

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

10:00 o' clock, Friday, March 29, 1968

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

I'd like to take a moment and introduce some students on my right to the honourable members. We have 42 students of Grade 11 standing from the St. Pierre Collegiate School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Denis Gregoire. This school is located in the Constituency of the Honourable Member for Carillon. On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you all here today.

Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE Q. C. (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Welfare, and with the leave of the House, I'd like to preface the question with a short statement. I listened last night to the Director of the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg stating as a fact that the number of adoptions in Manitoba had doubled this year over last year, and I hope that I misunderstood him when he said that the number would have been greater had it not been for the fact that some of the applications had been disallowed due to the fact that the applicant had no religious faith.

Now I hope that I misunderstood him, but assuming that I did understand him correctly, the questions that I wish to direct to the Minister are these: First, under what authority does the Society allege that such refusal is illegal; and what faiths are recognized by your department as adoptable faiths? And 3, assuming that the statement that I heard was correct, does the government share the opinion and views of the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg as expressed by its Director?

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare)(The Pas): Mr. Speaker, I'll take the questions as notice, but I would like to make some brief comment at the same time. A couple of years ago the Children's Aid Society of Western Manitoba realized that the religious sections of the Child Welfare Act were silent, or did not recognize the people who did not have a religious faith, those who might be classified as agnostics or atheists. This matter was raised with the various Children's Aid Societies by our Director of Child Welfare, and one of the agencies that has not expressed an opinion on it yet is the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg. There's one other that are also considering this and have been for some time, so there is some controversy within the agencies with respect to this particular section and what should be done about it.

At the same time, the Director of Child Welfare indicated that if there were any cases that came before the various agencies that was causing them concern, or problems of this kind, that they should refer them to him as a special case for consideration. As far as I am aware, there has only been one such case come forward and it was resolved to the satisfaction of all concerned.

We have also asked the Children's Aid Society to tell us if there are a number of cases that have been prevented for this reason. We've not yet had an answer from them, although some of their staff members have seen fit to make comment on the subject. I will take the question as notice and will be prepared to give a fuller reply at a later date.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of N. D. P.)(Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer. Indications are that the interest rates on CMHC mortgages will increase to 9 percent and possibly 9 1/4 percent at the commencement of the next month, April; and also, that as a result of this the income ceilings -- (Interjection)-- income floor, excuse me - thanks for the correction - floor of income will be approximately \$8,100 per annum insofar as the individual is concerned. My question to my honourable friend: does the government of Manitoba contemplate any protest on behalf of the citizens of Manitoba as to this exorbitant interest rate, and if it has not considered that thus far, will the government consider doing so on behalf of the citizens of our province; and will the government also undertake an investigation into the possibility of making CMHC loans more

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) favorable to the citizens of Manitoba, if necessary, by participating in the terms of mortgage agreements?

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer)(Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I think the matter of the CMHC loans and the other details my honourable friend referred to really come under the Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs. I have not been made aware of the proposal to raise the rate to nine percent nor of any announced rise in the floor - or income floor that's necessary to obtain a loan. My honourable friend may have information that I haven't got.

MR. PAULLEY: Might I, Mr. Speaker, direct my question to the Honourable the Minister of Urban Affairs?

HON. THELMA FORBES (Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs)(Cypress): Mr. Speaker, I have not had this information from CMHC either that they intend to -- however, if the statement has been made by Ottawa, I am sure CMHC will have that information here and I'll take your question as notice and reply to you later.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Attorney-General.

HON. STERLING R. LYON Q. C. (Attorney-General)(Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a correction to an answer that I gave yesterday to the Honourable Member for Burrows when he was enquiring about meat stores in Manitoba of a kind such as have been raided in -- (Interjection) -- Kildonan was it? -- such as have been charged in the Province of Ontario, and I said then that to the best of my information no such charges have been laid in Manitoba. I am now advised by the department that on further investigation they find that there have been charges laid, presumably by the federal authorities, under the Weights and Measures Act - the federal Weights and Measures Act - against one such corporation operating in Manitoba. The charge is that of practising fraud with reference to the quality of meat which this particular store has been selling and the nature of the sales and advertising operation, and actual fraud in the way that the meat was delivered. The preliminary hearing, as I am advised, on this trial will take place on the 9th of April. I wanted to have that correction in the record.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Attorney-General for this information. May I have a supplementary question now? Has the Attorney-General determined whether there has been any complaints in Manitoba to his department in this regard?

MR. LYON: I'll have to double check on that. I'm not personally aware of any but I will ask the department.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Education. In view of the very serious situation in education in Winnipeg where the Manitoba Teachers Society has declared the Winnipeg division in dispute, now as of yesterday the ten greater Winnipeg school boards are locking out . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Would the gentleman put his question?

MR. DOERN: Yes, I will. Can the Minister report on any progress being made by the conciliation officer in this regard, or any action that he himself has taken to arrest the steadily deteriorating situation?

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education)(Gimli): The answer is "no", Mr. Speaker, and I don't intend to use the authority of the Department -- as Minister of Education in this matter at this time.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Does the conciliation officer have any authority or power to also deal with the other school boards who are now involved?

MR. JOHNSON: The other school boards - you mean in Metro area? No, I don't believe so.

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

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK Q. C. (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(River Heights): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Honourable Member from St. George asked the following question of me: "Is it true that a member of this Cabinet, or a representative of the government, ignored normal diplomatic channels to contact His Royal Highness Prince Philip?" I may say that in answering for myself, and I would believe this would apply to all the other members of the Cabinet, the answer is "no".

However, because this matter is raised, and because I think it would be appropriate, I would like to tell the House about our efforts to stimulate expanded business relations with

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.).... the United Kingdom. It was our quest for the new sources of capital, and especially technology, that led the mission of Manitoba businessmen overseas last November. One of our hopes during that mission was that we might be able to stimulate at some future date a mission of British business and trade leaders to come to Manitoba and to see for themselves the opportunities that were available. During our mission, and later during our planning for the Business Summit Conference, we discussed with the Office of the Canadian High Commissioner in London

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, if I may. If the Minister wishes to make a statement before the Orders of the Day, then I think that the Minister should request leave of the House to do so. If he's answering a question, then I think he should answer the question, which he has not done. The question asked was whether he or other members of his department -- he said "no" insofar as he and Cabinet Ministers, he hasn't answered for other members representing the government. Now if he would answer that question - fine. If he wishes to make another statement and requests leave of the House, I have no objection.

MR. SPEAKER: It was my understanding that the Honourable Minister did answer the question. He said "no", and then continued to -- (Interjection) --I beg your pardon?

MR. MOLGAT: "No", Mr. Speaker, insofar as himself and members of the Cabinet; he has not answered insofar as representatives of the government. Now, if he will do so, then the question will be answered. Then if he wishes to make another statement and asks leave of the House, I've no objection.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if the Minister will co-operate. The Minister has answered the question. Is that satisfactory to the Honourable Member for St. George, or did he have

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, could I have leave and I'll make the statement and I think possibly satisfy the member for St. George.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): This is just a camouflage. I asked him a question yesterday and he's trying to talk about something else. Now my question was: Did a member of the Cabinet, or any representative of the government, make an improper approach to His Royal Highness? Now, answer the question.

MR. SPIVAK: Would you like to re-phrase that question?

MR. GUTTORMSON: Would you like me to?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, the answer is "no", but with leave I would like to make a statement.

MR. GUTTORMSON: What about the representatives of the government?

MR. SPIVAK: The answer is "no", Mr. Speaker, but I would like to make a statement, with leave.

MR. SPEAKER: to make a statement. The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. SPIVAK: I've referred to the fact that our mission, and later during our planning for the Business Summit Conference, we discussed with the Office of the Canadian High Commissioner in London, with the Canadian Committee of the British National Exports Council, and with the British Board of Trade, our hope for a mission from Britain to Manitoba and a British Trade Week to be held in Manitoba similar to the successful one held in Toronto this past year. We also enquired about possible leaders for such a British mission in line with our presentation in Britain that Manitoba could be a bridge between the United Kingdom and the markets of the midwestern part of the United States. Enquiries were made about the possibility of His Royal Highness Prince Philip, Prime Minister Wilson, Sir Peter Allen, the President of the Board of Trade or other leading dignitaries, as possible leaders of such a mission. It had been hoped that a British delegation might come at the time of the Business Summit Conference, but other commitments of British officials made that impossible. The Office of the High Commissioner was kind enough to make enquiries for us and to advise us on the ways in which a British mission and a leadership for the mission might be arranged.

However, I am very pleased to advise the House that our persistent efforts, including the contribution of our own businessmen overseas and the excellent effects of Mr. Rothschild's visit at the Business Summit Conference, have produced results. In the autumn of this year a delegation of senior British business executives, led by Sir Ralph Perring, Chairman of the British National Exports Council, will visit Manitoba for the purpose of exploring new trade

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) . . . and business possibilities. Of even greater significance, the main purpose of the visit will be the start of the planning for a major British Trade Week to be held in Winnipeg in 1970, our own centennial year. One of the subjects that will be discussed with this delegation will be the matter of the distinguished British officials or personage to lead the 1970 British mission and open British Trade Week. I am sure that the Member for St. George would confirm with me that if we were successful in having His Royal Highness come here to open British Trade Week, this would be to the credit of the mission and to the province.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for his statement. The reason that I wanted to have a differentiation here between a reply and a statement is that if the Minister is merely making a reply then we would not obviously be able to make any comments, but it's been the normal accepted practice in the House that when the government makes a statement before the Orders of the Day

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the matter has been dealt with and I don't think there's anything to be gained by continuing the subject.

MR. MOLGAT: Fine, then I wish to make a statement in reply to the Minister's statement, Mr. Speaker, and I naturally wish to compliment the Minister and the government on any attempts, any successful attempts that is, in line with the amount of money expended with relationship to the results so far as developing trade for the Province of Manitoba, and certainly in this area of trade with Great Britain there are some very good reasons why this particular trade is one that could be expanded. In view of our historic base here in Manitoba, the structure of the province itself, the background of the majority of the people, the whole basis of our industry, in fact our own growth -- there are some excellent reasons why trade with Great Britain is one area that can stand substantial improvement.

Now in this regard, I think that the Province of Saskatchewan has been one of the outstanding leaders, in that they have been conducting for some two or three years now an annual trade fair, I think in Regina, in conjunction with a number of British firms and with a view to developing substantially business with Great Britain. Now this is an area where Manitoba has a particular concern, and this is because of the Port of Churchill. In this regard I think the Province of Saskatchewan has been the main leader in developing trade with Great Britain, particularly through the Port of Churchill, and this is one of the crucial things that the Province of Manitoba should be working on.

Unfortunately, the government has not taken sufficient action in this regard and has not followed up the lead of the Province of Saskatchewan, because right now Saskatchewan, through the efforts of the Government of Saskatchewan in their own purchasing, has done everything it can to see to it that British goods are brought in through Churchill, and if there's one thing that we need through the Port of Churchill it is obviously more volume and more business. It's pretty difficult you know for the Canadian Wheat Board, for example, to say to Russia: "You should import or take your grain through the Port of Churchill when the Manitoba Government itself doesn't take the lead in seeing to it that it's done. The Manitoba Government for example, through the agencies that it has some control of, let us say the Government Liquor Commission, does not do in the same way as in Saskatchewan and bring in whatever it can through Churchill, when in the purchasing of many of its items it does not insist that the deliveries be made through Churchill.

So, for the Minister to give us a statement that he is going to do everything he can to promote British trade is excellent. I commend him for it, but I would like to see, as well as some statements of having a Trade Fair and so on, that the government itself, through whatever channels it has in its purchasing, in policies, does in fact see to it that in the trade we're doing with Britain now we take advantage of our geographical situation, take advantage of the fact that this is our seaport. We're the ones who should have the prime concern. We should not be waiting for the Province of Saskatchewan and the Province of Alberta to be encouraging British trade through Churchill. This is what the Manitoba Government should be doing, instead of dragging its feet waiting for someone else. I say to the Minister, get all of your departments, get all of them operating so that emphasis is put on bringing in British goods through Churchill and you'll be benefiting trade with Great Britain and at the same time benefiting the development of the Province of Manitoba.

I would hope that when the 1970 Trade Mission comes here that this will be one of the major factors involved, that there should be a real tie-in here with the use of Churchill. It might even be a good suggestion, Mr. Speaker, to suggest that the trade missions come in

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.)... through Churchill. I notice this year that in our Centennial booklet, when you look at the Manitoba page, it's recommended that tourists coming to Manitoba during Centennial year should come in through Churchill. Now, I find that this might be a somewhat difficult thing to do to bring in, American tourists particularly, through the Port of Churchill. However, be that as it may, I would think that in the case of this trade mission and in view of the fact that there is a regular service now through Dalgleish Lines serving the Port of Churchill - this is a British shipping company - that this might be a very appropriate method of emphasizing to this trade mission the fact that Manitoba has a seaport, that through this seaport we have particular access to British markets both ways, and emphasize to them the importance of the Province of Manitoba as a potential area for British trade and British shipment in this way.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Leader of the Opposition would permit a question?

MR. MOLGAT: Well, I don't think it's the normal procedure, but I'm quite prepared to do so.

MR. SPIVAK: Is the Leader of the Opposition aware of the fact that the Government of Manitoba, together with the Government of Alberta, through the Prairie Economic Council has co-operated in setting up the British Trade Week and activities in the Province of Saskatchewan?

MR. MOLGAT: I most assuredly am aware of the fact, Mr. Speaker, but I'm also aware of the fact it was the Province of Saskatchewan who took the lead and then my honourable friends were dragged in by the heel subsequently.

I would also like to ask a question of the Honourable Minister. Is he aware of the fact that the Province of Saskatchewan through its purchasing of alcoholic beverages, the purchasing of automobiles, insists that they be delivered through the Port of Churchill, and can he tell me whether the Province of Manitoba does the same?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: of statements and in connection with the development of industry and

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I take it that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition would care to make a statement at this time, and everything being equal, I wonder if I might ask leave of the House as to whether or not the Leader of the New Democratic Party may make a statement to what the Minister has already said. Agreed?

MR. PAULLEY: My statement will be brief, Mr. Speaker - I'm sure mercifully brief - because I have listened with a considerable degree of interest to the statement of the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce and also the Leader of the Liberal Party, who is telling us now in his opinion the fact that within the last two or three years the Government of that Province to the west of us insists on certain commodities being brought through the Port of Churchill, and he is quite concerned with the development of the Port of Churchill in Manitoba and I am sure in this we all agree and we are all most interested. But for the edification and information of my honourable friend the Leader of the Liberal Party, may I remind him that it was the policy of the former government of Saskatchewan, the CCF government, years before the Liberal Party took over in that province, it was their policy and their directive which led to the Saskatchewan Liquor Commission having to bring that commodity into the Province of Saskatchewan through the Port of Churchill.

And may I also in my statement make another observation insofar as the use of the Port of Churchill is concerned. I had the opportunity this year as one of the representatives of this Assembly to attend the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association gathering in New Brunswick, and during our tour down in New Brunswick we went around and through the harbour at the point of St. John. Of course the harbours in Canada are under the direction of the federal authority, and during our tour a brochure was given to the members on the tour of the harbours of Canada and the miles distant between the various ports, and particularly ports in Great Britain. But to my amazement, Mr. Speaker, this brochure under the sponsorship of the federal authority, which I believe at the present time is Liberal, or partially Liberal, made no reference whatsoever to the Port of Churchill in Manitoba. They told us how far it was from Vancouver to London, from Halifax to London, to St. John, but in this brochure no mention whatsoever of the great Manitoba Port of Churchill.

So, I would suggest, accompanying my statement, that we make a request to the

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.)... Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce to see that the Liberal authority at Ottawa corrects the error of its ways and starts giving some support to the Port of Churchill in Manitoba.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN Q. C. (Provincial Secretary)(Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, if I may inform the members that new parking regulations with respect to vehicles on Memorial Boulevard and on the grounds of the Manitoba Government offices in Metropolitan Winnipeg have been approved, passed, and rather than read the statement of it to the members I'm going to ask the Page Boys if they will be good enough to distribute these for the information of the members. This of course does not affect the parking of members of the Legislature in their allotted spaces here at the building.

May I also inform the members that in order to provide additional telephone numbers on what is known as the Norquay Exchange, that we are going to have to alter our local dialing within this area from three numbers to four numbers commencing on the 8th of April. The numbers for local dialing will be 7 and the other numbers -- there'll be 4 digits -- and I inform the members that that will come into effect on April 8th, reflecting the increased number of offices and the increased number of telephones that are in the Legislative Building arrangements here.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, if I may, just remind the members of the trip to Gillam tomorrow morning and ask them to be at Gate No. 2 at the Airport at 7:15 for 7:30 departure; breakfast on board the aircraft. This is not a black tie function; come informally, warm clothes, parka or similar dress if you have it, and preferably high rubbers if you have them because it's expected to be rather a bit sloppy and muddy there. We are pleased that a very large number are coming on the trip and we look forward to having the members with us.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Honourable Minister a question. Will there be a bus or limousine to pick us up either at the Legislative Building or at the St. Regis Hotel, or do we take our own cars?

MR. McLEAN: Members will have to make their own way to the Airport.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Carillon.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Works. Since we're already a little bit behind time and the weekend is coming up, I wonder if he would find time in his department to synchronize the clocks in this building. They seem to be out of time again.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, if it isn't the members opposite after me about synchronizing the clocks, it's my colleague the Provincial Treasurer. I thought we had them synchronized but we'll try our best again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Health. Is it true that the minimum qualifications for establishing an ambulance service in Manitoba are a Chauffeur's Licence, a First Aid Certificate and a panel truck or other vehicle?

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health)(Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, the Department of Health has really no qualifications at the moment. Regulations have been prepared over the past year and are in the process of being considered now, and those regulations will call for qualifications.

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

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Attorney-General. Some two weeks ago I directed a question with respect to wire tapping in Manitoba and he said he'd get the answers for me. I wonder if he could give me the answer this morning.

MR. LYON: I hope to have the information for my honourable friend soon.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Public Works arising out of his statement regarding parking on government grounds. I presume that Manitoba Government office grounds would include the parking facilities to the rear of the Law Courts, and I would like to know whether there's going to be any prohibition against double parking of vehicles there. I have found that in the small space that is allotted to the Manitoba Law Society, you may park your car there and then come out and find some policeman from St. Vital or Fort Garry has parked his car right behind yours and you can't get out. Now is there going to be any prohibitions in these grounds prohibiting that type of parking?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, the regulations will apply to the parking at the Law Courts Building. They prevent or prohibit double parking and we'll do our best to see that that

(MR. McLEAN cont'd.)... provision is enforced.

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

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I wonder if the Minister could tell me if the government has now made up its mind as to the Chairman of the Boundaries Commission being a full-time chairman or not. Yesterday the Minister was not sure and I wondered . . .

MRS. FORBES: Mr. Speaker, I took the question as notice and I will reply in due course.

MR. DESJARDINS: Could I assume from this, Mr. Speaker, that the government is looking into this matter?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Yesterday I asked him some further questions regarding the loan to San Antonio Gold Mines and the interest. Does he intend to make any further comment on this and get the information on the record of the House as to what the situation is or not?

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources)(St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, I think the question yesterday was whether or not the repayments were for principal or for interest, and informally I passed on the information to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that the repayments were for the principal, because the type of loan was what is called the income debenture, meaning that the interest is payable only if the company achieves a profit position, which it hasn't done. Therefore, the payments have all been paid back on the basis of the principal only, with the exception of an amount of approximately \$11,000 that accumulated during the period of default of the company during 1966. But other than that short period, there has been no interest paid on the loan.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, a subsequent question then. We can assume then that there will be no interest collected on this loan of \$240,000.00.

MR. CRAIK: Well, I don't think we can answer definitely because the end of the period isn't reached yet, but if past history gives any indication, that would be true.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. John's. The Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned Debates on Second Readings. Bill No. 10. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, may I have permission of the House to have this matter stand?

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 27. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I suppose it will be the opinion of many of the members of the Assembly that this legislation is not of the same importance as some other that will be coming before this House. I would agree with that position; on the other hand, it's a matter that is of interest and I think some concern, to a major sector of the farm economy, and so I think it deserves our serious attention.

I noted that the Minister himself said in moving second reading of this Bill that he had some hesitation about introducing this amendment. I can share his concern because it is not an easy decision to make, and consequently before I am through, Mr. Speaker, I propose to make a suggestion to the Honourable the Minister and to the House which I think would give us an opportunity to some extent to dispel our conflicting opinions and doubts on the matter and to arrive at what in my opinion would be a better procedure than that one that is recommended at the moment. In fact, my suggestion will follow very closely along the lines that have already been mentioned by the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead, because I am sure that there is difference of opinion on this question.

Before dealing with the merits of it, I would like to take a moment to comment on the financial statement that the Honourable the Minister tabled. First and foremost, I am rather surprised to find that the amount deducted from horns in the calendar year under question is an odd amount, \$87,128.70. I never considered myself a very good mathematician, but it it's an even \$2.00 that is deducted in each case and if the commission that is paid is an even 5% commission, then I would think that this would be an even figure. That isn't a serious

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.) omission perhaps but the next one I come to certainly is serious, because I noticed that the bank interest amount is just \$2,000-odd.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if I read the financial statement properly, this account has had in the bank well over \$100,000 as a minimum balance, and if my honourable friend's department are receiving only 1 3/4% in these times, then I would feel that somebody is asleep at the switch, and that appears to me to be actually less than 1 3/4 percent. I think Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable the Minister might have given us some more information that would have been helpful to the members of the House if he had reported to us on exactly the work that has been carried on by the Board and the Department in administering this Act. Perhaps he will be willing to do that on closing the debate. I would have felt that it would have been more useful to the members had it been given at the time of moving second reading. However, I have more hope of my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture than I have of most of his colleagues in listening to well-intentioned advice and I think I'm going to be able, with the help that's already been given by other members and what will probably follow, to convince him that it would be better to delay passage of this bill and refer this subject matter to the Committee on Agriculture so that we could call before that committee, or we could invite before that committee, representatives of the stock growers who are primarily concerned and others, packing companies and others, who are interested in this matter. And let us have a full discussion on it and see what we would recommend after having that discussion.

Personally, I would be inclined to recommend that we should increase the penalty. I would think that would be the right way to approach it perhaps, but I'm not an expert. I've been away from this business for a long time; I've been away from the department a long time. There may be some consideration obtaining that I am not familiar with and I do not pretend to be as conversant with the subject as I used to be. The honourable members will likely have noticed, whether they were interested or not, that from the time that this legislation came in that I happened to be - I assure you it was a happening - the Minister of Agriculture at that time. I was the one who had to sponsor that original bill through this House in 1939 and I wasn't too sure of it myself at that time. I thought it was worth a try, and with typical caution we put it on at only \$1.00 per head of cattle with horns. Later on, not while I was Minister of Agriculture but during the time that we were still in office, it was increased to \$2.00 for the simple reason that we felt that it was not doing the job that it was intended to do. And I was glad to hear my honourable friend the Minister report that he believes it has been doing the job.

Well, if it's been doing the job and if it has reduced the percentage from more than 20 percent to 10 or 11 percent, as he reported to us, and if we are convinced that there is still a lot of damage being done, then don't you think, Mr. Speaker, that we should take a good look at it before we take it off? It is incontrovertible, I know, that cattle with horns do damage to other cattle, and that damage is translated into the finished product. And this is loss and waste. I'm not talking about the suffering to the animal. Some of us who grew up with farm animals consider that that's a feature too that should be considered; there is the humane point of view. But, leaving that aside, there is the economic loss and, Mr. Speaker, any waste - any waste - is wrong; any waste. And this is an industry where we cannot afford the waste, and so if it is true, and I suggest to you that it's definitely true, that cattle with horns cause great damage and that this is easy to see in the finished product, then I think we should look very, very carefully before we take it off.

Now, at the time that this legislation was put on, the buyers of cattle with horns, whether they were drovers or whether they were packing-house operators, were already making a deduction. There's no question about that. And, Mr. Speaker, don't make any mistake about it, the deductions will be made even if this legislation is taken off; the deductions will definitely be made. And because there is damage people know there is damage; there is going to be waste of the carcass, therefore deductions will be made; and if deductions are going to be made - maybe you think that I'm out of character in making this suggestion - but if deductions are going to be made wouldn't it be better for the department to have a regular schedule or fee of deductions and have that made compulsory, than to have the buyer making variable deductions and doing it according to their own judgment?

The legislation at that time was prefaced by the fact - and this is contained right in the preamble of the Act - that cattle with horns are a cause of damage. That has not changed, Mr. Speaker. That is as valid today as it was thirty years ago. Other cattle or livestock with

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.) . . . which the same are in contact are damaged - no doubt of that. The buyers of that time were adopting a practice of deductions. The object of making the deductions was to encourage the raisers of cattle to dehorn all horned cattle, and honourable members will be aware that the deduction is not made on cattle of less than 400 pounds in weight, which generally corresponds to approximately year-olds, it being figured that below that time they don't do serious damage. And it was contained in the original Act, and should be continued I'm sure, that the funds from this trust fund should be used for the improvement of the cattle industry.

Now someone mentioned - I think it was my honourable friend from La Verendrye - I believe that the stock growers are doubtful of some of the expenditures that have been made under this fund. That, I think, would be a fruitful subject for review in the committee. But I come back to the matter that I mentioned at the start, Mr. Speaker, that damage causes waste in any form is not efficient. I said a moment ago that, leaving out the humanitarian or cruelty points of view, there is the economic loss, but some of these funds have been spent, as I recall it, Mr. Speaker, for what was called the Livestock Protection Society where checks are made with regard to cruelty to animals and crowding, cruelty in any form, rough handling and such like, because those too, apart altogether from the suffering features, those too cause actual damage and waste.

Now, one suggestion that I would make for consideration in the committee, Mr. Chairman, is that we should attempt to get away from the duplication in this matter of the deduction and horns, because it is possible, under the present practice - and I don't know the method by which you would cure it but I should think it could be cured - it is possible at present for one cattle beast to be penalized three or even four times by being picked up, let us say at the stockyards in the first instance, taken out to a farm, sold at one of the local markets and eventually arriving back at the stockyards.

Now I know, Mr. Speaker, that it is not always possible to do away with the horns, I know that it's inefficient and uneconomic to dehorn cattle after a certain growth. I know that the right way is, if they belong to the breeds that have horns, I know that the right way is to use caustic or gougers when they're little. But I know that for the cattle that are raised on the range, that are born on the range, that some of these things are difficult to do. So you're always going to have some horns; you're going to have some horns in the dairy breeds as well. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that one of the areas that might be considered by the committee is to have some discussions with the Purebred Breeders Association to ask them about their show practices. If it is a fact - and it is; no question about this; no dispute about this - it is a fact that cattle with horns cause damage - and there is no need any more under these conditions for cattle to grow those protective features with which nature supplied them in the days when they had to compete with all the other animals that they came in contact with - there's no need - and if it's advantageous to get rid of them, then I think it should start with the purebred breeders and instead of that, what happens at some of the shows at least, is that one of the features taken into account in the judging ring is the grace, shape, condition, of the horns. I think we could have fruitful discussions with the purebred breeders themselves.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to debate this matter at any greater length and I do not pretend to have all the answers in this questions but I do think that rather than departing even temporarily from a program that has accomplished a good bit of good over the years, that it would be better for us to hold this bill in abeyance for a while and take another look at the situation. And, Mr. Speaker, without a word of criticism to my honourable friend at all for the action that he's taken because I know that there have been representative and informed people have made pleas for the removal of this penalty, without any criticism of the Minister and his department but in a sincere effort to have a further look at this matter before this step is taken, which I am sure would be a retrograde step and that it would likely have to be re-imposed later on, but the interruption of the services, the dropping of the inspectors who it employed, would in my opinion seriously curtail and interrupt the good work that is being done. And Mr. Speaker, I repeat: don't think that the deductions wouldn't be made in the meantime. Not only are they made on the horned cattle themselves, but if there's one horned beast in a load there are deductions made on the whole load and don't think there aren't, and they'll continue to be made.

Now the purpose of this legislation is to try and encourage, first, by advertising programs and others to get people to dehorn, and if they don't to have the penalty there where

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.) the money can be used for more encouragement. There's a bit of both the carrot and the stick in this legislation. I'm a greater believer in the carrot than the stick and I think it's the one that we should use, but if the carrot won't work Mr. Speaker, maybe we should take a look at putting a \$5.00 stick in there. Still keep the carrot out in front but have the \$5.00 stick waiting if necessary. So I, in all seriousness, suggest that a review of this by the Committee of Agriculture and Conservation, which has many, many people on it who are more familiar with this subject than I am and could invite to come and make representations to it people who are closer to both sides of this business than we are in general, I think it would be beneficial.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Selkirk, that the motion be amended by striking out all the words after the word "Act" where it occurs for the second time, and substituting the following: "be held for further consideration, and that the subject matter of the said Bill be referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Conservation for study and report." You're aware, Mr. Speaker, that the motion is that Bill No. 27, The Horned Cattle Purchases Act, be now read a second time. We simply strike out the words after that second "Act" and say that the Bill be held and the subject matter of the Bill be referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Conservation for study and report.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation)(Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker. . . . I'm sorry -- unless -- I was moving to adjourn the debate on this matter. I have no objection to the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party making a comment or two.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, the motion that we have before us at the present time puts a separate consideration than we would have before us if we were just simply voting for or against second reading of the bill. I don't pose to be an expert insofar as horned cattle are concerned, but I can see that the adoption of the original bill could bring about complications and would not achieve the purpose that I'm sure that the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture had in mind when he first presented the bill. Now had the bill normally gone through second reading and most likely would have been referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Conservation but without the proposition that we have before us now by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, acceptance of second reading would have been firm adoption in principle and it would have tied our hands down too conclusively. It seems to me, as I've listened to the debates over the last few days in respect to this matter, that the proposition of the Honourable Member for Lakeside is a very reasonable one and one that should receive the support of the House. My main purpose in rising, Mr. Speaker, is to indicate to the Honourable Member for Lakeside, to the Minister and this House, that we think that the position or the proposition suggested by the member is a proper course of action for this House to take in respect of this matter at this time.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'm quite interested in the amendment that is being proposed in connection with the bill that is before us that we are discussing. I do appreciate the amendment coming forward for one reason, and that is that it gives me a second opportunity to speak on the bill. I had already exhausted my right to speak and I didn't feel so good about it because in the meantime

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member that the motion has not been adopted by the House as yet. The question has not been put.

MR. FROESE: Well, I thought the amendment had been properly brought before the House.

MR. SPEAKER: No, but the honourable gentleman was of the opinion that it gave him an opportunity to speak on the matter again by this amendment.

MR. FROESE: Well yes.

MR. SPEAKER: It has not been -- I'm simply reminding him that it has not been adopted by the House as yet.

MR. FROESE: Well no, I realize that, and I wouldn't have another right to speak a second time if it hadn't been for this amendment. This is the point I'm trying to make.

In the meantime, some information was given to some honourable members apparently. They received the financial statement of the Trust Horned Cattle Purchases Act Trust Fund, which I didn't receive; I don't know why. But I certainly would have liked to receive this information before I spoke the previous time, because this is information that I appreciate, and I know when I spoke the previous time I mentioned that, because

(MR. FROESE cont'd.)... I didn't have the statement, that I would be discussing this matter when we got to the Agriculture estimates because I was going to discuss the trust fund at that particular time. I borrowed the statement from the Member for Brokenhead and I find here the amount that has been received during 1967, which is quite a substantial amount, and also it gives the various items for which this money is being spent.

I, for one, do not like Acts of this kind where you're penalizing certain breeders who probably have a breed of cattle that has horns, whereas other growers will have pulled breeds and therefore do not have this problem at all, so that we are penalizing certain breeders in this case and certain people, whereas we are not putting the same penalty on others.

And then to go ahead and use the money for the purposes that are listed here, some of them probably are of no concern to some of the breeders that grow these cattle, and it seems whenever funds of this type are set up that you find drones or pests coming to these funds and they all want to have a share in using the money. But to the people that have to put the money up, it's quite a different thing.

We have such items here under the expense list, under the General heading: Advisory Board meeting expenses, \$326.00. Cost of speaker to encourage cattle improvement, \$337.00. Repair animal scale, \$129.00 -- I don't know where this comes into the picture. Do they have a special scale for weighing the horned cattle? Mastitis control, foot and mouth inspection, \$1,000.00. I don't see where mastitis comes into the picture, because in so many cases the animals that are sold are steers.

Then we find the Gladstone auction mart, fees and mileage, \$2,553.00. Advertising re dehorning cattle, \$103.00. Well, this is a matter that I would think that pertains to such a fee as we are imposing on the cattle breeders, but this matter of dehorning cattle and those of you that have witnessed dehorning of cattle, it's not a pleasant sight to behold, with blood spluttering around all over, and, as already mentioned by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, it's much better to take care of this while the animals are small and not have it come to the point where you have to dehorn.

Another item is the purchase of Keystone blades and dehorners, \$418.00. Then, Westlake Projects Studies, \$746.00. I would like to know from the Minister what is this project. What is it about? I for one have no idea what it entails or what it means. So that you have a total of general expenses here of \$5,623.00.

Then we come to more substantial amounts such as the grants, and we have a grant to the University of Manitoba, Faculty of Agriculture and Home Economics, \$30,227; and the Manitoba Beef Cattle Performance Association, \$10,220; and the next item is Livestock Protection Society, \$6,000; a total of \$46,447 in grants. These last items I would like to have more information on them too, because we're putting a penalty on the breeders of these cattle, that sell horned cattle, and then dispose of the money when I don't know whether these are worthy causes and whether they are pertaining to this particular type of business. Anyway, I hope that I get a sheet of this trust fund of my own so that I don't have to borrow other members' papers.

Now, the motion is to delay or to refer this bill to the Agricultural Committee and then that they study the contents and also the repercussions or any of the results that would come about if the policy is changed. I have no objection to having this referred for further study to this committee. It certainly would help them that we could call people in and hear what they have to say in this connection, to voice their objections or approval whatever the case may be, so I will support the amendment so that we can have a proper discussion on this.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask simply a question. I don't want to exhaust my right to speak, but when he does reply, I wonder if he could give some explanation for the item, Westlake Projects Studies, \$746.00.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, when I do rise to close the debate, I'd certainly be prepared to go into further detail on the items listed on that financial statement. I beg to move then, seconded by the Minister of Health, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 20. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? Second readings.

MR. LYON presented Bill No. 7, The Presumption of Death Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I think a short explanation would be in order in connection with this bill. This Act which is brought before the Legislature is one which has received the recommendation of the Commissioners on Uniformity of Legislation for Canada. Similar legislation to this bill has already been enacted in the provinces of British Columbia, Nova Scotia, North West Territories and the Yukon. The bill was also reviewed by our own Law Reform Committee and recommended for enactment by them.

There is no general authority in the courts to make an order of presumption of death. The matter has been dealt with specifically under the life insurance part of the Insurance Act and in the Marriage Act, but no provision has ever been made for the probate of a will or issue of Letters of Administration on the presumption of death, although the matter seems to have been looked after in some cases where there has been no certificate of death. There are some differences in this bill from the Insurance Act provision. For instance, there is no mandatory seven-year waiting period. This was considered very carefully by the Uniformity of Laws commissioners and they felt that it would be best to leave the matter of how long a waiting period should be required, to the courts in various cases. For instance, where there is fairly definite evidence of death, such as eye witnesses to a drowning where the body was not recovered, or to an explosion where no parts of the body could be located, the courts might not require any lengthy waiting period. On the other hand, if it was just a matter of disappearance with no evidence as to what happened to a person, the courts might require some considerable waiting period before issuing an order pursuant to the Act.

The bill also leaves to the courts the question of whether or not it wishes to assume jurisdiction. Any of the courts mentioned in Section (1) can issue the order. It was felt, however, that generally speaking, the courts would restrict themselves to matters which were of concern to the particular court. For instance, the Surrogate Court would likely only issue presumption of death orders in cases where it was required for probate or administration or other estate matters. The County Court would likely only issue it in cases where an action was pending in the County Court. For all other purposes it is assumed that the Queen's Bench would have general jurisdiction. This does not, however, prohibit a Surrogate Court or a County Court from issuing general orders of presumption of death that would be good for all purposes. It appears that there would be no particular reason for fixing one court or another with this specific jurisdiction.

You will also notice, Mr. Speaker, that the courts could give a general order of presumption of death so that it would be valid for all purposes. It is thought that this is not very likely to be granted in too many instances. For one thing, the court has to decide what notice is to be given of the application. It seems hardly likely that the courts would very often give a general order that might affect a number of people who had not had notice of the application, and there's also provision in the bill for the court to specify the date on which a person is presumed to have died. This may be of importance in a variety of circumstances. For instance, the date of death may affect the disposition of a person's properties by reason of the relevant time of death. It might be very important in these cases to know which of two persons survived the other. It might also be necessary in respect of causes of action where the date of death determines the period of limitation. That is, for instance, in the Fatal Accidents Act.

There's one other matter that I should like to bring to the attention of the House, Mr. Speaker, in connection with this bill, and it has to do with the form of the bill rather than with the substance of it. This bill, as honourable members will notice, is in a new format which is being tried. It is hoped that a similar format will be used for the printing of all new bills. There are two essential changes in this format, as you can see from a quick glance at the bill. First of all, the marginal notes are deleted and sub-headings for each section and subsection are inserted. Secondly, each subsection of a section will have the section number indicated for ease in reference.

There are two reasons why this format is being changed: firstly, the most important reason is because of the possibility - and I will be going into this when I get the estimates of the Attorney-General's department, going into it in more detail - the possibility that the statutes of Manitoba will be computerized in the future. It is difficult to program a computer to indicate a marginal note as a marginal note. However, it is relatively simple to program a computer to indicate a sub-heading which will have the same margin as the sections

(MR. LYON cont'd.) themselves. Also the computer will only have to print out the sub-section which will show the section number. The whole section will not necessarily be printed out by the computer unless requested, and here honourable members will appreciate I'm talking about information retrieval from a computer, and I hope to give a fuller description of the plans in this regard when we come to estimates of the department.

Secondly, it is felt that the sub-headings can be read more easily than the old marginal notes. For one thing, the sub-headings will practically always be confined to one line, whereas the marginal notes sometimes went to as many as six or seven lines. The ease in reading evidently is based to a considerable extent on the number of times that the eye has to go back to the margin and start a fresh line. The old marginal notes were originated in the early times when all the statutes were written as a continuing paragraph with no section numbers or titles. For ease in reference the clerks of the courts, and later of parliament, used to make notes in the margin opposite various parts to indicate where certain topics were dealt with in the statute, and this practice has continued down through the years even after our statutes were divided into sections and subsections and clauses and so on, so it's really a hangover from an earlier justification which was much greater than it is today.

So I thought it was worthwhile, Mr. Speaker, to give this brief explanation as to the change in format of the bill, which I am sure many honourable members have noticed, and I will look forward on that subject to go into more detail when we come to estimates. As for the legislation itself, the substance of it, I would commend it to the House for approval.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I like the format of this bill. You're following the same format as you did in Bill No. 10. I think it's a much better set-up and it's much easier to find.

Regarding the present bill, is it the intention of the government to remove the mandatory seven-year clause from the Insurance Act, and is it the intention of the government to remove from the Marriage Act the endorsement which is placed on a marriage certificate where an individual is married on producing a certificate of presumption of death? I forget the exact wording, but I think the Marriage Act says that in the event of so and so being alive that marriage is void. Now I was wondering whether there was going to be a corresponding amendment to the Marriage Act so that this certificate of presumption of death will be final, both in respect of the Marriage Act and the Insurance Act.

I notice, too, that the certificate of presumption of death can only be issued upon the applicant producing to the court, or proving to the court that reasonable grounds exist for supposing that the person is dead. Now I have run into instances where it is exceedingly difficult to prove that there are reasonable grounds. Take for instance a man who is living separate and apart from his wife, and there's an order issued against that man for maintenance and support, and he leaves the province. Now it's exceedingly difficult to convince the court, even after an absence of seven years, that that man should be presumed to be dead because he has a reasonable reason for keeping out of the province. Now I was just wondering whether or no we could not enlarge this Act by inserting in the mandatory seven-year clause to cover cases of that nature, because I think the Honourable the Attorney-General will recognize the difficulty sometimes in convincing the court that there are reasonable grounds to presume death, particularly where that individual in question has reasonable grounds for staying away.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Selkirk has pointed out some of the factors that come into play and come to mind in considering this, what appears to be a simple straightforward bill. I should say it is a simple straightforward Bill, not just it appears to be, it is. But there are many ramifications, many of which have been brought forward both by the Honourable the Minister and the Member for Selkirk.

I think that there is good reason to proceed with the Bill. There's also good reason to evaluate it carefully in committee, and I am hoping that the matters raised by the honourable member which may be raised in committee can be discussed with people who are versed in this field, possibly somebody from the administration or from the Law Reform Committee. In connection with that Law Reform Committee Report - apparently they did report their approval or recommendation - it would be helpful I think to members of the House if we were given copies of the reports made by the Law Reform Committee so that we could consider the reasons put forward, if indeed they give reasons. So I'm using this opportunity in urging the Honourable the Attorney-General to make available to us the recommendations which he receives

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) from the Law Reform Committee.

Might I say also in connection with the format of the Bill that I did notice it and it did seem to me to be a good presentation of it. I didn't realize the plans of the government in respect to computerizing of this. I don't know if there are plans or whether it's just something that may happen in the future. Possibly when the Minister replies in closing debate he might indicate what progress is being made towards new revised statutes, not having had any for some 14 or 15 years.

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

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 19. The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. LYON presented Bill No. 19, an Act to amend The Reciprocal Enforcement of Judgements Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, there is a slight change in the wording in this Act which was brought about by consideration of the judgment from the County Court of Saskatchewan in the case of the Government Insurance Office versus Anderson, 1966, Fifty-seven Western Weekly Reports, Page 633. This case was considered by the Uniformity Commissioners and the amendment contained in this draft bill was recommended by them as a result of the case.

The provision of the Act, as it presently stands, says that no order for registration shall be made if it is shown by the judgment debtor to a Court that the judgment debtor did not submit to jurisdiction of the Court making the original order. In the Saskatchewan case the defendant did not appear, although it became evident from the material submitted to the Court that the judgment debtor had never submitted to the jurisdiction of the Saskatchewan Court. The Court dismissed the application for the registration of the judgment but the Uniformity Commissioners felt, and our law officers agreed, that the section should be amended to make it clear that the Court can be satisfied by any means of any of the disqualified factors, not only by the judgment debtor but by any evidence that comes before the Court. And so this Bill is presented as a result of that case and the review of this matter by the law officers of the Crown and the Uniformity Commissioners. I commend it to the House.

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

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, the Bill as presented to us appears to meet with our approval and I'd be most interested to hear further debate when it goes to committee to ascertain that the rights of the creditor and the debtor would in no way be prejudiced by this position. I'm not quite sure whether this would have any adverse effect on either party. If it does not, then certainly it's the type of legislation that should be passed by this House.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Attorney-General. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I sympathize with the members of the Assembly that the luck of the draw means that at least a few of them, and I don't expect many, will have to listen to me twice in one morning. I recognize -- (Interjection) -- well if it was a pleasure to my honourable friend on this occasion it apparently wasn't on the last one. I'm sure of that. I quite understand the problems and I've been too long in the House to be worried by the fact of inattention. However, my honourable friend the Attorney-General, being a close personal friend even if not a political associate, will pay me the compliment of listening to me, and it's to his ears that I want to address my message. I might almost say please, Mr. Speaker, because I do want to once again urge something that I think is particularly important with two of the matters that were referred to this committee for consideration.

I do not intend to follow the example of others who have spoken in berating the government side of the House for the fact that they didn't call the committee earlier, because I know that they had major matters to deal with and time does slip by. These things happen and I haven't too much criticism of the way the affairs of the committee were proceeded with when we met. We heard many delegations; we received valuable counsel; and I would hope that we would be able when we meet the next time to finalize some of these important matters that have been referred to us.

One that I'm particularly interested in, Mr. Speaker, is the ombudsman. I think that it

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.) is urgently necessary that the government should proceed with the appointment of such an official. The government has been promising that it would do so for a long time and I think it's urgent now that this House, this Legislative Assembly, should get moving with regard to the necessary legislation and appointment in this connection.

Mr. Speaker, some of us in the House - I might refer to the Honourable Member for Rhineland and myself as conspicuous examples - but some of us look with a good deal of misgiving on the continuing tendency of government to get bigger and bigger and bigger, not necessarily in my opinion better but certainly bigger, and I do not exempt in this connection the Federal Government. I think that their record under both administrations has been just a continuation of the trend that I have seen for years, not only here, not only in Canada but in the United States as well. Government gets bigger and bigger and it invades - if that's the right word - at least it interposes itself in more and more fields all the time, and even though I will continue to protest and I will as long as I have a forum from which to do it and warn against this growth, yet I must be realistic and say that I see no sign whatever of the protestations of the Honourable the Member for Rhineland or myself being particularly effective in causing any change in that situation.

And as government gets bigger and bigger, Mr. Speaker, bureaucracy gets stronger and stronger, and bureaucracy is one of the difficulties in my opinion that we face today in Canada and in this province. It's a natural tendency. The bureaucrats are by no means bad people. They do not intend to do wrong but they have become very secure in their positions; they've become empire builders; and with the growth of big government comes the growth of bureaucracy as well. And as the government and the bureaucracy occupy more and more of the places that have been left that used to belong to the individual in the community, then I think the individual particularly, and to some extent the community, they require an advocate, an advocate with substantial powers to interpose himself or herself, according to what the choice should be, between that bureaucracy and that big government and the private individual. And so I urge, Mr. Speaker, that the government make haste very quickly to implement the office of ombudsman.

The other matter, and the fact that I touch only on two of them is not that I think the others are not deserving of consideration, but it's partly because they've already been covered by the Honourable Member for St. John's and others, and perhaps will be mentioned in greater detail as well. But the one that I would like to deal with in addition to ombudsman is the question of the draft Expropriation Bill. And there again I would like to make a plea to the government to give the most careful reconsideration before they set their minds upon implementing the Bill, the draft bill that is placed before us in its present form.

There's a biblical quotation, Mr. Speaker, that you and I will be more familiar with than most of the members of the Assembly because the younger folk, I think, don't go to the Good Book for inspiration and admonition in the way that you and I were taught to when we were young. It says, "If today ye hear His voice, harden not your hearts." And I say to the government, don't harden your hearts in your position with regard to this expropriation legislation because this is one of the fields where we are going to have more and more action by the authorities, and it's necessary in so many cases to enter in and take the properties of private individuals.

Mr. Speaker, this is something that we can all consider very objectively until we come up against it ourselves or someone who we know well, and it has been my misfortune or good fortune to have been thrust right up against it in connection with the Portage diversion, in connection with the Long Lake drainage improvement, in connection with the Winnipeg By-Pass and with the Birds Hill expropriation. I have tried to make a study of the situation because I was simply brought closely into contact with it because some of my friends were being expropriated in all of those areas.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to make invidious comparisons, but it has interested me, and to some extent it has saddened me, that in the Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders we had almost endless representations with regard to the matter of consumer protection; and I admit that this is a most important field. It is very important. We had many representations and they were very capable. We had them from private individuals as well as public bodies, but when it came to expropriation we had no representations that I recall except from legal gentlemen who were thoroughly conversant with that work. It's true that we had some from both sides, some who claimed to represent both sides.

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.)

But just let me draw the comparisons that I drew one day in the committee, and to me it's so important that in consumer protection - and again I do say that of course it's a matter of great importance to the individuals concerned - but at least it's just a question, generally speaking, of protecting somebody so far as it's possible to protect him against what to some extent is his own mistakes, at least his own actions, because if it's a case of dealing with the person who has purchased a refrigerator and it hasn't stood up the way he expected, or even if it's a case of fraud where somebody misrepresents the article - and there are many cases of these and they are important, they are important - but at least the person had the opportunity to exercise his judgment as to whether he would make that purchase or not, at least he had some area of decision for himself.

But when it comes to expropriation, Mr. Speaker, there the man's home can be taken away from him, his property on which his living depends can be taken away from him, and in this area it seems to me that we must give the utmost consideration to the position of the individual. And I was not aware of it. I sat on that side of the House for how many years - 36 about - and for pretty nearly a quarter of a century I was one of the front benchers there. I don't think there was as much expropriation at that time; I'm quite sure there wasn't. I don't think that where there was that we probably acted with quite the severity that I have seen in some cases since, but at least I was part of the government that put some of that legislation on the books and that was certainly using it at times, and I didn't know - I didn't know until I was released of some of my responsibilities and had time to investigate these things, I didn't know the hardships that occur to so many people with regard to expropriations.

I think there's the one cardinal virtue that we just have to write into the legislation, and that is that the interest of the authority must at all times be subservient to the interest of the individual. The individual isn't wanting to have his property taken. It's being in many cases forcibly taken from him, and surely to goodness under those cases he should get the major consideration rather than the minor one. I said here two years ago when my honourable friend the Provincial Secretary was the sponsor of the Bill at that time and he thought a good job had been done on it - and I know a lot of work had been done on it, I know they were capable people - but, Mr. Speaker, somehow or other these people have been connected with this matter in a professional capacity and they look at it differently, in my opinion, to the non-professional people. And two years ago, having studied that Act carefully in the light of conditions that I knew at first-hand, I made a speech in here that I admit was a pretty emphatic one. It was so emphatic that when I sat down my Leader and deskmate said to me: is the Bill really that bad? And I said it's worse than that. Mr. Speaker, this is two years ago and I do not retract one jot or tittle of what I said at that time.

And then later on - and I don't blame the government for this - I don't blame them if they don't pay too much attention to what I say about this because I was very concerned about this area and I used rather explosive language, more so than usual. And my honourable friend the Member for Selkirk, who is himself a professional man, a legal light of distinction and with many years of experience behind him, he said in the House later on that he has read my speech carefully and he agreed with what I said. Now, maybe you don't listen too much to the Honourable Member for Selkirk and myself, but the complaint that I have is that when the Bill came forward, on this occasion from my honourable friend the Attorney-General, not one single thing, not one effort had been made to meet the complaints that I had raised and had been endorsed by my honourable friend and colleague from Selkirk. Now, I don't expect to write the government legislation, of course I don't, but I do think that when somebody -- when two people such as my honourable friend and I make strong representations in this House, that they should be looked at, and the Bill came forward exactly as it was before.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the government and other authorities sometimes have to expropriate. I'm not unconscious of that fact. I know that there are occasions where one or two people must not be allowed, or even a series of people, to hold up a necessary public work. I know this, but what I do say is that when the Act is being applied, and there must be an Act there, that certain considerations must be kept in mind. I give the government credit, and I give my honourable friend the Attorney-General credit, that when some of these lawyers who had worked on drafting the Bill in the first instance and had worked closely with the committee all the way through and had made representations there, came before the committee and said either we were not in agreement with the decision of the committee when this was done or we

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.) have changed our minds. I give my honourable friend credit for saying that they were going to take another look at these. Well I want to add my voice just as fervently as I possibly can to say once again to take another look at some of these things.

I'm not going to speak at any great length, but one thing is the notification to the owner as it's in the present Bill - one is the notification to the owner. I said two years ago, Mr. Speaker, and I repeat now, would you believe it that the Act, as drawn, says that an individual's property can be expropriated and that he doesn't even receive notice of the expropriation for six months. I think that is terrible. The lawyers said, some of them in the committee, that they were sure that usually the word got around and the individual knew about the expropriation being in process. But this isn't the way to have it get around. Surely if you're going to take a person's property, surely you should notify him. First of all, I believe in negotiation. I believe in negotiation, but even if you are not going to negotiate, at least let him know immediately when you expropriate. And I repeat, that under this Bill, as proposed, they do not even need to notify him for six months.

Now my honourable friend the former Minister of Agriculture disagreed with me on that. He said it was three months and we had a basis of argument, because it is true that the authority would have to go before a Board, but one person can act in that capacity to give that second three months' extension. Well I think that is wrong, and I think they should tell the individual on the very first notification what they're prepared to pay. The authority has had time to think about this; it's only fair that the individual should know at the start what he's going to be paid.

And there's a provision in that Act that if land is expropriated and then not all of it is needed, that the authority can dispose of the remainder. There's nothing about the original owner getting the first chance on it. Surely, Mr. Speaker, if it were taken from him forcibly, surely he should get the first chance to get it back. If he disposed of it voluntarily, all right that's fine, but if it was forcibly taken and if he didn't want it to be taken, surely he should get the first chance to get it back.

And then there's provision for abandonment, that you can abandon land or property after having expropriated. There's nothing in this Act as far as I can see about damages to the owner. What if he's bought another farm in the meantime? You just hand it back to him. These things, Mr. Speaker, it's amazing to me -- it's amazing to me that the eminent lawyers that helped the government draft this legislation, responsible men, capable men and good intentioned men, it's amazing to me that they can really believe that these things are fair and reasonable to the individual. And it's amazing to me for Ministers of the Crown - and I suppose I would have done it in my day when I was sitting there, I suppose I would because I didn't know this situation as I do now - I suppose I would have argued as Ministers of the Crown now do in public relations, that the fact that so many people settle shows that they're reasonably well satisfied.

Mr. Speaker, one of the major facts as why so many people settle is because they can't afford to go to Court. They can't afford to fight the government. They can't afford to have cases appealed. The government can use the taxpayers' money, a wee infinitesimal bit of it being their own money, to fight against them through the Appeal Court and through the Supreme Court and all the way. The most of them can't afford this. I have made it a point in recent days to absent myself, even from the House on one occasion and from committees on a couple of occasions, to be across Broadway here listening in to three different cases that are going on on arbitration. And of course I can't discuss those cases because they're before the Courts, but I've been sitting in to try and catch the feeling of how this present system operates, and I must say, Mr. Speaker, that my heart actually bleeds for some of these people who are before the Court. They don't know what they're up against. I have little if any criticism of the judges - and there happened to be three different judges handling the cases - I've little if any criticism of their conduct, and I like the conduct of one of them better than the other two, but in general I think under the system that we have that they're handling it very well. But in the most cases it's a court case; it's not arbitration. This is supposed to be arbitration -- and I'm speaking too long, Mr. Speaker, for what I intended, and all I want to say is to the government, take another look at this; and I want to say to the Attorney-General, do what you said you would do and consider these points that have been raised.

Now two years ago, Mr. Speaker, the hearts were hardened and they heeded not the voice of the Honourable the Member for Selkirk and myself crying in the wilderness, but I urge them to listen now because this is an area of difficulty that is growing and we need to deal with it.

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.)

One other point and I'm through, Mr. Speaker. In the Act as we have it now, the one that's proposed, we have the same interest rate fixed for the money that is to come to the owner as we had before this new draft Act was put in, and that's the interest rate that will be paid upon any amount of money that is finally decided upon. Now it's true that without any prejudice to his or her position, the owner can draw up to 75 percent of the money. Not all of them do, but the provision is there. Some of them I find are afraid to do that because they're afraid that in some way it complicates the issue, but at least the opportunity is there for them to draw it. But even 25 percent remaining - some of these cases that are before the courts over here right now are four years old - and even 25 percent in some cases amounts to a great deal of money, and the interest rate is of importance, and yet the interest rate in the proposed Bill is five percent. Five percent has been in the Act for many many years, but it was put in away back - away back at the time when government bonds would be about 3-1/2 or 3-3/4 percent, and it was evidently put in to be some measure of bonus to these people whose property was being taken, and it is completely unrealistic to have such a rate in now. The rate was put in in those days, in the days of a tough government, at least one percent more than the rate at which the Province of Manitoba could have borrowed.

I hold in my hand - I've been carrying it for quite a while expecting to speak on this motion - an advertisement clip from the Tribune of March 21, 1968, an issue of non-callable Government of Canada Bond, and I'm looking at the five year figure, not the shorter ones - the five year figure - 7 percent bonds due April 1, 1973, issue price 98.75, yielding about 7.3 percent to maturity. Now, Mr. Speaker, in the face of this situation, surely we must look at the interest rate. However, that's not the big item. It's an important one to me, but the big item is that I do urge the government to give further consideration to some of the difficult features of the Bill. I have not enumerated all of them here. I do plead for the people, especially the poor folks who are having their properties taken and which will continue, and the wealthier ones - that's a different situation, they should still be used fairly I feel - but the others who have no recourse, absolutely no recourse to the Court simply because of the cost of going there.

There are many other matters that I could mention in this connection but I've taken enough time, Mr. Speaker, and I end by pleading once again with the government, let's put Manitoba in the forefront in this job; let's get an expropriation Act recognizing that this difficult job has to be done under some circumstances, under many conditions, that the area is likely going to grow; let's get an Act that we'll be proud of instead of one that I'm sure that a lot of us feel very doubtful about at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak, perhaps I could say just a few words, and I mean a few words in summary. I don't intend to attempt to answer all of the comments that have been made with respect to this particular motion because I, like most members of the House, am more prepared - or more interested I should say - in the future work that will be done by this committee with the important matters that are before us.

My honourable friend from Lakeside has just made a very thoughtful speech on the whole question of expropriation and all of us in this House know of his interest in this topic and of the strong feelings, and I think in many cases the soundly held feelings, that he has with respect to that Bill. I want to assure him, as I'm sure my predecessor did when the Bill was first introduced, that it was brought in as a draft document for consideration by the committee. It is still a draft document; we are not married to too many of the substantive points in it. I don't say that we are going to agree with everything that my honourable friend suggests because there will be -- (Interjection) -- Our hearts -- I can assure him our hearts however are not hardened. Our hearts will be soft and our minds will be amenable to all reasonable suggestions. I wanted to assure him on that point this morning that the bill is still a draft bill, and indeed there will be suggestions that will be coming from his quarter and from other quarters, and some from our quarter, with respect to changes that we have seen that might be made that would make the bill much more acceptable. As I say, I don't think we will get complete unanimity on it but I think we can emerge after further discussion and consultation with the lawyers and others who have been involved in this with a bill that will be much more in the public interest than the present legislation under which we are working.

There are many other items that have been discussed. It's not my intention at this time

(MR. LYON cont'd.) to go into the long speech that was made by my honourable friend from St. John's about what the committee should have done. I think the Honourable Member from Lakeside was quite right, and I would have used the words myself except that he has already used them and in much better terms, when he says that while consumer legislation or consumer protection legislation is extremely important, and we all grant it that importance, still we must never lose sight of the fact in dealing with legislation of this sort that it is only an attempt by government to protect people from their own folly. As long as we never lose sight of that base fact, then I think we can emerge with legislation which will be good. Indeed we have had one of the foremost experts in the field in Canada, Professor Zeigel, tell us that he thought the comprehensive code as presented by the Provincial Secretary was one of the best in Canada. And even though that code has not yet been implemented, I think that it speaks well for the effort of the whole House with respect to the study that has gone into this matter in order that we can then move forward and attempt to get it on the statute books as soon as we can.

The other matters that were mentioned, the question of legal aid, that is proceeding, there will be legislation as mentioned in the report before the House at this Session. Similarly with one aspect of the compensation to victims of crime, that is proceeding and there will be further discussion on the other matters.

So I hope that the House will see fit to support this resolution so that the committee can be re-established and that we can continue with the work of the committee which is dealing with all of these very important subjects, and resolve some of them at least to the satisfaction of all members of the House.

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Arthur in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before we proceed, members of the Committee are all aware of course that we are operating under Rule 62, I believe it is, that we are restricted to a maximum of 80 hours to consider the estimates before us. As you recall last year, we came to the end of the estimates without passing all the departments. We put through many resolutions including whole departments. They were not considered and I don't think that it's in the best interests of either the government or the opposition members and indeed not in the best interests of the people of Manitoba, the taxpayers. I actually have no authority, members of the committee, to restrict members within the 40 minute period of speaking; I'm confined actually to try to keep members speaking to the item at hand and to avoid repetition. But I am charged, members of the committee, with the responsibility of expediting the business of the Committee as rapidly as possible and at the same time giving consideration to all members of the Committee. So I appeal to you to try to keep this in mind. I direct my remarks to no particular member or members of the committee but rather to the committee as a whole, and not excluding of course the front bench on the government side of the House.

So with these few remarks I ask for your co-operation and I think it will be in the best interests of the committee as a whole, and whether you like it or not, it may make it a little easier for me.

Committee proceed. The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party. I think he was speaking last night.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, last night I was making some requests of the government in connection with the fishing industry, and the main point that I was trying to make at that particular time was an appeal to the Minister not to hold back if necessary on the establishing of a Fish Marketing Board in the Province of Manitoba in the event of any undue delay on the adoption of the recommendations of the McIvor Report and receiving the co-operation of the other provinces concerned. I do not intend, Mr. Chairman - and I appreciate your observations insofar as the conduct of the committee are concerned - I do not intend to pursue this particular point to a much greater degree than I did last night, but I do want to say to the

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) Minister that if he would take the time out to take a look at the various Newsletters emanating from the Indian and Metis conferences from time to time he will see further justification for action in the field of the fishing industry and that that action should be not long delayed.

Now as I mentioned last night, there was a Fish Marketing Board in Saskatchewan which has since gone out of business. However, I do want to say that it is the considered opinion of many people that it did render an invaluable service, in total, during the time that it was in operation. And I say to my honourable friend if he would take a look at the Newsletters of the Indian and Metis Conferences -- and many of our Indian and Metis people are directly affected with the depressed conditions in the fishing industry and in this area. This is one area I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the government can take action through the establishing of greater areas of support for fishing co-operatives in the areas, particularly in northern Manitoba with their Indian and Metis friends, and that in these fields the need is now. Let us not delay unduly the adoption of the recommendations of the McIvor Report if we have to await other jurisdictions entering into the scheme. I think that there is a serious problem. I think all members of this committee appreciate the fact that there is a serious problem. When we know through our Manitoba Economic Consultative Board that the average income for a fisherman is around about \$600.00 a year, and while we can suggest that possibly one of the answers may be to cut down on the number of licences that are issued in order that a lesser number of people are engaged in the fishing industry due in some respects to the depletion of the fish in the water and there not being sufficient available incomes, the answer might be in some opinion to cut down on the number of fishing licences. This is admirable and it's well worthy of consideration, but I also suggest, Mr. Chairman, that until such time as we have alternative employment for the people that may be affected through a policy of this nature, of the curtailing of licences, it's no real solution, and as yet, as far as my observations are concerned, we haven't the alternatives at the present time.

Now I mentioned last night too of huge amounts of fish that were, and I believe they still are to a considerable degree, in cold storage awaiting better prices. Of course we know that even in cold storage there is a deterioration in the quality of the fish and the price will go down.

My main purpose, Mr. Chairman, in speaking last night and again this morning is an appeal for action to support and help this very important industry in Manitoba, and I would like just to pose one further question to my friend the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources insofar as the fishing industry is concerned. It has been drawn to my attention that a considerable amount of fish fry from our hatcheries here in Manitoba is being exported to the United States of America, and I wonder if the Honourable the Minister can inform me as to whether or not this is a correct statement, if it is a fact that particularly some of the fry from the hatcheries up and around Lake Manitoba is being transported by truck across the border into the United States. If this is so, I would suggest that the matter be reconsidered and stopped.

Now I appreciate, Mr. Chairman, your remarks insofar as carrying on items under the departments in debate. There are other opportunities. I certainly do not wish to dominate this aspect. I had a few things to say tonight -- or last night; I repeat some of them this morning. In conclusion at this time, unless provoked, I wish to re-emphasize the dire necessity of a very close look at the present plight of the fishermen of Manitoba, and when I talk of the fishermen of Manitoba I'm mindful of our Indian and Metis, our Icelanders, and all who are engaged in the fishing industry, and I trust and hope that some solutions will be forthcoming rapidly and quickly to put this industry back on a firm foundation.

MR. JOHNSON: No, Mr. Chairman, I won't be long in my remarks.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I'll gladly give way because I know that last night he was on the verge of being on his feet on many occasions.

MR. JOHNSON: Yes. I'm frankly delighted this morning with the change in tone and emphasis by the Leader of the New Democratic Party, because last evening I'm afraid I too might have gone a little further than I intended to go or intend to go this morning, because he brought out this morning the point that this is a serious and continuing and complex problem and it's been so ever since Benjamin Christoperson put a net, a small mesh net in the lake off Willow Point in 1875, and John Taylor gave him a dollar for the first goldeye, and the price has never of course reached that point since.

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd.)

But I do want to say just a couple of points because I too want to rise and compliment the past and present Ministers for the energy and concern which they have been showing toward the real solution, I think, to the problems of the fishing industry on the area that I'm more familiar with, the largest inland body of water on the continent, Lake Winnipeg. The fishermen are terribly concerned, and I do want to say that I believe the previous member from Gimli, Dr. Thompson, in his time, like myself I'm sure, became so frustrated in approaching this problem and recommended very socialistic measures from time to time to deal with it. This is a problem I think that really is a large social economic problem as we appreciate.

But there are a few things that I wanted to say in defence of the government's position because like my predecessors in this Legislature from Gimli even after close to ten years that I've been here the progress has not been what I would like to have seen, it's the one area in activity that I have not been completely happy with. But as I become more fully apprised of the problems I have come to the conclusion that the solution does lie in the marketing end. I do know the several commissions which the former government had and investigations into the industry on the lake and I don't think the solution lies in the policing measures on the lake and regulating that lake; I think the solution lies in a central marketing agency. I say that certainly during the time of the CCF government in Saskatchewan they did subsidize the fishermen. For that they are to be commended but obviously it couldn't last because of the lack of marketing and where that government had to dispose of its fish through companies based here in Winnipeg.

So they never cured the problem but they tried and anybody that tries deserves credit. But I never -- and many of our fishermen don't believe that subsidy in itself is a solution. Part of this fish pile-up last year, one of the things that really bothered our fishermen in Manitoba, was the fact that the Federal Government saw its way clear to give a subsidy on Lake Erie for perch which replaced a lot of their small sauger and pickerel markets and further caused a back-up here. Fishermen also believe that companies overextended themselves. The fishermen were getting 65 cents a pound a year and a half ago for pickerel which was an all time high and then it piled up here because I think the marketing broke down at the other end. But I also have some compassion for the companies because of their difficulty and the control of fish disposal in the United States which is a pretty tight ship and it cannot be combatted unless all the western provinces and Northwest Territories come together on one fish marketing board.

And that leads me to the point that this government in 1964 was the strong voice at the federal level in pleading for a commission to investigate the whole matter, which brought about the McIvor Commission. The fishermen were heartened at that time by a statement by the Prime Minister at that time that all the kinds of services and help given to farmers would be extended to fishermen -- and then we had the McIvor Commission. Our government made a submission to Mr. McIvor in the Town of Gimli. I was pleased that the Leader of the Opposition was there at the time. I did not recall seeing my honourable friend. -- (Interjection) -- I see. Well I think that submission was largely presented by the now Attorney-General in his capacity as Minister at that time, was well received by the fishermen and was really the McIvor Commission Report that is now before us. I know of the present Provincial Treasurer and his negotiations with the Federal Government breaking down at one point and I'm most pleased as all the people are, and I know our present Minister, that the Federal Government has reopened negotiations. I would just like to say in that case that I would hope that all the members of the Liberal Party going down to this leadership convention might think of giving their support to the Minister who reopened this and said he would continue to look at it. I would rather they were down supporting the Member for Lakeside who I think should be the natural candidate from the west for the Liberal Leadership but in his absence and his reluctance to accept the post I would suggest they vote for Mr. Winters who has revived these fish negotiations under the McIvor Report. I know you'll take my advice seriously and -- but I thought I'd pass it on to you.

So I reject in short the statement by the Leader of the New Democratic Party because he knows a lot of measures were taken since this government came to office to try and rationalize the industry on the lake, the assistance of co-operatives at Berens and Norway House and Playgreen Lake and these have been fairly successful especially at Grand Rapids. He knows that unless this is a marketing board that has a pretty wide background and is an

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd.) interprovincial board it's not going to meet with success because we can turn to the experience of Saskatchewan in that regard. And I commend the present Minister for the energy and effort that I know he's putting into bringing about an agreement with the Federal authorities, and I feel that it may not come out just exactly the way Mr. McIvor has recommended because there are still some fishermen who, some problems that, as it comes to fruition, that the Minister will have to consider.

I do think that the government, previous government, tried with their commissions to get to some of the roots of the problems. The present government has given an awful lot of time and energy to this. I am convinced that nothing can be done unless you do have marketing a la McIvor Report in order to stabilize it. When you get that, you'll automatically get the rationalization on the lake as to licences and quantities and so on, and the fishermen look forward to this. In the meantime, many fishermen have been displaced and are pondering their future, and I do think and do hope that the Federal authorities will see their way clear to give all that co-operation that our Minister so urgently is seeking to bring about this marketing effort, and I think as far as I can see the companies recognize the need for this.

The one thing that will be the toughest, with the large part of our fish going to the United States market - for example, white fish is still pretty well all exported. The Lake Winnipeg white, which is more amenable to smoking and sold on the New York market, the fishermen were still only getting 32 cents a pound last year; it sells for over \$2.00 a pound in New York and more, but I think the companies have problems of -- I think there's -- in fact, there is a monopolistic type of control down there that can only be broken by all fresh water fish in the west being dispensed through an agency that can break down this kind of defense against us here in Canada.

So, I think we're coming closer to a solution. I know the fishermen on the lake are most keen to review a final draft of agreement when the Minister is able to conclude a plan with the Federal authorities, and I just want to commend him for the energies he's put forward and for the past Ministers who have done so much in bringing this about, and I'm proud that Manitoba - who have the biggest stake in this, in my opinion - I'm pleased that they are leading the way in this area. But it is probably the most - has been to me, at least, since I came into public life - one of the most difficult areas, and that's why, Mr. Speaker, I was so pleased to see the reversal to his true form this morning of the Leader of the NDP.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh come on, now.

MR. JOHNSON: Same principle.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, last night I tried to impress upon the House the situation with regard to the rough fish. The Minister, when he replied to my remarks, made no mention of the situation.

Two years ago, I believe while the present Attorney-General was then the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, we were told that a pilot project was to be set up in the Inter-lake, I believe along Lake Winnipeg, with respect to a fish processing plant. Could he indicate at this time is this plant in operation and what success there was with it?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, if I could pass on some comments to date. First of all, the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party is not in his seat so I'll not comment on his remarks, I suppose, until he returns.

There were two or three questions the Honourable Member for St. George asked last night which I don't think I commented on. He did mention with regard to the hunting regulations on mallards, which I think maybe he was overstating the case a little bit. As a matter of fact, I think there's a pseudo technical term that applies to something like this, which is referred to as a thermo-plausible, and when you transpose this technical term in plain ordinary English it means something that is designed to create more heat than light, and I think that his remarks, along with some of the others, are more inclined to be of this nature. First of all, with regard to farmers getting up at 3:00 a. m. to scare the geese off their fields, or ducks off the fields, or geese or whatever it happens to be, I think he knows that there are under severe conditions available to them time-operated Zon bangers that can be used for this purpose, and I don't suppose that we're ever going to resolve the problem completely. We do run across the greatest problem for -- you have farmers who are just not interested in game and as a matter of fact this is where the difficulty usually arises and it would be virtually impossible to satisfy them regardless of what was done by the government.

Now, with regards to the rough fish processing plant, I would point out to him that we

(MR. CRAIK cont'd.) have been studying, among other things, the fish protein concentrate plant which doesn't at the present time show the necessary economics to justify it. The fish protein concentrate as a food supplement, or as a protein source, is gaining world-wide popularity. It has had Food and Drug legislation up to date that has been prohibiting it, but this legislation is changing as the research develops new techniques. We have investigated into the feasibility of such a plant being located in Manitoba, but I'd point out the economics don't look good for it at the moment. In order to make it feasible you couldn't pay more than about three to five cents per pound for the rough fish. Otherwise, it would be non-competitive with the protein concentrate which can be developed from the salt water fish. So I'm not really suggesting that there's much likelihood of this developing but there it's still under active examination and has been for some time, and I've had a particular interest in this since coming to the department and have reopened it.

Now I think he asked another question with regards to how accurate the reports are on waterfall kill. Probably the best over-all indication we have now is that since this is an arbitrary board and comes under the Federal jurisdiction in terms of the kill on both sides of the border and the regulations pertaining thereto, there is, we believe, good information coming from the reports that go back on their licences, and we can get pretty good tabulation of what is happening on an inter-provincial basis backed on the whole scene. Furthermore, we further believe that there is good reliability in the replies that we're getting from the hunters.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee has considered a certain resolution, asks me to report progress, and requests leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Springfield, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

DEPUTY SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

MR. SPEAKER: May it please your Honour, the Legislative Assembly at its present Session passed Bill No. 50, an Act to amend The Municipal Act (1), which in the name of the Assembly I present to Your Honour, and to which Bill I respectfully request Your Honour's consent.

MR. CLERK: In Her Majesty's name, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor doth assent to this Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and faithful subjects, the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba in Session assembled, approach Your Honour with sentiments of unfeigned devotion and loyalty to Her Majesty's person and government, and beg for Your Honour the acceptance of this Bill No. 41, an Act for Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for the Public Service of the Province for the Fiscal Year ending the 31st day of March, 1969.

MR. CLERK: His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor doth thank Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, accept their benevolence, and assent to this Bill in Her Majesty's name.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm now calling it 12:30, and I'm leaving the Chair and will return again at 2:30 this afternoon.