

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Friday, April 17, 1970

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before I proceed with Orders of the Day for the afternoon I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have with us 44 students from Grades 9 to 12 of the Lake Winnipeg Society High School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Orvis. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Rupertsland. On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you this afternoon.

Private Members' Resolutions. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution . . . The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we can, again with the concurrence of the House, revert to the bills that are presented by private members. Excuse me, there are Orders for Return. I wonder if the order of business could be the Orders for Return, then the bills that are being presented by private members, followed by the private members' resolutions. I wonder if we have general agreement in that respect. (Agreed.)

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

MR. SPEAKER: Order for Return, the Honourable Member for Morris. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering if I could have the indulgence of the House to have this stand. (Agreed.)

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Brandon West. The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I adjourned the debate to propose an amendment to the - in view of the statements of the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources - to move an amendment to the Order, and I'd like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Arthur, that the motion of the Honourable Member for Brandon be amended by deleting Item 3 and substituting the following as Item 3: "Copies of correspondence between the Government of Manitoba and the Fresh Water Fish Marketing Board relating to the location of the proposed Fresh Fish Processing Plant."

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, if I may before the question is put, I wonder what the Honourable Member for Morris thinks of somebody amending somebody else's resolution?

MR. WALTER WEIR (Leader of the Opposition)(Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, if we're speaking to a point of order, it's a completely different situation, speaking to the point of order. We accept quite frankly on this side of the House the point that was made by the House Leader and we're attempting to seek the same information in a manner which can be accepted by the House. Really what we're trying to do is be co-operative in taking the measure that we're taking.

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . you're also asking for more than you did previously, and this is exactly what I did, Mr. . . .

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, in accordance with our practice I would indicate that there is no objection to complying with the request of my honourable friend. I did indicate the other day that there was no difficulty with Item No. 1. I may have to now qualify that in indicating that the reports are made for the benefit of the people seeking same. I could indicate to the honourable member that a copy of the report could be obtained from the Fresh Water Fish Marketing Corporation and if they are prepared to give it to the honourable member then there's no difficulty. But I question whether it would be good practice to release reports that have been prepared for a particular agency, and in that respect there may be some difficulty in presenting that report to the members of the House on the grounds of policy; but I would think that it would be available from the corporation to whom it was given. But otherwise, and with the qualification I gave the other day, there's no difficulty in complying with the request of my honourable friend.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, I think that our side of the House would be completely satisfied if the permission of the Fresh Water Fish Marketing Board was sought. It's not new in the

(MR. WEIR cont'd) House to accept on condition that the other party agrees, particularly if it's another government body and we'd be quite happy under those circumstances to have the order accepted under those circumstances.

MR. GREEN: It's quite agreeable. I have no difficulty in that respect. The only thing is that it probably could be obtained in that way and the government is prepared to try to cooperate to have it obtained. With regard to the new request, there's no difficulty at all.

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

PRIVATE AND PUBLIC BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading. Private Bills. -- (Interjection) -- No, for Return, perhaps that was dealt with this morning. -- (Interjection) -- Is it the intention of the House Leader to move on to second reading of Private Bills?

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading, Private Bills. Bill No. 33. The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON presented Bill No. 33, an Act to amend an Act to incorporate the "Portage Industrial Exhibition Association."

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, this is to legalize what may be open to misinterpretation in the past with respect to horse racing and pari mutuel betting. It's at the request of the Racing Commission.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 36. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House, may I have this matter stand? (Agreed.)

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate, second reading. On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Brandon West. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Which one are we on? Sorry, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 6.

MR. FOX: We have no objection to this, Mr. Speaker. We were looking at it . . .

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

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

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

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

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, after looking at this, there is no objection to it. May proceed.

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

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. Vital. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I rise to participate in the debate at this stage after a number of very eloquent speeches by honourable members from across the floor. I indicated during the course of the early exhortation from the Honourable Member from Assiniboia some reservation as to the propriety of the broadening of the debate which occurred as a result of his contribution. It was suggested by some of the honourable friends that perhaps I was trying to escape a full discussion of this subject. Far be it from me, Mr. Speaker, to do anything like that.

Mr. Speaker, I, like the Honourable Member from Morris have some opinion as to the rules and I felt that on that occasion that the rules were being somewhat abridged, but my honourable colleague the Minister of Finance pointed out to me that during the days when we were on that side of the House, I unfortunately didn't have the pleasure to be there with him and others, had interpreted the rules in accordance with the thinking of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia and others, and therefore I felt that the ruling of the Speaker had to be accepted, but I still thought that the debate had been enlarged beyond the context of the matter that was really an issue in the Honourable Member from Riel's bill. But be that as it may, I welcome the discussion that occurred, because I think that it did give this House an opportunity to discuss

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) in some detail some of the principles that were involved.

Earlier, much earlier in this session, one of the honourable members opposite asked me in a rather pointed manner what I intended to do about the concern on the part of this one establishment whose license had apparently been not renewed by the Liquor Control Licensing Board. I pointed out on that occasion that it was my understanding that the former licensee had made application to have his case reviewed by the Ombudsman and I thought that that was the proper person who could then review his case. And I reiterate what I said on that occasion. My understanding and interpretation of the Liquor Control Act is that the Attorney-General does not constitute a Court of Appeal or an appellate source to which an applicant may turn. Rather the applicant can request a new hearing by the board, or now with the enactment of the Ombudsman Act he can make application to the Ombudsman and the Ombudsman can review the case, and that presumably is what is occurring; and I felt constrained to desist from any involvement at all because it's not proper for me to do so. So I want to assure honourable members on both those counts that I am not at all unhappy about the extension of debate. I have an appreciation for the rules, perhaps not as zealous an appreciation for the rules as some of the honourable members, but nevertheless I did think that the rules were being slightly abridged on that occasion.

However, the bill itself and the discussion on it has given an opportunity for a fairly expansive discussion of some of the principles involved. I would like for a moment to deal with the most interesting feature of the debate which occurred the last Private Members' day dealing with the licensed vendor whose license was not renewed. And there's no hesitation in my using the name, it's been used before - Shakey's Pizza Parlor or Pizza Restaurant in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, has been in operation for some time. I think it's a very high calibre operation. I understand that the food product is excellent. I have not personally had the pleasure and I'm looking forward to very shortly having that pleasure of consuming some of what are their very very tasty and satisfying food. However, -- (Interjection) -- I have a free offer.

MR. DESJARDINS: No, no, not free. I said save your money and I'll take you.

MR. MACKLING: I see, I see. I thought you were going to sponsor my edification. However, I think though that it would be of note for the honourable members to reflect for a few moments upon the basis of the present Act, and I feel therefore compelled to present to you some thoughts regarding the implications and significance of this controversy, the decision of which may well affect the whole philosophy and principles of licensing in the Province of Manitoba. As I am sure every honourable member is aware, the present Manitoba Liquor Control Act is based upon the recommendations contained in the Bracken Commission Report, a report which ushered in a new era in liquor legislation and in public attitude, not only in the Province of Manitoba but across the width and breadth of Canada. I am sure that each and every member will agree that the Bracken Commission Report stands as a lasting legacy to the people of Manitoba and still provides the philosophy and principles upon which our Act and the Regulations are based. I am sure that you also agree that the present Manitoba Liquor Control Act emanating from the Bracken Commission Report stands as a monument to the chairman of that commission and to the then Premier of this province, the Honourable Douglas Campbell, whom I am sure everyone in the Chamber holds in high affection and regard. I hope that all members are aware of the philosophy and the principles engendered in the Bracken Commission Report upon which not only the Manitoba Act but other Acts in other provinces across Canada have been based or amended. I want to inform you that commissions in other provinces still look to the Manitoba Liquor Control Act in this province as a guide and as an inspiration in their efforts to bring about the exercise of the philosophy and principles basic in our Act which have emanated from that report. Many, if not all of us, will recall that the Bracken Commission interpreted a liquor license as a special privilege which would be used as an instrument by the Licensing Board and the Liquor Control Commission to upgrade and maintain the highest possible standards of service in licensed premises in Manitoba. And I'm indebted to the Honourable Member from Morris for his remarks which were to this point as well. It is well-known that in regard to premises, quality of service and food, Manitoba still stands tall among all the provinces of Canada, and I think most will agree, including people in the food and liquor industry, that the implementation of the philosophy and principles inherent in the Bracken Commission Report are largely responsible for the enviable reputation Manitoba enjoys in the accommodation and restaurant industry. It is not at all unjustified to say that on an

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) across-the-province basis, accommodation and food service in Manitoba is without parallel across Canada, if not beyond our borders. I am sure that each and every one of us is aware of the tremendous improvements that have taken place in these service industries since the implementation of the Bracken Commission recommendations. I am sure also that each and every honourable member will agree with me when I say that the successful implementation of the philosophy and principles of the Bracken Commission report could not have been realized had it not been for the full cooperation of the hotel industry and the proprietors of food establishments in our province. It was the belief of the Bracken Commission that the issuing of licenses under the Manitoba Liquor Control Act should be a major instrument in bringing about the tremendous improvements that I have mentioned in the accommodation of food services industries.

Since I am sure every honourable member is conversant with the Bracken Commission report, I know that you are aware that the various liquor licenses were not intended and are not intended to be an inalienable right, but are a special privilege issued to applicants who agree to comply with requirements as laid down by the Licensing Board and the Commission toward maintaining the high degree of standards and service which were a main basis of the Bracken report. In order to fulfill these objectives, it was necessary of course to give discretionary powers to the Licensing Board and to the Liquor Commission, to allow these bodies to continue to upgrade requirements so as to maintain the high standards inherent in the licensing philosophy as set out by the Bracken Commission.

I want to make the point again to all honourable members that under the Manitoba Liquor Control Act a liquor license is a privilege not an inalienable right, and is intended to be used to achieve and maintain high standard of service for the general public of Manitoba in licensed premises. That is why in Section 121 of the Act it is stated that the Commission may, and I repeat may, issue a restaurant beer and wine license to any hotel restaurant or other restaurant that in the opinion of the Commission is otherwise conducted as required by the regulations respecting restaurants and is deemed by the Commission to conform to such a high standard as to warrant the issue of the license for which the application is made.

As you will note, Section 121 states that the Commission may issue a restaurant, beer and wine license to the proprietor or operator of any hotel restaurant or other restaurant that in the opinion of the commission is deemed by the Commission to conform to such a high standard as to warrant the issue of the license for which the application is made. I am sure you will all agree that the successful implementation of the spirit and the letter of the Act, and the philosophy and principles underlying the Act, can only be achieved by continuing cooperation between applicants and licensees with the Licensing Board and the Liquor Control Commission. I think you will also agree that to maintain the high standards achieved in Manitoba in the accommodation and restaurant industry, there must be on the part of the Licensing Board and Commission consistent, fair and equitable treatment of all licensees and as equitable as possible requirements governing each type of license.

At this time I should like to mention briefly the various types of licenses, particularly what could be called the most popular licenses, so that the honourable members of the Legislature may not only be mindful of the different types of licenses but so that the honourable members will recognize and realize that different requirements are conditional with the issuance of each type of license. I'm sure that all honourable members will also agree how basically important it is for the Commission and the Licensing Board to be as consistent as possible in laying down requirements under each type of license, so that there is all possible equity in the requirements required by all licensees in each specific licensed area. The most popular licenses are the beer parlour license, which sometimes has been referred to as man's last private preserve, the beverage room license, the restaurant beer and wine license, the dining room license, the cocktail room and cocktail lounge license and the cabaret license.

Before going into the specific situation affecting Shakey's Pizza Parlour in St. James-Assiniboia, I wish to read in full Section 121 which deals with restaurant, beverage room, dining room, cocktail room and cabaret licenses. -- (Interjection) -- That is not beer or wine, there are no food present and we don't have a license here yet. Note the emphasis on "yet." Section 121 -- (Interjection) -- Good, good, very good. Oh, that's right. That's right, I'm glad you recalled that. As a matter of fact we have several in the House.

Section 121, subsection (1): "On application therefor being made in the prescribed form, and on payment by him of the prescribed fees and compliance with this Act, the Commission may, subject to Part VIII, issue a restaurant beer and wine license to the proprietor or

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) operator of any hotel restaurant or other restaurant that, in the opinion of the Commission (a) is conducted in premises having sufficient floor space for the purposes; (b) has a kitchen and dining room of such a size and so equipped with cooking utensils, tables, chairs, tableware, dishes and other facilities as to be suitable to accommodate the patrons thereof; (c) offers food of good quality and in adequate quantity and that is cooked or prepared and served with reasonable efficiency and in a clean and sanitary manner; and (d) is otherwise conducted as required by the regulations respecting restaurants and is deemed by the Commission to conform to such a high standard as to warrant the issue of the license for which application is made. Subsection (2) provides: "A restaurant beer and wine license authorizes the licensee to purchase from the commission and to sell only beer and natural wine by the glass for consumption only in the restaurant together with meals by persons of either sex who are the full age of 21 years and are not otherwise disqualified under this Act from consuming liquor." -- (Interjection) -- Well maybe it will be 18 one day shortly.

I have given you the complete wording of Section 121 because I am not about to comment on the specific situation affecting Shakey's Pizza Parlour on Portage Avenue. As I read subsection (1) (b) of Section 121, I am sure that the specific requirements contained therein are familiar to you because you have noticed them in all licensed restaurants, that is all licensed restaurants with the exception of Shakey's Pizza Parlour on Portage Avenue. You will also find in licensed restaurants other facilities and accessories which are not specifically mentioned in Section 121 but which have become standard requirements which are understood by practically all restaurant beer and wine license applicants and licensees. I am told it is the experience of the Licensing Board and the Commission that, particularly since the implementation of the Bracken Report recommendations, it has generally only been necessary for the Commission and the Licensing Board to inform applicants for the restaurant beer and wine license of the requirements of the Commission to conform to a high standard. It became the general practice that the applicant would discuss the requirement situation with the office of the Superintendent of Licenses and with the office of the Chief Inspector, and that the cooperation forthcoming from applicants was such that there was not, until now, a need for the Commission and the Licensing Board to specify in detail each and every requirement the Commission and Licensing Board expected to be fulfilled by the successful applicant.

Generally speaking, the applicants or their counsel were familiar with the philosophy and principles inherent in the Manitoba Liquor Control Act as well as being conversant with the standards upheld by existing licensees. I am told that this atmosphere of cooperation on the part of applicants and on the part of the licensees was very much appreciated by the Licensing Board and Commission of past years because it meant the absence of the bureaucratic red tape that is involved when rules, regulations and requirements are listed to the nth degree. I am sure honourable members will also appreciate that where there is full cooperation there is an opportunity for the exercise of some degree of flexibility, particularly on the part of licensees who wish to effect for example a particular atmosphere in their licensed premises. In view of all of the foregoing, I am sure honourable members will also agree how very important it is to have two-way cooperation and to maintain high standards in restaurant facilities, food service enjoyed by the public of Manitoba, particularly since the implementation of the Bracken recommendations.

About two years ago, about March 22, 1968 Dandee Foods Limited came to Canada and to Manitoba for the purpose of implementing its franchise from its American Company in the Metropolitan area of Winnipeg in the then municipality of Assiniboia. I am told that Shakey's Pizza Parlours in the United States are operated on a style which we here in Manitoba would equate with the serving of pizzas in a beverage room with entertainment. Shakey's, of course, wished to carry on at its Portage Avenue proposed location the same style of operation which it employs in its parlours in the United States. To make a long story shorter, it is my understanding that the Licensing Board and the Commission, because of this specialty connotation, decided to issue a restaurant beer and wine license to Shakey's Portage Avenue operation on a very cooperative wait and see basis.

It is my understanding also, that after a period of time it was felt by the Commission that Shakey's Portage operation was not meeting the standards which the Commission felt should be met by holders of a restaurant beer and wine license. A number of visits were made to the Portage Avenue operation of Shakey's by the Chief Inspector's office, informing the management of the Commission's dissatisfaction with the standard of operations there as compared to the

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) requirements being met by other restaurant beer and wine licensees in Metropolitan Winnipeg and in Manitoba generally. I am informed that eventually the Commission listed ten requirements which were discussed by the then acting chairman and Shakey's management, and presumably after much negotiation these requirements were cut to five in number.

About a year ago Shakey's established another Pizza Parlour in the area of Nairn Avenue and Highway 59, applied for a license and were informed that the license application would be considered favourably only on the assurance that the Nairn Avenue operation would comply with the five requirements referred to. Shakey's operation on Nairn Avenue did comply with these five requirements and the restaurant beer and wine license was issued.

When the present Liquor Control Commission Chairman, the Commission members and Licensing Board members took office, they of course became aware of the situation. On Friday, February 6, 1970 the present chairman met in the chairman's office with Mr. Gendreau of Shakey's Pizza Parlour and the chairman tells me that he informed Mr. Gendreau and that Mr. Gendreau agreed with the five basic requirements laid down by the previous Commission, and he told Mr. Gendreau -- pardon me, he told Mr. Gendreau that he was aware of the five conditions and that the chairman and the Commission members agreed with the five conditions, and he told Mr. Gendreau it was his opinion that the previous Commission had dealt more than fairly with Shakey's Pizza Parlour in that Shakey's were allowed to fulfill less requirements than other holders of restaurant beer and wine licenses.

At this point I would like to give that information again to the Honourable Member from Assiniboia, who the other day made some comment in this House to the effect that action should be taken so that new members of the Liquor Commission do not go about making new requirement rules, or to the effect that new Commission members should not change the rules or requirements laid down by the previous administration. I want to reiterate for the benefit of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia that the five requirements the present Licensing Board and the present Commission require of the Portage Avenue operation at Shakey's Pizza Parlour are the same five requirements that the previous Commission and the previous Licensing Board required Shakey's operation on Nairn Avenue prior to Shakey's receiving its present restaurant beer and wine license for that location. Apparently the Honourable Member from Assiniboia was misinformed regarding this situation.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I don't want to interrupt the Minister, but if I may I think it would help the discussion. Is it not true that the Commission asked for ten specific changes to be made, and then after a certain amount of negotiation they said all right if you make it five, you don't have to change the other five?

MR. MACKLING: One page back I think I pointed that out, that the Acting Chairman of the former Commission had apparently met with Mr. Gendreau of Shakey's and where there had originally been ten requirements, it was agreed that they would, in order to be flexible with this specialty type of operation, cut these requirements down to five and the former acting chairman and the Commission apparently did that and this is what the new Commission inherited.

MR. PATRICK: Perhaps I can just pose another question before I forget it. Would it not be better, and would not the Attorney-General agree that perhaps if the Commission or the Board would have some kind of guidelines or regulations to go by or deal with, it would be much easier for the Commission itself and I think for many people.

MR. MACKLING: Well, as I have indicated, Section 121 of the Act sets down a very high standard which the Commission is presumed to follow, and the Bracken Enquiry Commission laid down a philosophy which it was intended that Liquor Control Commissions in future would follow and Liquor Licensing Boards would follow, and it's that same high standard that this Commission has inherited. There has been no deviation, no change in philosophy or principles of the new Commission or new Licensing Board.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, just one more question. I don't want to interrupt, but would it not be correct to say that perhaps if we did get some guidelines and regulations for the Commission, still trying to maintain the high standards, that I think it would be helpful to the new Board or the Commission and still I think it would be much easier for them to operate. What I'm trying to say is, trying to be helpful to the Commission.

MR. MACKLING: Well I am sure the honourable member is trying to be helpful to me as well, but I think if I might complete my remarks I might even be much more helpful.

Following the February 6th meeting with the present chairman of the Liquor Control

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) Commission, the next contact Mr. Gendreau had with the Commission and the Licensing Board was at the Licensing Board hearing of March 2nd of this year. After hearing the presentation from Shakey's it was the decision of the March 2nd meeting of the Licensing Board that the Portage operation of Shakey's must meet the five minimal requirements set by the previous Licensing Board and which were being met by Shakey's operation on Nairn Avenue.

A MEMBER: What are they? What are they?

MR. MACKLING: They're minimal. They just require some reasonable high standards. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, if you want me to give you the details I will. Upon refusal, upon refusal of Shakey's to comply with these five minimal requirements, Shakey's restaurant beer and wine licence for 1970 for its Portage Avenue operation was not renewed at the start of the new licensing year April 1, 1970.

It seems rather apparent that the previous Licensing Board and the previous Commission and the present Licensing Board and the present Commission have been more than cooperative in dealing with the Shakey's Pizza Parlour situation. I gather that the Shakey's Pizza Parlour operation on Nairn Avenue only saw fit to comply with the five requirements in order to obtain its licence. In this regard it might be stated in Shakey's favour that Dandee Foods Limited, Shakey's Pizza Parlour, has been and is consistent in its attitude toward resolving the present situation on a basis of mutual reasonable compromise, that is they've indicated that they take the stand that these requirements are unnecessary and they refuse to accept them on the Portage Avenue premises although they did accept them on Nairn Avenue. Now that's an apparent conflict that doesn't seem to be too rational to me.

However, I cannot help but get the impression that at least some members of this Legislature and some members perhaps of the public . . . -- (Interjection) -- Well I think that if you would allow me to finish then I could perhaps deal with all of your questions . . . have a desire to see the philosophy and principles of the Manitoba Liquor Control Act changed so that either a new type of specialty restaurant licence be introduced with compatible requirements and conditions, or that licences either be divorced from the privileged status that it is now and has been in use as an instrument to upgrade and maintain high standards or that a complete review and study of requirements for each type of licence be undertaken. In short, it would appear that some honourable gentlemen, and I have a measure of support for this view, consider that it is time that perhaps study be given to the type of licence that is offered in the classification and standards that are required.

MR. DOERN: More beer.

MR. MACKLING: More beer, I hear. I wish to inform honourable members that this is only one of the great many areas I discussed with the present Chairman and members of the Commission and Licensing Board immediately after their taking office. However, I may use that hackneyed cliché, Rome wasn't built in a day. I want to indicate to the Honourable Member from Assiniboia in particular, when he cares to listen -- I'll take another little shot of water here.

MR. DESJARDINS: Are you sure it's water?

MR. MACKLING: I'm assured that it's water. There are so many assurers in this House that I have to be assured that it's assured water. I want to assure the Honourable Member particularly from Assiniboia who has spoken, and others who have spoken in this with conviction and feeling, that there are many areas of the Liquor Control Act which I personally commend to this House to be a subject for immediate review. And I want to indicate to my honourable friend who says "now?" that now is a relative term; if you said two or three weeks from today I think that might be about the timing. It is my expectation that a series of amendments will be ready for introduction by me into the House which are of a rather technical nature dealing with minor administrative or minor points of policy which will be part of a government bill to tidy up little anomalies that have crept up in the working of the Act.

But in addition to that, it is my expectation that I will be introducing a bill which will have quite a large number of sections dealing with changes in the philosophy and principle of various sections of the Liquor Control Act, and I might say that the amendment that is sought in this bill would otherwise have been one of those amendments. But I want to indicate that when that bill is introduced by me it will be naturally a matter over which people have great feelings, or may have very strong feelings from a moral point of view, and therefore it will be an open vote, it will be a free vote.

(MR. MACKLING cont'd)

Going back to the question, the particular question of Shakey's for a moment, you may agree or disagree with any or all of the requirements attached to each of the licences that I endeavoured to describe earlier. You may agree or disagree with the philosophy and principles of the Act as set out in the present Liquor Control Act and as suggested by the former Bracken Enquiry Commission. However, I would hope that each and every member would agree that unless and until there are changes in the requirements as set by precedent in the Act, or regulations, that these requirements and discretionary powers of the Commission and the Licensing Board must be maintained or the result would be chaos and confusion in service industries in Manitoba, which as I stated previously are the envy of the rest of Canada. No one can deny, no one will deny that great changes have taken place in every industry in the last ten or fifteen years and nobody is more aware than myself, the Licensing Board and the Liquor Control Commission members that improvement and updating must be studied in all areas regarding the Liquor Control Act and the regulations. Somebody has said that in regard to the rapid changes taking place in society today that one must run like a deer to keep up with yesterday.

As a new government we are taking a fresh look at all areas under our jurisdiction. Decisions emanating from our deliberations, studies and reviews will continue to come before this Legislature for consideration by all honourable members. And I want to assure you that the changes that I think are possible of the Liquor Control Act touching on matters of philosophy, principle and policy will be brought before this legislative session and the honourable member will have ample opportunity to indicate his support or otherwise of the changes in philosophy that are provided in those amendments, and each of us will be given an opportunity to speak with his own personal conviction without fear that this is going to be a political football or a political weapon that will be used by any political party. It's an area over which there is major public concern because it's a matter which transcends political beliefs; it's a matter of impinging on moral beliefs, religious persuasions and so on, and there may be sections in the proposed bill which I will introduce which would be free votes that I might not agree with, but nevertheless which I feel constrained to introduce in order that members will have an opportunity to air their views in respect to these matters.

Now I would like to return for a moment, now that I've taken that path of deviation which was opened for me, I would like to return for a moment to the bill, the private member's bill that the Honourable Member from St. Vital has brought before the House. As I've indicated, the import of this bill is in concert with the thinking of one of the amendments which I would have otherwise been including in the bill that I have referred to, and I have no hesitation in saying that I fully subscribe to the measure of tolerance, the greater measure of tolerance that enactment of this amendment will bring so that the Liquor Control Commission can use a reasonable discretion in exercising its power to permit special events such as referred to, the Festival du Voyageur, to take place on what is otherwise a prohibited day.

I have had the unpleasant task, and I'm sorry that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition isn't here, but I want to assure honourable members that the Liquor Control Commission and the Licensing Board are endeavouring in respect to the Shakey's matter and any other application to adhere to the principles and philosophy of the Act. Now in respect to the Festival du Voyageur, under the circumstances, the special nature of the occasion and so on and -- well, the warm constraints that were involved, they felt it was within the spirit of the Act but it wasn't within the letter of the Act. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition was right and I was constrained to write to the Commission pointing out they must interpret the Act in a manner strictly in accordance with the letter of the Act, and certainly I think that they are doing that in their consideration of the matters that have been brought before them, including the Shakey's matter.

Now I'm aware of the fact that in this our Centennial year there are a number of occasions that may well require the granting of a special licence for a special occasion to be held on a Sunday, and I am personally anxious that if members of this House are in agreement that we proceed to give this bill its second reading, preferably if we could today, I would urge upon the Honourable House Leader that if second reading is proceeded with that he call the Law Amendments Committee in session so that we can hear representations in respect to this bill, in view of the fact that I am aware that there are organizations who would like to be able to have an opportunity to have a Centennial festivity on a Sunday which might involve the consumption of wine, beer or spirits, and I think with the cooperation of the House we could deal

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) within the Law Amendments Committee if we so wish. I think, Mr. Speaker, those are my remarks.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I just have one question, but before I pose my question perhaps I could say to the Minister I am most appreciative that he is so considerate in explaining the Liquor Act itself and his observations with respect to the changes that are required, and I think that he's agreeable. But my question was -- I think that the Minister said he couldn't understand the rationale why the proprietor, or Shakey's complied with regulations at Nairn Avenue and would not comply in Westwood. Well is it not true that there was a great amount of money invested in the Nairn business? It was supposed to open on a certain date and just before it was opened the liquor licence was denied, so naturally there was no other course of action that this person could take except to comply and make changes at an extra expense. So he had to do this. Would this not be correct?

MR. MACKLING: Well, dealing with whether or not that was correct, I haven't had an opportunity to carefully consider what you said in the light of the facts as I know them. But in substance, in substance what I said though was that the principles seemed to be acceptable and the business could operate apparently effectively at 59 and Nairn. The five requirements had been requested earlier on the Portage Avenue site and it seemed to the Commission to be rather difficult to appreciate why it was impossible to accept those same five minimal requirements at the Portage Avenue site, and I accept the difficulty of the Commission in understanding that.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. G. JOHNSTON: . . . the five requirements that would have made the licensee suitable to have a licence. I don't know whether he does not wish to do that or not, but I'm interested to know how one changes one's appearance from appearing as a beer waiter and appearing as a waiter, a food waiter. -- (Interjection) --

MR. CHERNIACK: No, you'd just have to be a beer waiter.

MR. MACKLING: I think in one of the items that will be introduced in the bill for free vote there'll be something dealing with beer waiters that may answer your question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I was out of the Chamber when this matter came up on the last occasion but I am compelled to make a few remarks. You know, Mr. Speaker, I believe it was a Mr. Arnold Beaton that said the law is sometimes an ass, and we've seen it demonstrated so admirably today in this Chamber that it amazes me. It amazes me, and I don't really care what the high standards of the previous Commission was. As my friend the Honourable Minister of Transportation would say, they were only Tory stooges anyway so why should we worry about what their particular standards were. I don't of course treat the matter that lightly, but forgive me for having a little bit of fun with this thing.

MR. SCHREYER: You're not an authority on literature.

MR. ENNS: The question is a licence was granted, a service is being performed, many thousands of people are obviously very happy with the service in that area and . . .

MR. SCHREYER: They're all voters.

MR. ENNS: . . . they are not to my knowledge bothering or descending upon the Attorney-General's office with any long list of complaints -- (Interjection) -- Certainly, Mr. First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Who did you quote as saying that the law was an ass?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Arnold Beaton.

MR. CHERNIACK: How do you spell that?

MR. ENNS: B - e - a - t - o - n.

MR. CHERNIACK: Where did he say that?

MR. ENNS: He said it -- I can get you the references for it in a little while. There's a close relative sitting in the fourth estate that I can assure you that I could get the firsthand information from.

MR. SCHREYER: I'll ask for some assistance.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I accuse the First Minister of diversionary tactics again. He's attempting to divert me from the very serious question that I wish to address myself to, namely again, Mr. Speaker, the inability of this fine group of radicals, this group of people that were going to do things different, to do much different than send letters to the Commission to adhere strictly to the letter of the law.

MR. CHERNIACK: That's different eh? You wouldn't do that. Break the law.

MR. ENNS: Let's get one thing straight, Mr. Speaker, let's get the ground rules straight. You know it's credible, it's credible that you accuse me as a reactionary Tory, as a Tory - and you know that's when they're in benevolent moods - you know Fascist pig is probably what they'd like to call me, that's their normal terminology that they'd like to use on me. But let's understand this thing. It's quite acceptable and credible when you say that we're supposed to operate within the letter of the law. . .

MR. SCHREYER: Do you want us to break the law?

MR. ENNS: . . . but you know, Mr. Speaker, there are a great number of Manitobans, great number of Canadians, and I would suggest many more Canadians . . .

MR. SCHREYER: Do you want us to break the law?

MR. ENNS: . . . that look to this government, that look to this group of individuals not to break the law - certainly not to break the law, certainly not to break the law - but to approach the law, to make the necessary changes in the law to keep abreast with those things that are topical and current in 1970 in Manitoba today. And I suggest to you that the practices that are being carried out at this establishment are topical and acceptable to the norms and to the standards that Manitoba citizens in 1970 wish to enjoy. I find it somewhat amusing to find the posture taken by the Attorney-General by reciting to us ad infinitum a speech that must have kept him - and I would really like to think not him but perhaps somebody that played a supporting cast in his department - undue hours, undue hours preparing.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, I had one other reason for rising, and that is the Attorney-General at the outset mentioned in a very clear way, indicated that in his opinion the Attorney-General's office was in this matter not in a position as an appeal place or appellate court and that therefore any petitions on the part of this person should not be directed to the Attorney-General. Now I think a plea should be entered into the record for the Honourable -- not the Honourable but the party or the persons, the business establishment that made this application directly to the Attorney-General, in their ignorance of course I think, but nonetheless with some basis of understanding. It may have come to him . . .

MR. MACKLING: I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I didn't say that anyone had come to me, it was only a question in the House.

MR. ENNS: My understanding, Mr. Speaker, was that a brief of sorts, or an appeal of sorts was directed to the Attorney-General's Department. -- (Interjection) -- Well, if that's not the case then I could be corrected, but my information has it that an appeal was directed to the Attorney-General's office, and I . . .

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

MR. ENNS: Certainly.

MR. SCHREYER: Is the honourable member aware that it is often that he can be corrected.

MR. ENNS: Pardon?

MR. DESJARDINS: He didn't get that.

MR. ENNS: I thought perhaps the First Minister was going to ask me where my current information was coming from and I was about to refer to him that it comes from the same Mr. Beaton already quoted. Mr. Speaker, I did want to make this little point that -- well then, let's put it in hypothetical terms. One should understand, have an understanding for Mr. Gendreau. The owner of the establishment in question had thought of going to the Attorney-General . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Call him Shakey for short.

MR. ENNS: . . . because perhaps while he appreciated the fact that the Attorney-General was not in a legal position to act as an appellate court, he might have been coming to the Attorney-General in the hope that the Attorney-General from a party point of view would address himself to his past president, his immediate past president - you know, in the political sense - for redress in this matter, and that of course would have been understood by most Manitobans too under the circumstances.

MR. MACKLING: Was that standard practice for your previous administration?

MR. ENNS: Yes of course, the only difficulty was we, I don't believe, made any change in the appointment at the time our government took over from the Liquor Commission chairman since 1957 or '58. I believe Major General Rodger, who was appointed by the previous government, carried on throughout the tenure of our administration. -- (Interjection) -- He

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . was never appointed chairman of the board. In the leaving of Major-General Rodger he was good enough, kind enough to carry on in an acting role until the government opposite had an opportunity to make a suitable appointment. Well, Mr. Speaker . . .

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

MR. ENNS: Certainly.

MR. CHERNIACK: Who said the law is an ass?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I do not -- you know, I was referring specifically to the one member in this Chamber who when he rises on behalf of the Attorney-General's Department no doubt is the best single or sole representative of the law in this Chamber. Now, Mr. Speaker, if he wants to tell me what I indicated, I'll go back to the story of the cows and the bulls and the bees and a few other things. I can give him a tour description of my constituency. I am an expert at the castration of young bull calves as the House is already aware of and a few other such things, but not necessary the law, Mr. Speaker, I'm the first one to accept that fact. Mr. Speaker, let's not let levity enter into the whole debate. I merely want to say that it is a tragedy that we can't somehow, you know - and I really am trying to help them - I'm trying to help them to not take themselves all that serious in their ministerial offices and their ministerial functions, that they can be the same group of free wheeling, free thinking, radical group that they were when they were on this side. You know, when they were on this side and they suggested things to do . . .

MR. FOX: Would the member permit a question?

MR. ENNS: . . . and things that ought to be done . . . to do them, Mr. Speaker. Now here we have a simple situation where we want to recognize the fact that the moods, the manner and the way in which we approach our attitudes towards liquor, the consumption of liquor, the type of restaurants that are acceptable to us, were acceptable to us five years ago and acceptable to us now have changed, changed rapidly, and for goodness sakes let's try at least during the 1970, our Centennial Year, to keep up with this. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FOX: Would the member permit a question?

MR. ENNS: Certainly.

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You mentioned that you were offering aid to the government. Is it the kind that a bull offers in the china shop?

MR. ENNS: Well, I can't recall, Mr. Speaker, that I was offering aid to the government. Perhaps I was suggesting I was trying to help them out, but I haven't got that generous soul that my honourable friend the Member from River Heights has who has agreed to fill in the vacancy in the Deputy Minister's role in the Department of Industry and Commerce or other such places, travelling perhaps to Chicago in lieu of an embarrassed Minister to promote trade. No, my generosity stops short from making the odd helpful contribution from this side to that side.

MR. FOX: Now we need a tractor.

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

MR. HARDY: Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak, I'll be closing debate. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Harry, I must admit you're a tough act to follow, but it's TGIF anyhow, members of the Assembly.

I was very pleased to hear the comments of the Honourable the Attorney-General. For a moment there I thought we were on a Wardair tour on a cheap rate. We certainly did take in all aspects of the - or perhaps I should have said TransAir - all aspects of the operation of the Liquor Control Commission. I was going to at this time indicate and discuss other aspects of the operation of the Commission itself under the AG's department, but because of the latitude that obviously was granted, some of the comments that had to do with Shakey's and some of the other operations were quite divorced actually from Bill 22. But I appreciate the comments and I appreciate the attitude that the Attorney-General has adopted towards Bill 22 and I think it's probably a step in the right direction used with discretion.

Now the Attorney-General has indicated, and rightfully so, I think he can be proud of it, his department, but I think also that this speaks well of the previous administration in the operation of the Liquor Control Commission inasmuch as Manitoba has in fact one of the highest standards in the operation of its eating facilities and its drinking facilities, if you want to put it in that manner. There are a number of other comments that I would make but this will come under the Attorney-General's Department; it has to do with revenues and such items such as that. So at that point, Mr. Speaker, I thank the members of the Assembly for their indulgence

(MR. HARDY cont'd) in accepting Bill 22.

MR. CHERNIACK: Would the member permit a question?

MR. HARDY: Yes, certainly.

MR. CHERNIACK: I wonder if he is aware that in Chapter 47 of Oliver Twist, Mr. Bumble said: "The law is an ass."

MR. HARDY: Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that the Honourable the Minister of Finance direct those comments to the gentleman that's under the table.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. SHERMAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Member for Lakeside, my colleague, was quoting Arnold Beaton who said, "The law is sometimes an ass." That was his quotation.

MR. CHERNIACK: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I might indicate I can't find any Arnold Beaton in the encyclopaedia or in the work "Familiar Quotations."

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

MR. SPEAKER: If I may revert to an earlier item on the Orders of the Day, it was an oversight on my part and has since been drawn to my attention that on the Order for Return of the Honourable Member from Morris, which presently stands in the name of the Honourable First Minister, a request was made that it continue to stand in his name. Now, if I interpret our House Rule 60, sub-rule 6 correctly, then it appears to me that I'm not allowed to do that and I have no alternative but to put the question at this point.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, may I suggest if the House is not prepared to give leave for this to stand since there was a misunderstanding, that if you feel it must be done in this way then I would either suggest that we give the Honourable the First Minister an opportunity to speak today, as soon as we can get him back, or otherwise if you want to be rigidly correct, and I don't blame you for that, then I would be prepared to move the adjournment of debate.

MR. WEIR: Well, Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, and I'm sorry I missed part of it, I got the message and got here as quickly as I could. As I understand it, it may very well be that the First Minister has lost his right to speak. I don't know about the question being put. I think a scrutiny of precedent in the House would indicate that on more than one occasion a member has lost his right to speak, a given member of the House, and the debate shows up on the Orders of the Day the next day marked "open" - marked "Open" - and then some other member of the group is able to pick up the debate at that point in time. I think there's even been an example of it at this session of the Legislature. I believe the Member for River Heights, if I can recall, lost his right to speak on one occasion and somebody else automatically picked up the debate on the next occasion. If I interpret the rule correctly, it wouldn't be that the question would be put today automatically, but if somebody didn't pick up the debate next time, if it was marked "Open" then it would be open for debate. So that would be my understanding of the rules as they exist and I don't see an emergency at all.

MR. SPEAKER: I take it then that it remains as "Open"?

MR. WEIR: Well, Mr. Speaker, that would be my interpretation and it would certainly appear to solve the situation.

MR. GREEN: . . . too, and we did this before too. If the First Minister is back in the House and we've passed it by, we have gone back. If he wishes to speak today, I take it that there will be no objection to his speaking today.

MR. WEIR: Well, Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, I don't think that we would care to object.

MR. GREEN: Okay, then leave it open.

MR. WEIR: But on the point of order, I don't think we'd care to object but we must have the understanding then that once we've passed something on the Order Paper we back up for every member of the House and not just for the First Minister. It hasn't really be precedent that we back up on the Order Paper generally speaking.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this for the Honourable Minister of Transport.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

HON. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Minister of Transportation)(Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I have checked the Bill and I find that by pure coincidence - I'm sure it's coincidence - this is the same type of bill that's at our Legislative Counsel at the moment. I had announced about

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) two months ago that we were bringing in a Bill to allow right turns on red lights. I don't know why the Member for Fort Garry suddenly becomes concerned about this matter, they could have done it over several years. However, they do have it before us and we're not going to take the tack that was taken by the previous government that we want to get all the Bills in and not allow the opposition to get any. As far as I'm concerned, if it's the same type of Bill that we're proposing, they brought it in first and we'll support it because we think it is a good Bill.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, I had really not intended to take part in this debate but I can't really sit and accept the comments of the Minister of Transportation in the manner in which they were given. This is one more of the Bills, or a part of one of the Bills that was on the Order Paper a year ago at this time. It's not new, and if nothing else our honourable friends had an opportunity at the last session of the Legislature, had they so desired, to have brought it in and the Member for River Heights, quite rightly in my view, Sir, felt that this was something that he was interested in and he introduced the Bill and I don't think that there should be any motives . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: The Member for River Heights did not introduce the Bill.

MR. WEIR: It was the Member for Fort Garry. If my honourable friend the Minister of Finance wants to make a speech -- he has a habit if somebody interjects, he sits down to see if somebody wants the floor. He's a pretty good interjector himself but he doesn't really like other people to do it to him. But, Mr. Speaker, I just can't accept what appeared to be the questioning of motives being presented by the Minister of Transportation because we have chosen on this side to attempt to -- instead of putting on resolutions, and certainly it's likely to increase with the attitude that is being taken to Private Members' Resolutions by the government, it's rendered them completely useless; they don't mean anything. If there's anything including money that has "consider the advisability of", we might as well save our time and our breath and our energy and attempt to bring in positive suggestions for the consideration of the House in Bill form. In spite of the things that are said on the other side of the House, members on this side of the House are attempting to be positive, are attempting to put forward suggestions that are worthy of the consideration of the members of the House and in the interests of the people of Manitoba, and I reject out of hand the statement that was made by my honourable friend the Minister of Transportation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I think the Minister of Transportation's remarks should be corrected. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, on a point of privilege. His comments about the opportunity to present a Bill of this type being available for the last 10 years were directed specifically to me, Mr. Speaker, and I would just like to remind him that I haven't had that opportunity until this Legislature.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I just briefly want to comment on the remarks made by my honourable friend with regard to Private Members' Resolutions. They are certainly not useless. The government is going to give consideration to . . .

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The thing that is in front of us is the Bill, and if my honourable friend is prepared to relate it to the Bill like I attempted to do because of my honourable friend's comments, I'd be prepared to listen to him, but if he talks about Private Members' Resolutions there might be another opportunity.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I . . . relate it to the Bill just as my honourable friend did. I just want to indicate that my honourable friend is not correct in suggesting that bills are being brought because Private Members' Resolutions are useless -- I think those were the terms that he used -- that the government thereby has somehow not seen fit to give proper consideration to matters which are brought by the members of the opposition. I think the Minister of Transportation merely indicated that if something comes in that respect which we find useful, we are prepared to consider it and if necessary to pass it, which is what he has indicated that we are doing, and I can't conceive of a procedure which more than that should bring a kind of a good feeling in the House rather than a bad one, and for my honourable friend to say that Private Members' Resolutions are useless is, of course, patently untrue because, if they don't involve the expenditure of public funds, they resolve themselves into a resolution of the House, some of which may be passed, some of which may be defeated. If they are considered a resolution which

(MR. GREEN cont'd) the government should consider in the spending of money, then they may be passed, which is something which my honourable friend when he was Leader of the Government Party decided that they wouldn't do and which we have indicated that we will not do. I would only indicate, Mr. Speaker, and I do want to make this one point and that's the reason I got up to speak, is that if we were not prepared to give proper consideration to a bill presented by a private member, then we would not be discussing that bill, because we could go through the Order Paper on Private Members' Resolutions and perhaps not reach that bill. Government legislation taking precedence, we could get to the Minister of Transportation's bill before we reached the bill of the Member for Fort Garry and then claim the right to have brought this resolution in by ourselves. So I am really trying to establish that the Minister of Transportation has thrown out an olive branch, and I don't see why he should be rebuked with the kind of a fighting speech that the honourable member makes on such rare occasions. So Mr. Speaker, all that the Minister of Transportation is saying is that if a resolution comes to the House which the government finds favour with, then we are not going to out of course oppose it and that we are going to proceed along the lines that are suggested by the Member for Fort Garry.

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

. Continued on next page

PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: Private Members' Resolutions. Adjourned Debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Rhineland in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, it's not my intention to take much time of the House on this particular resolution because most of the things that are required to be said on it, I think have already been said by the mover of the resolution and by others who have spoken at this point. I would just like to add the reminder that this was, as has been pointed out by many members of this Assembly already, an election pledge, an election undertaking on the part of my friends opposite occupying the Treasury benches, and that the gestation period of nine months ended this past Wednesday. This government took office on the 15th of July and Wednesday was the 15th of April, and so now the blessed event is due and there are a good many people no doubt standing perhaps in the rhetorical position of midwives around the delivery table, waiting to see what this government is going to do as it labours to bring forth the kind of legislation that it has promised for many years on the hustings of this province, and written in black and white.

Now we have had classical exercises in this Chamber today by the Minister of Finance and last Friday by the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, in smoke-screening this issue. This morning, in discussing the estimates of the Minister of Youth and Education, the Minister of Finance launched a formidable bid for the title of smoke-screening champion, a red herring champion, which up to this point has reposed on the broad shoulders and on the loquacious and colorful tongue of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Last Friday afternoon, last Friday afternoon we got into discussion of this particular subject, the subject of the education tax burden on the shoulders of real property owners. It wasn't specifically on this resolution, it was on a resolution proposed by the Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party, but the subject of the debate was essentially the same and we had a demonstration by the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources for which he has now become justly famous in this Chamber, of how to divert the attention of members of this Chamber and indeed citizens of Manitoba, away from a prickly issue to which this government refuses to face up and hide behind and take shelter behind some of the things they did yesterday.

Well, the old political saying, of course, and I don't think I need to remind an astute politician like the Minister of Mines and Resources, is, "What have you done for us lately?" And you've been saying, Mr. Speaker, through you to the Minister, the government has been saying, Mr. Speaker, for years and months before that, months before this House went into Session and years before that in my recollection, that one of the first things that they would do, if not the first thing that they would do, would be attempt to remove the burdensome education cost load from the shoulders of those least able to support it, least able to pay for it - those persons, in other words, who are on fixed incomes, who have reached the end of their effective earning years and are receiving the Old Age Security benefit and Old Age Pensions. This Resolution, advanced by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, simply asks them to put up or shut up; to put their money where their mouth has been through election campaigns past, and provide the \$2,000 municipal tax exemption for citizens in that category that they have said would be one of the first, one of the keenest commitments, one of the most critical commitments that they would undertake if they ever occupied the benches opposite that they now occupy. So all the diversion and all the fancy verbal footwork and all the smoke-screening in the world about lowering the cost of Medicare to the average Manitoban is not going to detract for one moment from the difficulty that persons paying real property taxes, and through those taxes paying for the school costs in this province, now face and particularly persons in that category who are on Old Age Security.

I mentioned last night in the debate on the Education Estimates, or yesterday afternoon, that the mill rate in Fort Garry, my constituency, had jumped astronomically in the past year and that this year was being struck at new record highs to accommodate school costs. Many other members of my party and members on this side of the House have made reference to the same situation, the same economic plight in our community today. All the Minister of Finance could do this morning when he was defending the position of the Minister of Youth and Education was do precisely what the Minister of Mines and Resources did a week ago and take refuge in the tax shifts, the burden shifts that have taken place up to now in the form, for example, of relief on Medicare. No one's quarreling, least of all I, with the relief that has been granted

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.) those who had to pay the premium tax, who had to pay for their Medicare in amounts that were beyond economic practicality and comfort for them. But the fact remains, Mr. . . .

HON. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Minister of Transportation) (Thompson): Why did you vote against it?

MR. SHERMAN: I think if the Minister of Transportation would check my record, he'd see that I didn't vote against it. The fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that a firm commitment to the people of this province has been made by this government; the nine-month period, the first nine-month period in office for them is over, and surely the day of reckoning is at hand. And those people who are on Old Age Security and having to continue paying the burden of education costs in this province are now expecting some action from the government, and I'm here to ask, as many others on this side have asked, when might that action be forthcoming? And to say that it may be forthcoming in three or four years, or even "soon", is not good enough.

I made reference, as I have said, to the increase in the mill rate, the increase in municipal taxes in my constituency, which is the result of runaway school spending and school costs. The Minister of Youth and Education, in replying to me, said that he had read the same things in the paper that I had read. Well, he's not in his seat at the moment but I would like to convey the message to him through Hansard that I'm not referring to what I've read in the newspaper on that subject; I'm referring specifically to personal approaches, personal entreaties, face to face and over the telephone, that I've had in the last few days from citizens in Fort Garry. And I'm sure every member in this Chamber has had them from citizens in his own constituency where there have been these similar increases in mill rates and school spending; approaches from citizens in Fort Garry who sincerely are at the end of their tether in terms of maintaining their homes, in terms of meeting the property tax loads that they have. I suggest that trouble is brewing; really serious trouble is brewing in this respect, Mr. Speaker, and I challenge the government at this point, in what admittedly is so far a short life but nonetheless a life, I challenge the government at this point to deliver on that promise before the trouble reaches proportions where it is truly out of hand. And although I'm concerned for young home owners, for young home builders, family people, young working couples, it's really the people in the fixed income stage of their lives, the people who've reached the end of their effective earning years, who are most heavily and onerously burdened in this situation. And we ask, Mr. Speaker, of the Ministry sitting opposite: what are you going to do for us with respect to that pledge and that promise you made where the first \$2,000 in municipal assessment is concerned on their, on our homes? Never mind all the talk about Medicare. That was wonderful. That was wonderful. We've heard it all from the Minister of Finance and we've heard it all from the Minister of Mines and Resources, but what about that promise of the \$2,000 municipal assessment taxation exemption for those people? And it's on this point that many of us have stood up on this side of the Chamber and asked for an answer, and all we've had is evasion. We've had excellent rhetoric by the Minister of Finance, whose ability in this capacity has to be admired. We've had perhaps even superior rhetoric in performance by the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, protecting a government record that certainly needs protection on this score at this point in its life. The nine months are over, gentlemen. How about delivering the baby? How about delivering the goods?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, in the time that I've been in the House, I don't think that I have ever listened to an individual that I so love to listen to as the Honourable Member for Fort Garry. I know that he is one of those individuals who is expertise in affairs politic. I know that his upbringing is such and indeed his career is such -- (Interjection) -- that my honourable -- and he's a fellow Anglican, yes, and that's all to his credit because I too am an Anglican and very very proud of it, Mr. Speaker, and without reservation; but I love to listen to my honourable friend who is so experienced in the field of politics. I also love to listen to my honourable friend, and I had expected him during his discourse to reach his hands into his pockets and pull out a handkerchief and wipe the tears from his eyes. He disappointed me. He didn't do it. He talked about the nine months for the creation of a new child. There are some of us who have worked over the years longer than nine months for the creation of a child in Manitoba that will get things done. And I'm so proud and so happy that over a reasonable number of years, that today Manitoba has a child in the new government that will get things done. And I want to assure my honourable friend . . .

MR. WEIR: A juvenile delinquent.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . the Member for Fort Garry that things are being done.

MR. SHERMAN: Not on that.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . and that things will be done, and at the present time the proposition we have before us is whether or not this government will give consideration to the advisability of doing something in respect of assessments in the relieving of property tax.

Then we have the amendment before us to the main Resolution, and surely my friend the Member for Fort Garry, with his long experience in the field politic, his knowledgeability of parliamentary procedures and motions and amendments, will realize that in consideration of the amendment that we have before us, which asks that something be done within the fiscal year in respect of municipalities, is fully cognizant of the fact. As a matter of fact he admitted it, that the mill rates in most of the municipalities if not all of the municipalities in Manitoba have now been struck. My honourable friend the Member for Fort Garry mentioned of increases in that great municipality of Fort Garry which he temporarily represents, admitted that there were increases there. But I'm sure that the people of Fort Garry realize also that even if we did, after the mill rate has been struck, as my friend admits, change the ground rules, that it wouldn't apply to them for the present fiscal year in respect of Fort Garry because I know that they're a very capable municipality, a very competent municipality, and I would imagine, Mr. Speaker, that already the tax bill for my honourable friend has been printed and possibly it's in the mail to him.

But this government is a government that is giving consideration to these problems. The Throne Speech announced that we are fully cognizant of the problems that are confronting Manitoba and Manitobans at all levels, but we are following through a policy that takes into consideration the present economic climate that is prevailing, and I know full well, as amiable as he is, that my honourable friend the Member for Fort Garry would be one of the first to stand up in this House if we were to increase provincial bases of taxation in order to achieve those things that we are considering at the present time. And may I refer my honourable friend to the remarks that were made just the other day by his colleague the Honourable Member for Emerson when he was referring to an increase in minimum wages. The Member for Emerson said that he had no objections at all basically to an increase in minimum wages but should those increases be put into effect now because of the economic climate prevailing in the Province of Manitoba? So, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to my honourable friend the Member for Fort Garry that he should consider the over-all picture.

MR. SHERMAN: I do.

MR. PAULLEY: He does, Mr. Speaker. My honourable friend admits the logic of what I'm trying to say at the present time but my honourable friend, when he was speaking a few moments ago, didn't recognize the logic. He condemned us; he condemned this government for not doing what he now says would be a logical approach, and I admire what my honourable friend says when he is seated far more than I admire my honourable friend for what he says when he is standing on his feet in debate. There's a vast difference and I suggest . . .

MR. SHERMAN: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. There is no contradiction in what I have said in sitting in my chair as against what I said standing on my feet. I agreed with the Minister that we have to take the over-all view, but does he not agree that people on Old Age Security are part of the over-all people who are losing their homes?

MR. PAULLEY: Oh definitely, and I'm sure that my honourable friend will recognize that I am concerned with those on fixed incomes and that we have been trying to do something about it over the years, but the seeds we have tried to plant over the years in this House have fallen on deaf ears, deaf ears of both Liberal and Conservative administrations in the Province of Manitoba. And all that we are asking, as far as this government is concerned, is to do exactly what the Honourable Member for Fort Garry just said a moment ago, an opportunity in the light of the economic climate prevailing in the Province of Manitoba to forward our program and our policy.

I want to say to my honourable friend the Member for Fort Garry that, after having sat on that side of the House for sixteen or seventeen years, that when his colleagues and adherents to his so-called political philosophy, when they were on this side for ten years, they listened with dimmed ear to our propositions on that side. And these were years, Mr. Speaker, these were years of relative affluence in the Province of Manitoba. These were the years when expansion was taking place economically, but my honourable friend just a few moments ago admitted that

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) the situation is temporarily changed. I had an opportunity yesterday of saying as far as the economic climate in Manitoba is concerned in respect of unemployment that we do have the least amount of unemployment in Canada. And my honourable friend I'm sure was pleased to hear that, but that doesn't mean - and I'm sure he would agree with me - that we have the same affluence in Manitoba now in the year 1970 that we had during the ten years of Conservative administration when they sat on their fannies on this side of the House and would not make any move at all to alleviate the problems and the burdens on the local taxpayer.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. That's not a fair statement.

MR. SHERMAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. PAULLEY: On a point of order?

MR. SHERMAN: No, on a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker; on a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The Minister is casting unfair -- is impugning quite unfairly the record of the past administration, with no reference to the roads, the schools and the economic development undertaken by that government.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't know what the point of privilege is. In all deference to my honourable friend, while some of us were in this House fighting for the progress in Manitoba my friend was not here. I'm fully aware, I'm fully aware that there was some progress made in Manitoba by the former administration. I give them credit. Yes, I can tell of it, Mr. Speaker, as suggested by my honourable friend from the southwest corner of Manitoba. I can say it in about three words, or at the most three sentences, and I would say that it was only about a quarter of what could have been achieved under an effective progressive administration such as that that is now conducting the affairs of Manitoba; that if we had the same resources as they had, we would not be in the dire plight that we are as a result of the ineptness of the previous administration in the Province of Manitoba. And I want to say to my honourable friend the Member for Fort Garry that I'm positive, I'm positive that if my honourable friend would only care to look over the record on a factual basis, that he would agree with me.

MR. SHERMAN: My roots were always here.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . and he would not attempt to rise on a question of privilege because

MR. ENNS: Would the Honourable Minister accept a question?

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, certainly I would.

MR. ENNS: Is the Minister now working on the agricultural surplus in this province?

MR. PAULLEY: On the agricultural surplus? You know, one of the problems that we have and one of the reasons, one of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, that we have an agricultural surplus in this province and the other provinces as well, is because of the ineptness of previous Conservative and Liberal administrations in disposing of the products of the prairies, and if they hadn't done that in their administration we wouldn't be faced with the economic problems with which we are faced here in the Province of Manitoba and the western prairies. When the likes of my honourable friend the Member for Arthur . . .

MR. WATT: Will my honourable friend permit a question?

MR. PAULLEY: . . . whose contribution in respect with agriculture was a junket to see how many boats were lying idle in the Port of Vancouver without achieving anything. This was the approach of the former administration, the Conservative administration in this House.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, are we on agriculture . . .

MR. PAULLEY: . . . and this is the reason that we're in the dire plight that we are today.

MR. WATT: On a point of order, are we on agriculture now? Because I want to make a statement on agriculture now, Mr. Speaker, if we're on agriculture. I'd like to ask my honourable friend a question. Which position is he with the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture has taken? We're now on wheat and we're on the wheat surplus and we're on wheat reduction. Which position does he take?

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please. Order please. I would hope that rather than attempt to answer the questions put to the Honourable Minister, that rather the Honourable Minister would contain his remarks within the framework of the resolution before the House.

MR. SHERMAN: . . . permit one question, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister permit one question? With his great sense of fair play, and his continual -- well this is the preamble to the question, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister, with his great sense of fair play and his

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.) continual reference to all things in their time, not concede that the previous administration - that is, going back to its original point of election in 1958 - had to lift this province literally out of the dark ages, and had many challenges, all of which had to be . . . ?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order. I'm sure the Honourable Member for Fort Garry will find ample opportunity to present his views before the House. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, did I not hear the Minister say the word "progressive" for the former government?

MR. SPEAKER: I must inform the honourable member that a hearing disability is not a point of privilege. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much your suggestion that I should get back to the subject matter, and I'm sorry my honourable friend is leaving because I had an answer to his question. And I think, Mr. Speaker, in all deference, that it is appropriate, because one of the reasons that this government is faced with the necessity of a delay or at least further consideration in the implementation of the subject matter of the resolution and the amendment, is because of the plight in agriculture. And when my honourable friend stands and says are we dealing with the matter of agriculture, or whether we're dealing with the question of being able to give exemptions insofar as municipal assessments are concerned, and taxation, they are related even if my honourable friend doesn't understand that we still basically in Manitoba have an agricultural industry that under a proper administration would be so healthy that they would be able to make their contribution to the coffers provincially and otherwise, which they're not able to now as the result of the ineptness of past policies of the former administration, federally and provincially.

And then my honourable friend the Member for Fort Garry's request to me, did we not come out of the dark ages of 1958? - I say to him, yes; we came out of the dark ages of 1958 into just a little grey area for the next ten years and now we're going hopefully into an area in which light will prevail insofar as Manitoba is concerned. So you're right. We did come out of the dark, dim days of liberalism in Manitoba, and we're in them now - we're in them now federally, and we're hopeful as the result of the by-election in Selkirk that this will be a beacon, a forward thrust to light in the federal arena as well, and my honourable friends opposite I'm sure will really realize that, as a result of the by-election in Selkirk -- (Interjection) -- Western Canada has had a curse on both of you. Anyway . . .

Mr. Speaker, my main purpose in rising after my honourable friend the Member for Fort Garry had spoken. He seemed to condemn us for a delay. The delay is only caused and has only been caused by the ineptness of the previous administration to take into consideration the plight of our old age pensioners, those on fixed income. And surely, surely my friend the Member for Fort Garry, who is such an influential character, should be able to go within his caucus and say to his members - men and women alike - and say well, now, look. We failed. We failed. Is it not fair to give to the present administration an opportunity of a reassessment and a look at the mess that our municipalities were left in as a result of our conduct of the business of the Province of Manitoba?

MR. SHERMAN: I have no influence - just a big heart.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, I'm very pleased to hear the Minister's remarks on this subject. I'm not going to stand up and go on about election promises. -- (Interjection) -- No, well I really don't think there's any reason to. I will get the same answer as we've always got, that "we have only been in two sessions and we are going to get to them" but there was an election promise. It wasn't just \$2,000 for old age pensioners as far as school taxes were concerned, it was for everybody. But I'm not going to go on election promises. Mr. Speaker, the government at the present time seems to be taking the attitude that unless you can do something complete -- and I don't disagree with this; I just hope we don't get a white paper or something like that right off the bat because . . .

MR. GREEN: . . . Pink Paper.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: That's right. Because the only statement I have heard from most people in an NDP party is that the White Paper hasn't gone far enough, and I'd be very concerned if we get a Pink Paper, as the Minister says. But they don't seem to realize - as they

April 17, 1970

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd.) did when they changed the Medicare premium, whether I agree with the way it was, but they said, "This is an emergency" - they don't seem to realize that there are emergencies such as this, Mr. Speaker, and I'd like to read a letter. This is addressed to the Honourable Howard Pawley, Minister of Municipal Affairs, Legislative Building. I received a copy as the MLA for Sturgeon Creek. Mr. Patrick, the Member for Assiniboia, received a copy and the Attorney-General received a copy, and this is the type of thing that you might call an emergency that should be dealt with. It's from the Mayor of St. James-Assiniboia and he doesn't mention any election promises. He says, and here it is - basically a problem:

"Council has recently given consideration to requests from senior citizens now in receipt of Old Age Security payments with respect to a payment of school taxes. A typical example reads as follows: 'After paying taxes in St. James for over 50 years on Brooklyn Street, I would like to request the school tax be deducted from my taxes. It's rather hard to save \$200.00 out of \$109.00 pay, pay phone, light, water and gas. There's not too much surplus left to eat and clothe on.'" The Mayor continues though: "Inasmuch as it is practically impossible to discriminate in these cases, and furthermore, any grants on composite grounds must be added to the bills of other citizens, our council is of the opinion that the government should take under consideration some relief for people in this category. I might point out that, according to statistical information we have available, there are some 3,200 people in St. James-Assiniboia alone over 65."

All he says is, there are people having problems at the present time. All he says, and we can't rebate a school tax without permission from the Minister or the government, and this is the type of letter cities and municipalities are receiving. So, Mr. Speaker, I am not saying \$2,000 rebate to everybody, or even a lot of people that maybe can pay it - maybe we should take a look at their means; but we know this lady and this lady is in dire trouble and needs help. The City has requested that the government find some way for the cities and municipalities to do it, and if you give them a way they'll do it a lot more efficiently than maybe the government will, but just give us the chance to do it.

So, Mr. Speaker, that's all I have on the resolution: just give us a chance to help people with an emergency such as this. -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, if I might quote just one more little thing that I wrote down this morning - I might not have it right, and it was said by the Honourable Minister of Finance: "Don't open your mouth unless to breathe." That's all I'd like to say. Back to the resolution. Give the Cities and municipalities the chance to help people in this condition.

MR. DESJARDINS: Like the former administration did!

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce in amendment thereto, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for River Heights, which I am holding.

I've taken the matter of the sub-amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for River Heights under advisement. I feel that the rules of procedure regarding this point are quite clear. May I refer honourable members to Beauchesne, 4th Edition 1958, Citation 202, subsection (1), which reads as follows, and I quote: "To an amendment, when proposed from the Chair, an amendment may be moved but only two amendments can be proposed at the same time to a question. Some limit is necessary and the usage has grown into law that an amendment to an amendment is allowable."

In perusing the proposed sub-amendment before me, I can only quote Mr. Speaker Bilton: "In reviewing the detail in particular items of reference pertaining to the subject before the House, I feel that honourable members might be placed in a peculiar situation in determining their course of action, in their attitude toward what, in my opinion, are two separate approaches to the main motion." And I would refer honourable members to the Journals of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba of 1968, Page 239.

May I also refer honourable members to a ruling by Mr. Speaker Bilton as reported in

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.) Journals of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, 1969, Page 167, wherein Mr. Speaker Bilton stated: "In his attempt to amend the amendment, he proceeded to amend parts of the main motion. This action disqualifies his motion." Citation 202 subsection (3) of Beauchesne hereinbefore referred to is very clear in stating that the purpose of a sub-amendment is to alter the amendment. May I relate the foregoing to the motion, amendment and proposed sub-amendment before us.

In essence, the main motion states that whereas the TED Commission had made four main recommendations and whereas the government had acted on one, that therefore the government consider the advisability of acting on the remaining three. The amendment states that the government had acted on two and calls upon it to act on the remaining two. The proposed sub-amendment states that the TED Commission made recommendations in addition to the four cited in the main motion, and calls upon the government to act on all of them.

Therefore, the issue before the House, as posed by the main motion and amendment thereto, is the question of what number of the TED Commission's recommendations had the government acted upon, and having established that, it calls upon the government to consider acting on the remainder of the main recommendations.

The sub-amendment speaks of additional recommendations of the TED Commission and hence brings up matters foreign to the amendment in the sense that it contributes nothing to altering the amendment. If the sub-amendment were to be ruled in order, then its adoption or rejection by the House would have no effect on the amendment as it may affect the main motion. Therefore, I must rule the proposed sub-amendment of the Honourable Member for River Heights out of order.

May I remind the Honourable member that he is at liberty to take advantage of Citation 202 (3) of Beauchesne, and I quote: "If it is intended to bring up matters foreign to the amendment, the member should wait until the amendment is disposed of and move a new amendment."

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, seconded by -- the Honourable Member for Elmwood wishes to speak?

MR. DOERN: Yes, I thought there was another amendment coming but I was prepared to speak at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, the original resolution dealt with the four main recommendations set out in a chapter of the TED Report, and the debate centres around the implementation or otherwise, or the degree of implementation or otherwise, of those four recommendations and the debate has been -- various speakers have entered into it, including the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose and the Minister of Industry and Commerce, to mention two.

I would like to review some of the points and emphasize one of the points that the Minister himself said he would look into but I feel might need some additional urging on, and that is the third point, in regard to the establishment in Ottawa of an office of Manitoba Economic Affairs.

In regard to the four general points, the amendment has already been made that really the first couple have been brought into effect, and I regret that my friend the Honourable Member for River Heights wasn't present because he has of course made some pretty fiery statements in regard to this resolution - radical statements in regard to this resolution.

The suggestion of a committee, Standing Committee on Economic Development, has already been initiated and I would only say this on that point: The whole basis for a committee is, I think, one of mutual benefit, that the members of the Legislature would make themselves familiar with the economic problems and solutions of our province and that it should not be a place for rancorous debate but a place where one can learn by talking among ourselves, and also by hearing from and questioning people of the Deputy Minister rank, and professionals, and so on. The Member for River Heights seems to be more interested in a straight debating forum between himself as the former Minister of Industry and Commerce and the present Minister of Industry and Commerce.

The second point, as already mentioned, was the establishment of an Advisory Council on Economic Development, and that has been done. The Board has been appointed and professional staff have been acquired.

(MR. DOERN cont'd.)

Mr. Speaker, the point that I really wish to emphasize here, mentioned by the Minister, is the third point, and that is the establishment in Ottawa of an Office of Manitoba Economic Affairs. The Minister said that he was going to look into this and that he thought it was a worthwhile proposal, but I would like to emphasize it a little stronger because I think that this is a key recommendation and one that can be easily overlooked, and I think differs from the reference made by the Minister himself about the office that was once established in London, England. There was, I think a number of years ago, some sort of a trade office or something like that, whereby Manitoba as a province attempted to get contracts and negotiate business with people in Great Britain, and I submit that this was quite a different thing altogether; that perhaps in that context this is the rightful place of the Federal Government or it's somewhat superfluous for a province to establish its own office in a foreign country or even in a part of the Commonwealth.

I think the importance of an office in Ottawa is very clear. There are an increasing number of complicated grants and regulations streaming out of the House of Commons and out of the Civil Service in Ottawa, and I think that it is invaluable for a province to have representatives right there in order to, first of all, be fully informed and in direct communication with people in government. I also think that it's crucial for business in Manitoba to be made aware of contracts and opportunities that come from the Federal Government. I think that the present system of learning from Manitoba, or flying down there occasionally, is not as efficient as having a small staff of people who would be in effect specialists in government contracts and also in establishing liaison between the Provincial Government and the Federal Government. This group of people could also be in touch with the Members of Parliament in the federal House and I think also work with them and through them.

The TED Report suggests that the function of this permanent office of Manitoba Economic Affairs should have the following functions and I would like to quote the three mentioned on Page 401: First, to explain to the Federal Government, Manitoba's position on all matters that affect economic development with a view to influencing favourably the Federal Government's action in this regard; second, to provide liaison for Manitoba industry regarding Federal Government contract possibilities, export insurance and similar matters; and third, finally, to provide liaison for all provincial departments and agencies with federal departments and agencies.

I think that it's worth the investment to have a person of senior Deputy Minister rank and two or three senior specialists, in the capital to carry out that function and these people obviously should work not only in close contact with the Minister of Industry and Commerce, but with the Premier of the province as well.

On other questions in regard to the resolution, the use mentioned, the need for development of an applied technical and economic research capability for industry and a new institute. The new Minister himself, I think, is bringing a new approach to this portfolio which is superior to the former Minister who tended to concentrate a great deal on fanfare, crude growth, the power of positive thinking, and other such things in the tradition of show business and Diefenbaker mania and other such techniques which are, you know, really somewhat heart-warming but sometimes, when translated into actual results, are not as productive as they might seem.

The new Minister will obviously, given his background and his training is very much interested in carefully researched products, I think you'll see more research done in this department than ever before; there'll be more selective investment made and, in the words of the Minister himself, there'll be planned growth rather than raw growth, and I think that this will benefit the province.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for River Heights raised all sorts of questions which I think will be answered in the estimates of the Department of Industry and Commerce if we should ever reach that department in the remaining 39 hours, and the result is that I will leave those questions for him to answer, questions of air policy which our government has backed and questions of uranium enrichment and so on.

But, in short, I would say that of those four key recommendations which were drawn to the attention of the House by the Member for Ste. Rose, two have been implemented and the remaining two are in the process of being implemented.

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

MR. BEARD: Mr. Speaker, I promise you not to be very long. I understand there's quite an important meeting down at the end of the hall, and I would like to make sure I don't miss out on it. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, I believe that's on the development of Manitoba.

But when we're talking about the economic development of Manitoba, I think that we must involve ourselves in a little broader thinking than people have been considered up to now, because we're talking about something that is past - the FRED and TED Commissions that are tabled, and we're wondering, looking back over our shoulders and saying, "Where have we gone?" and the thing that brings me to my feet today is the fact that now we find that there's been a press release in respect to Churchill and we've lost the opportunity to become the centre of the Arctic Armed Services which was, I suppose, supposed to create the image of Arctic sovereignty of the North. This has been located in Yellowknife and there are several other centres in the Territories that will be used. I think it is unfortunate from the development of this province in that most of the equipment and the accommodation that would be necessary is at Churchill, so they will require new accommodation, new equipment and new everything. And while I'm not on the government's side of the House, I do not know what this government has done about it in encouraging the Federal Government to consider this approach, but certainly whatever they've done has failed and so we again have failed as far as the North is concerned in respect to economic development, an opportunity to get a piece of the action in economic development.

They talk about the importance of an information office in Ottawa and I think perhaps this may be a good thing, because I don't think that the MPs for the Province of Manitoba are getting through to those in charge of the affairs of this country. I think there should be a little more action down there, and if it means that we've got to set up our own lobby down in Ottawa, then maybe we should be going ahead and doing this. We don't seem to be able to get it off our feet here. We in the North asked that they set up a port authority at Churchill to look after the development, economic development of Churchill, and there doesn't seem to be any action from this government at this time, and if they're waiting I don't know what they're waiting for because the season will be over shortly, the bookings will be all made for the grain and they'll shut that off and say somebody else -- the Commission will blame the brokers and the brokers will blame the buyers and such on and such on, and we've heard it over and over again. The Hudson Bay Route Association will be here holding their convention and you'll hear the excuses, the excuses all over again, the same excuses, no action. But in Manitoba when we send out the committees to look into this type of development, they come back, give suggestions to a government in the Province of Manitoba, and that's about as far as it ever goes as far as I'm concerned.

Somebody handed me a Legislative Lament. It says, "We've heard about FRED and now we've got TED but whatever happened to SAM?" And I say to you, whatever happened to Churchill we've lost again - how many times do you lose? They say there's a little apathy sets in once in a while at Churchill, and my goodness, how many times do you have to get kicked in the rear end before you kind of give up? If this had happened anywhere else in the Province of Manitoba, there would have been a great deal of support and a great deal of talk about it today, but it just proves that Churchill is not considered a part of Manitoba by most Manitobans and they look at it and say, "Who would want to live there? It's too far north. That's up near the North West Territories," and I think that North West Territories look at Churchill with a far more favourable attitude than the people of Manitoba. One woman even apparently stated that why would Churchill want to move to the North West Territories because it's so much colder up there? This is actually the attitude of the people of Manitoba. They're not interested. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I will now go to the party.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question, the question on the amendment?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I do believe that the Honourable Member for Fort Garry wanted to adjourn debate. Perhaps one of his colleagues would help in this connection.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: In case the Member for Fort Garry's motion wasn't held in abeyance, I'd 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.

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

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I ran to the press before for the Honourable Member for

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd.) Churchill to report his resolution. I hope he'll do the same for me now. In the meantime, I consider this a serious resolution. First of all, I wish to thank the members that participated in this debate. I remember particularly one question that the member for Roblin was asking and I thought I'd just clarify that under the -- he asked why the 500, and this is under the Municipal Act. It's Section 365 subsection (1) and it just plainly reads this way: "Every city, town and suburban municipality and every village having a population of 500 or more persons shall" - and I'll leave the rest out - "appoint one chief constable or more." So you might find that in there.

It was very interesting to listen to the Attorney-General in his remarks. He mentioned the fact that perhaps this idea had originated from our Committee at meetings on municipal affairs, which is correct - it did, and I remember quite vividly that he mentioned at that time that it was a matter of finances perhaps, and that he could not really see it that time, but I must admit to the Honourable Minister that this is where I began to look at this and I think it is to me a very serious resolution. I think that the Minister was worried about the monies involved concerned at that time and I believe he still is. I know that by his deliberations or statements that he made, I think this is his concern.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think at times we have to get to the point and realize that money just isn't everything. We can have all the education in the world; we can claim that we've the highest standard of living in Canada, or for that matter claim the highest standard of living in the world, and we may very well claim to be the most progressive people in Canada here in Manitoba, but if we cannot afford to keep law and order in our own communities, we have achieved but very little in my opinion. Nor have we achieved anything, not the right things, for the people of this province. So, Mr. Speaker, as far as the Attorney-General's attitude, in my opinion it's not good enough, although I have a feeling - I'm sorry he's not here - I have a feeling that deep down he thinks different, and that he is not of that opinion. I think he would like to see this help coming to the communities, communities that just can't afford the kind of police protection that they deserve. I would also - I should perhaps say, although I appreciate his concern in regards to the government perhaps being willing, I think this is not good enough. I think his government or this government has to accept that responsibility at this time. I think they should and I hope still hope they will, although according to his remarks I doubt if they will.

I'm happy to see that so many people are concerned with this matter. Just last Saturday, I read in Monday's Free Press, Free Press of April 13th, where people of all avenues of life are concerned about some of the problems that we have talked about in this resolution. Just last Saturday in a seminar held at the University of Winnipeg, I believe it was, a seminar of the Manitoba Society of Criminology, and we had some very important -- or there were some very important people present at this seminar. We had the RCMP represented, a member of the Crown Counsel was present; the Chief Magistrate of Manitoba was present, and some other important people - the Director of Juvenile Corrections, a panel of seven. I think also Mr. Gallaher, a Winnipeg lawyer, was on this panel, and they came up with quite a few comments which I thought were very interesting, because following the panel discussions - and they had an audience of about 125 - they divided into different groups and tried to summarize what was really needed. And I just wish to quote on this. "One group called for establishment of a municipal police training college in Manitoba. Another proposed provincial grants on a per capita basis to municipalities to assist in the administration and training of police."

I'd like to particularly, while closing this debate, bring to the attention what the Chief Magistrate of Manitoba mentioned, and I think it's worthy of stating in this House and I wish to quote from this same article at this time. He said, "The pressure on municipalities of having to equate police costs with revenue, encourages their police forces, for example, to set more radar traps. It's this kind of pressure which isn't in keeping with the best principles of a proper judicial system and proper police work." And he goes on: "Perhaps government grants for municipal police financing could help, or perhaps municipalities should be free from involvement in actual police work." And he goes on to state his concern, and I'm happy to see people of that calibre beginning to take note of the serious problem that exists in many communities, and I think it backs up my resolution that problems do exist and that somebody has to, just simply has to do something about it.

I think we're aware that many of these communities are not getting the right kind of police training and I think we're full aware that somebody has to pay for this kind of protection

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd.) if we like it or not. We realize that some are just not in as good a position as others are in this respect, but we know and we agree, I'm sure every member in this Chamber agrees, that as far as police protection is concerned, that good police protection is very essential. I don't think I have to convince anybody in this House concerning that matter.

So, Mr. Speaker, again I appreciate the remarks that were made by various members. I'd just like to sum up what I have tried to say during this resolution. I think, first of all, I've tried to point out and perhaps I should quickly summarize, that communities of 500 or more must have a constable regardless if they can pay for it or not. And also, I must agree it is a good law - there's nothing wrong with the law - but it does need financial help; there's no question in anyone's mind. And I want to repeat again that I believe that police protection is very much the life blood of our community. And as I mentioned at the start, not today but when I presented the resolution, that communities are paying up to 10 and 15 mills for this kind of protection, it is just higher money than these communities can afford. As was brought out by the Attorney-General, and I've tried to bring it out, crime is on the increase today. We don't have to argue about that - we know this is a fact. And here we're really not willing to help areas that do need help, and I'm very serious when I say that if this government is not going to consider giving complete financial help at this time, I do hope that they will consider some form or some kind of a per capita grant, whether it be five or ten dollars per person - this I'll leave up to the government - but there has to be some help to maintain this law and order and perhaps only to the group in the 500 or to the 5,000 population group. Maybe the smaller ones, as we know, they're getting their help from the RCMP and the provincial and federal governments; maybe the larger ones can afford to get their own help; but groups in the area of 500 to 5,000 population, I think should get this opportunity of getting help from this government. So, in closing, I do hope members on this side will support this resolution and I do hope that not only if the front benches have decided not to vote for it, although I still hope they will, I hope at least that those sitting behind the front benches will vote for it.

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

MR. BARKMAN: Yeas and Nays please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. For the information of the honourable members, the division on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, Resolution No. 15.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Claydon, Einarson, Enns, Girard, Graham, Hardy, Henderson, F. Johnston, Jorgenson, McGill, McGregor, McKenzie, Sherman, Watt, Weir and Mrs. Trueman.

NAYS: Messrs. Allard, Borowski, Boyce, Burtiak, Desjardins, Doern, Fox, Gottfried, Green, Jenkins, Johannson, McBryde, Mackling, Malinowski, Miller, Paulley, Pawley, Petursson, Schreyer, Shafransky, Turnbull, Uskiw and Uruski.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 17; Nays, 23.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Services. Had I voted, I would have voted in favour of the motion.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the Minister of Finance. Had I voted, I would have voted in favour of the motion.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the Member for Crescentwood. Had I voted, I would have voted for the resolution.

MR. BEARD: Mr. Speaker, I understood I was paired with the Minister of Health.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I believe that's known as double indemnity insurance.

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

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, this topic is not unfamiliar to the House and I don't intend to waste any time talking about it. I would point out that the basic resolution calls for changes in the Foundation Program to 80-20 for 1971, 90-10 for '72 and 100 percent of the program for '73. I would like to point out that had the government not made the move that it has made with regard to the Foundation levy, that they could have moved pretty close to 75-25 this year and this would have put them well on the way.

However, I'm not going to speak on the motion, Mr. Speaker, but I do want to take issue

(MR. CRAIK cont'd.) with the clause "consider the advisability" and the interpretation that the government has put on it. I think that this is probably a valid interpretation the first time that a resolution appears on an Order Paper, but this resolution has been on the Order Paper before. It was on last fall and it was on previous to that when the previous government was in office and it was looked at at that time and the issue was considered and I think all the issues were aired. The previous government voted against it because they could not at that time see the move coming up in the forthcoming year to make the decision requested by this and felt bound by this clause "advisability" if they had agreed with it.

So I feel, Mr. Speaker, that when a resolution of this sort is approved by the government at one session, that it it appears a second time around at another session and no action has been indicated by the government but that the government again approves it, that it's meaningless. It's meaningless to consider it, meaningless for the government to vote for it, it's meaningless for us to waste our time talking about it. And on this basis, until the government indicates what its position is on these resolutions and changes its interpretation of this clause "consider the advisability of" in respect to the second time a resolution appears on an Order Paper, then on those grounds, Mr. Speaker, at the appropriate time I will either vote against this resolution or I will absent myself from voting.

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

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm quite certain that the honourable member who is not here is prepared to relinquish his right to speak. Let the matter go to a vote.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? -- (Interjection) -- Resolution No. 9.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, did the House Leader say the matter stand or . . .

MR. GREEN: No. I'm suggesting that the Honourable Member for Kildonan is relinquishing his right to speak, so anybody can pick it up if they like.

MR. PATRICK: If no one else wishes to speak, I'll be closing this debate, or adjourning it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member appreciates the effect of Rule 6, subsection (6). Are you ready for the question?

MR. GREEN: I would move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Honourable Attorney-General, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the indulgence of the House in having this matter stand, (Agreed).

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

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this debate for the Minister of Agriculture but I see he's not here, so if somebody else wishes to speak they can do so.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Attorney-General, that debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the House to allow this matter to stand. (Agreed.)

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

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

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

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

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

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, that

WHEREAS there are many elderly people who are afflicted with chronic degenerative diseases of old age, and

WHEREAS these people are not acutely ill enough to be eligible for admission to hospital where costs are covered by the Manitoba Hospital insurance scheme, yet are unable to be cared for at home, and

WHEREAS they have contributed to said insurance scheme for many years since its inception in the hope of protecting themselves against catastrophic costs of illness, and

WHEREAS they must resort to alternative care, such as nursing homes, where they do not benefit from this insurance;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the government consider the advisability of forgiving these people their premiums under the hospital insurance plan during the time they are paying their own costs for alternative care.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, it seems to be my destiny this year to speak at the last moment and frequently to have to give half of my speech and then continue on the next occasion, and I was just wondering, shall I start or shall we call it 5:30? Twenty minutes? Do you think that's long enough for anyone to speak?

MR. GREEN: I would remind the honourable member, Mr. Speaker, as I was once reminded by the former Speaker, that the rules say that you may speak 40 minutes, not that you must speak 40 minutes.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, in recent years a great deal of attention has been focussed on the chronic degenerative diseases of the elderly, and as people are living longer the numbers of senior citizens increases. As part of coping with these increased numbers, society is becoming more and more concerned with ensuring that their twilight years can be lived with freedom from illness and want and that it can be a time of relaxation and enjoyment. Geriatrics, the science which deals with old age and its phenomena, has become a specialty in the practice of medicine. With the resulting concentration of effort, we might well hope for some improvements in diagnosis, prevention and treatment of some of the problems of the elderly.

In Vancouver a health service within 60 and up health centres is designed to meet the health needs of Vancouver's many older citizens. This was instituted in November, 1969. N. P. Anderson, the Professor of Geriatric Medicine at the University of Glasgow, has said that many older people living at home are not in a sound state of health and the self-reporting of illness in the elderly is not a satisfactory way of preventing disabilities as people grow older. These people accept certain health problems as being natural to old age and they fail to seek help. The Geriatric Clinic in Vancouver makes an assessment not only of the health problems but is strengthened by investigation of their nutritional and their social needs as well. This is a commendable program for the prevention of illness and I think should be observed and considered here.

Now not everyone who has a dramatic, acute illness marshall's health services and facilities for its aid. Many of our elderly merely wear out, or rust out, and gradually become dependent on others. Many are cared for by their families at home with supportive services such as the Victorian Order of Nurses, Homemakers, part-time help and meal delivery

(MRS. TRUEMAN cont'd) . . . services, drugs and equipment. Provincial care services assist the elderly in obtaining living arrangements that will provide them with care and the physical facilities suited to their needs. It is also responsible for setting the standards in care institutions and promoting the development of adequate care resources throughout the province.

The Hospital Plan covers part of this service and represents a great saving to the community by providing alternate care, thereby relieving pressure on the more costly hospital beds. At the present the per diem hospital cost is about \$50.00 per day. However, for many people, nursing home care is the only answer. They are not acutely ill enough to be admitted to hospitals and yet they are unable to be cared for at home. Now here another problem presents itself, the shortage of nursing home beds and the need frequently to go on a waiting list. Now recently a policy statement was made by the Minister of Health and Social Services concerning the construction of more nursing home facilities and this was greatly appreciated by the people who have been concerned with this problem.

It has been recommended by the Continuity of Care Committee of the Age and Opportunity Bureau that to encourage the construction of more facilities money could be made available through the Manitoba Development Fund to private operators to enable them to replace or enlarge facilities. Exemption from provincial sales tax on nursing home construction would also be of help. There are about 1,700 patients 65 years and up in personal care homes. Of these, around 1,100 are assisted through social allowances. All persons receiving social allowances are exempt from paying Manitoba Hospital Service Plan premiums. Per diem rates for public assistance patients are from \$7.20 a day to \$11.00 or \$12.00. For the private patients, the per diem runs from \$7.20 to \$16.00 per day. Now roughly about 500 of these patients are paying for their own care. They may stay from one to twenty years in a nursing home, and few stay under a year. So you can see that this would be a serious drain on a family's financial resources.

Now it seems to me a grave social injustice is the fact that these people thought they were being protected from the catastrophic cost of illness as they paid compulsory hospital insurance premiums over the years, and now they're denied these benefits. Surely they could be forgiven the hospital premium during the period of time they are paying their own costs for alternative care. The costs to the public purse would not be very great. At \$4.15 per month per individual or roughly about \$50.00 per year, but around 500 persons involved this could amount to about \$25,000 per annum. Now in the name of efficiency and control, large compulsory programs do sometimes overlook the individual in whose interest they are supposed to have come into existence. Until a community can afford to provide more alternate care facility and bring nursing homes under the Hospital Plan, this gesture would correct what I feel is a social injustice and show our senior citizens that we really do care and are concerned about their problems. Thank you.

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

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

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

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

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'm just amazed what one can manage to do in a few short moments. I would move, seconded by the Member from Birtle-Russell, that

WHEREAS in 1970, it is in the proper spirit to encourage Manitobans to commemorate the province's Centennial year in some manner of lasting value, and

WHEREAS we have a great idle resource which could be developed for wholesome family recreation in the Winnipeg floodway, and

WHEREAS reforestation would help to prevent soil erosion and to preserve the ecological balance, and

WHEREAS beautification of our great land should be of paramount importance for visual recreation,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government consider the advisability of designating a portion of the floodway banks as a Centennial Park where Manitoba families could be invited to plant trees as a lasting memorial of the Province's first hundred years.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, I still think it would be a good idea to call it 5:30 and --

(MRS. TRUEMAN cont'd) ... All right. Mr. Chairman, all of us realize that with the improved labour laws and the increasing leisure time, that we have a need for more recreation areas and facilities. As this city was built, not enough green areas were provided within walking distances of homes. People have been deprived of a visual recreation which our river banks might have provided if they had been saved for public use. Hopefully, we may retrieve some of these river banks over the years as they become available and since we now have perhaps better planning. Meanwhile, we have a great idle strip of land which is in effect the green belt, that many cities are crying for. It's 29 miles long and has a top width of 700 to 1000 feet. There are 500 feet across the bottom, leaving 250 feet roughly on each side. I understand 125 feet of that is required as a disposal area, but this leaves a further 125 feet for such use as perhaps a tree planting program.

A family in the metropolitan area have a variety of Centennial events which they may choose from, but I've heard of no plans whatsoever for a tree planting program. If a section of this floodway, perhaps just a five-mile strip to begin with, could be set aside at minimum expense to the government, perhaps with as little effort as to place stakes to indicate the places where the trees should be planted, families could take a picnic lunch, plant trees, enjoy a day out of doors, and I think they would return often to check on these trees, to look after them, and that this would in effect begin to bring people to the area for recreational activity in greater numbers and then some commercial facilities might very well follow. This could be the beginning of opening the floodway as a recreational area.

Now I can visualize a stretch of evergreens on these banks to be a five-mile stretch of trees which would include every variety of evergreens that grow within Canada. Or it could be planted with flowering trees. I think that this could be a tourist attraction which might rival cherry blossom time in Washington or apple blossom time in the Annapolis Valley.

Apart from the development of new recreational areas, there is a further beneficial effect. The ecology of a small part of the prairie might be returned to something nearer to its natural state. Perhaps 200 years ago this section of the prairie was completely covered with trees. Now we all remember our elementary biology lessons and the important effect trees have on the balance of nature. In the process of photosynthesis, plants utilize carbon dioxide and produce oxygen and carbohydrate. Animals need that oxygen, and scientists tell us that as part of the pollution problem the carbon dioxide levels are rising to a point where they become dangerous and affect our lives.

Now one corn plant transpires something like two quarts of water in a day, but trees with their roots dug deeply into invisible water are efficient accumulators of water, and this water can be pulled to the tops of tall trees and is then transpired through the leaves. A Douglas Fir is known to draw literally tons of water. Now it's short-sighted to simply run all this water off into Hudson's Bay, and it makes good sense to keep this water around a bit longer and make it work for us. These trees would also help to prevent the erosion of this denuded land and stabilize the banks. The best defence, of course, is grass. However, erosion occurs more quickly where the land is not yet settled in tracts, and this occurs in three stages: First, in sheet erosion caused by water which lies on the surface of the land after a rainfall; real erosion following a rain -- land, say, affected by numerous small gullies called rills; and thirdly, by gully erosion, where large gullies develop from the rills and are limited in depth only by the underlying bedrock or the elevation of the mouth of the gully.

Now I'm told by a young man who went out to check this for me that on the floodway we have already reached this third stage of erosion in some areas. The forest, of course, also protects the land as the rain falls. It strikes with greater force on bare land than when it falls on grass or vegetation. When the rain strikes the bare land it carries some of the top soil down the slope with it, and in time the gullies will carry away the fertile soil which is natural to the land. Forests help to prevent this destruction. The leaves, for instance, which fall on the land hold moisture, and again, protect the soil from being washed away. This leaves the water time to sink into the ground and not only prevents erosion but floods as well. These trees provide a windbreak and I'm told that bare ground loses approximately 820 pounds of nutrient elements per acre per year. Recently, in one of the erosion pamphlets that was - Resources, I think it's called - that was sent to all of us, I read that under the federal-provincial ARDA agreement to share the development cost of provincial parks and recreation sites, that it was announced recently by the federal Department of Regional Economic Expansion and the Saskatchewan Department of Natural Resources, this program is meant to increase

April 17, 1970.

(MRS. TRUMAN cont'd) . . . income and employment opportunities, but . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I'm wondering, in view of the fact it appears to be the intention of the honourable member to quote from an article, if this may not be an opportune moment to break in her debate and she may be able to continue when this matter next appears on the Order Paper.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Labour, that the House do now adjourn.

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