrictions and controls is the right move, but then if you ask of the world food nutritionists who are trying desperately to feed the world, the need is some 64 billion bushels, so really the question is: is the economists' angle right or is our distribution wrong? And I have to say that I think that our contributing is wrong -- and where is it wrong? I think we are just not doing enough horse trading. That surely must be the answer. People are hungry; we surely must be able to use things that they have or in turn trade it to others, and that could take, to go into that and go into it fully -- but these are the things that I think we should be thinking of, of feeding the world rather than listen to the economists because they are only adding machine professors, I think. I'm never too confident of what they're saying. And I think the general gist of that tour, people really don't want government interfering with their affairs -- very little. Even though they're going through a real strife today I really appreciate the point, by some at least, not all, that they would appreciate government staying out of their affairs.

Speaking of labour -- every department I seem to be hitting, I'm hitting vacant seats, and I didn't forewarn them -- but the other thing is labour. We've seen our hourly, week work change. In one area it seemed to be coming to us as members that the service industries, such as garages, service stations, and I believe in speaking to us they say they have not got a member on the Manitoba Labour Board, and maybe this is why they sort of went beyond. And they're very much opposed to what's going on now and this is not coming from management, it's not coming from the garage owner; it's also coming from the people who work there, who would like to work their particular set of hours, not any question about the minimum wage. It was reported to me last Christmas Day someone gassed up at Portage; there was not another filling station open to Moosomin, Saskatchewan, simply because of the triple wages, that they couldn't possibly afford to open. Now I didn't go down the highway, I don't know, but I know other members got the same story and I just wonder if the Minister of Labour or his acting Minister would take note of this to see, surely that these services do rate a man on the Labour Management Board, or that particular Board who investigates this particular field.

Now the Minister of Health again. I have two constituents who had health problems, and I know them very well. I know one several years ago; one is in the throes right at the moment, and their only help after one going to Rochester, Winnipeg, every clinic that conceivably could help him with no help, they went to a natureopathic physician. The one is completely back into health; the other is in a very forward progressive recovery; the third one I got a letter from McAuley, Manitoba, indicating the same thing. I don't know this third one personally but the question is, surely these people rate to be under the Medicare. If chiropractors do, they have their faith, and I would hope the Minister would take note of this because to these people and to those of us who watch this going on, you know we find it hard to answer these people why it isn't.

To the Minister of Tourism and Recreation -- still absent -- we have a real progressive Wildlife Association group in Virden that have been doing a tremendous job of spending, earning, getting this money without any government help at the moment and they have requested, as this letter, again with the Minister, with the Premier, Mr. Green and the rest of us, Mr. Evans,

(MR. MCGREGOR cont'd.) and their answer, the department's answer has been not too encouraging; and I ask again this project which the Premier and I toured with last year in association with another function in Virden. I might say that other function was an international function . . . Highway 83, and I can say to you, when we're talking of selling things, do we do enough individually? Well I don't know, but I spent \$1,000 out of my pocket on this promotion and probably I got thanks - and I didn't do it for thanks or anything else - but in the route of doing that and being down in Texas, I had a call from Larado which is just on the border of Mexico, and he was ordering one carload of dried milk per month, stepping it up to one a week only because I was down there and knew some associates. I turned it over -- the Minister of Agriculture was not in; he was over in Italy or somewhere on that occasion -- I turned it over to the Deputy Minister. But these are the type of things. If we all did a better selling job of our province, our product, I think we would all benefit, we'd get out of some of this conjecture, and with that, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Mathews. I call it 12:30 now. I am leaving the Chair; I shall be back at 2:30.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, just before the House adjourns for the 12:30 recess, I take it to be confirmed what we agreed earlier in the week, that we will continue with the Throne Speech debate this afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: . . ., Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? The House is now recessed.