

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

10:00 o'clock, Saturday, June 1, 1974

Opening Prayer by Mr. Deputy Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Jenkins): Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports; Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; The Honourable First Minister.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere), on behalf of the Minister of Labour, introduced Bill No. 91, an Act to amend The Civil Service Superannuation Act. (Recommended by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor)

HON. HOWARD PAWLEY, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (Selkirk), on behalf of the Minister of Labour introduced Bill No. 93, an Act respecting the Family of Cyril George John Orchard, Deceased. (Recommended by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor)

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Education) (Burrows) introduced Bill No. 92, an Act to Amend the Teachers' Pensions Act. (Recommended by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor)

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Oral Questions; The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Official Opposition) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Finance and it relates to the release of three pages of a report from the Provincial Auditor relating to the Lotteries Commission. I wonder if he could indicate procedurally whether that report, the Auditor's Report, was handed to his department and to himself as Minister of Finance, or possibly the First Minister as Minister of Finance, before it was received by the department or by the Minister involved.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance) (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, I had already explained yesterday or the day before, yesterday I guess, that what appears to have been leaked to the press was not in any report that was received by any person in Cabinet that I am aware of, or a department. I explained that what apparently was leaked to the press was part of a document which were the internal working papers of the Provincial Auditor, who explained to me that when he was dealing, or when his staff was dealing in detail with the Department of Tourism relating to the specifics, that the information contained therein was made available to members of the staff of the Department of Tourism or possibly whoever was involved in reviewing the work of the Centennial Corporation, in order to assist them in straightening out the problems raised, so that that was never in my hands or the Premier's hands and I am sure it was not directly in the hands of the Minister for Tourism.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs) (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. The report alluded by the Leader of the Conservative Party was not a report from the Provincial Auditor. It was an in-house document from one auditor to another.

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

MR. SPIVAK: . . . I believe the First Minister has already indicated that he was informed of this or the information contained in the documents some nine months ago. May I ask, was he informed by the Provincial Auditor or was he informed by the Minister in charge?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may respond to that question. There was a report made that was customarily done by the Provincial Auditor, where he writes to the Minister of Tourism with copy to me, which report did not contain the kind of detailed information that was referred to in the press but rather dealt with the fact that there were a number of areas of concern. And these are the areas which were then - and the letter, as I recall it, also said they are already being taken up with people within the department and are being dealt with in that way. That was a general statement, no names and no specifics, but a general description.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, in view of the fact that the former Minister of Tourism has already

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd). . . indicated that he brought the matter to cabinet, I wonder if the First Minister is in a position to indicate at what point the former Minister of Tourism brought this to Cabinet and did he deal with the specifics contained with a general position or specifics as contained in that report?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, it is correct to say that the former Minister of Tourism did bring the concerns expressed by the Provincial Auditor and/or staff of the Provincial Auditor's office to the attention of Cabinet. This was in the autumn of 1973 and it was then a matter of only a few days or weeks that the kind of remedial and corrective action and whatever changes that were recommended by the Provincial Auditor, that were put in train or put in progress of implementation, and accordingly it was done. It is about nine months ago.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the First Minister can indicate whether the Minister of Tourism at the time had the internal document, part of which was leaked.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have no way of knowing whether the former Minister had any particular document or documents with him. Certainly my recollection is that he brought the matter to the attention of Cabinet during the normal course of dealing with agenda items of that department, without any documentation, but rather in the way of a verbal report - which was not lengthy, either, as I recall.

MR. SPIVAK: Well I wonder if the First Minister can recall, did he deal with it in a general way that the Honourable Minister of Finance indicates the information was passed on to him, or was it . . . ? --(Interjection)-- No, Mr. Speaker. I think this is fairly important and I don't want to get involved in an argument because we can discuss this with the Provincial Auditor of Public Accounts, but I am asking the First Minister whether it was in a general way that this matter was dealt with or were the specifics before Cabinet.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, it was both, as I recall, in the sense that our former colleague brought to our attention the fact that the Provincial Auditor had, as is the really part of the normal operation of the Provincial Auditor's office, brought to the attention of a particular Minister that there was a certain administrative procedure or series of procedures and practices being carried on in that department which were, in the opinion of the Auditor and/or the auditor's staff, undesirable, which required remedial action. And in this case the point at issue really had to do with the internal administrative working, and only aspects of it at that, of a -- not of the department proper but of an agency, that is to say the Centennial Centre Corporation, Citizens Committee, I guess the term is. And so our colleague informed us of the Auditor's concern and also there was some discussion as to the remedial course of action to be undertaken, which I indicated in a general way yesterday was undertaken during the month of October, certainly culminating in November, with changes in personnel, etc.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, the members opposite have put a number of questions with respect to the operations of the Hog Marketing Board. I should like to inform members that the Marketing Board for the last month or month and a half, thereabouts, has invoked a new pricing policy, namely that they are attempting to set a price somewhere within the area of the freight differentials between Toronto and Winnipeg, which in fact amounts to about \$1.90 per cwt below Toronto prices, as opposed to the system that was applied up to that point in time, mainly that the packers would bid from any level and end up at any price dependent on their choice of that particular moment.

The history of it, Mr. Speaker, is that the price differentials this year and on a number of occasions have varied so greatly, in fact somewhere in the order of six or seven dollars a cwt below Toronto, and so the Board felt that it had to move to peg a price to reflect only the freight differential; in other words, to pay for the cost of freighting pork from Manitoba to the Ontario and Quebec markets. The industry objected to that, and there have been, by the way, ongoing negotiations to establish a formula as between the Board and the industry for, well, I would say all of three years now, and the industry consistently objected to a pricing system which would reflect a more reasonable relationship between the price of pork in Manitoba to that of Toronto, and consequently the Manitoba Hog Marketing Board took unilateral action about a month and a half ago in establishing a price relationship between the

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. USKIW cont'd). . .two markets. I'm talking about the packing industry and I presume that everyone knows what I'm talking about.

Now consequently, the industry people decided to, or attempted to, and are continuing to attempt to prevent the Board from succeeding with this new pricing formula and have been cutting back their purchases. Because of that, the Board has had to find markets elsewhere, have had to deal directly with people in Eastern Canada, people in the United States, and have attempted to co-opt the support of other marketing boards across Canada; mainly the Marketing Board of Saskatchewan has lent its moral support to the operations of the Manitoba Hog Marketing Board in that they too, Mr. Speaker, have pegged their price, and that they have not used the teletype or the bid system whatever since they have set up their operations. So that it is in this context that we find some difficulty in the marketplace. Compounding that, however, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that the industry feels that there is an imminent strike, and I'm advised that they may not be taking on as much supply as they otherwise would be because of that eventuality, in fact I had a call from one of the major packers only two days ago indicating that they may shut down completely if one of their plants are struck. So that these are a combination of factors that are adding to the confusion and the concern that we all have with respect to the price of hogs in this province.

The industry had proposed for some time, Mr. Speaker, that the price differential between Toronto and Winnipeg be somewhere in the order of \$3.30 or \$3.40 a cwt and have indicated they would really prefer it to be about \$4.00 below Toronto. And that is essentially the area of dispute, Mr. Speaker, as to the amount of differential. One has to bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that Manitoba does not ship all of its pork out of this province. We consume about one third of our total production and therefore it seems unreasonable for the industry to expect that kind of differential, bearing in mind that they only ship two thirds of the product out.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): I wonder if the Minister would now answer questions that were posed to him rather than the recitation that he has just given us on the history of the situation, which we were all familiar with. My question to the Minister now is, what percentage of Manitoba pork finds itself into the Toronto market?

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what percentage precisely goes to the Toronto market. I know that we export about two thirds of our total production, so that whether it's Toronto, Montreal or a combination of markets outside of Manitoba is not relevant.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I think it's important to know just what percentage goes into the Toronto market to determine why there should be a relationship between the Toronto and Winnipeg markets, and my question to the Minister now: Will he find out what percentage of Manitoba exports of pork go into the Toronto market?

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that particular item can be very easily discovered by looking at, I believe, I'm not sure but I would think the Annual Report may indicate the shipments, the percentages of production and the various markets that we supply, but I may not be correct on that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. JORGENSEN: The report shows the quantity of exports, not necessarily the market. What I'm asking is, how much of it goes into the Toronto market?

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before we proceed, I draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery where we have 25 students of Grade 5 and 6 standing, from the Alexandra School at Brandon, Manitoba, under the direction of Mrs. Parker. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Brandon East, the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. On behalf of all the honourable members, I bid you welcome this morning to the Chamber.

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS: (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if on a matter of privilege I could be permitted to correct an impression left in Friday's Tribune with respect to the Conservative Party's position on the Treasury Branch Bill. I believe, and I haven't had the

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . opportunity to check out Hansard, that I referred several times during the course of my response that this was the kind of a bill that could well be considered in between sessions at a committee. I had in mind a special committee. I make no plea if I may well be accurately reported here, but in any event it should not be, I had not in mind that we would approve it and would oppose it only in Law Amendments, or that this bill should be -- it was the Law Amendments Committee that I had in mind. I had sincerely in mind the suggestion that this was the kind of a bill that could well be studied in between sessions at a committee, a special committee set up of some description by this Government, that would take this bill, you know, out into the country and throughout the province for further discussion. In any event, that is the position that I intended to convey. I am conveying that at this particular time. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ORAL QUESTIONS CONT'D

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY McKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs. I wonder if the Honourable Minister can advise the House if the Hudson's Bay Company Archives Collection of Historical Documents have arrived in Manitoba.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I was checking that during the week and I'm told that this is due later. The exact date I haven't got before me -- July, August . . .

MR. McKENZIE: A supplementary question. I wonder can the Honourable Minister advise the House, when the papers do arrive here for safekeeping in our Archives, will Manitoba own them or will the Hudson's Bay Company still retain ownership?

MR. TOUPIN: Again, Mr. Speaker, I'm not quite sure what will happen. We have a bill before the House, as the honourable member well knows, the Heritage Act, which could be taken advantage of.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. My question is, will there be any assistance for flood damage to, well, particularly areas like golf courses and so forth?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the reason why the honourable member is posing a question of me and not the Minister responsible to co-ordinate the flood damage in the Province of Manitoba. There has been damages on a lot of golf courses on greens and what not, and I'm aware that the Flood Assistance Board itself has been discussing some of these problems with those responsible for the upkeep of these golf courses. The department has brought help to the best of its ability.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - GOVERNMENT BILLS

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources & Environmental Management) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to proceed with Bill No. 88 on the bottom of Page 2 of the Order Paper, Bill No. 90 on the top of Page 3, and then the Adjourned Debates on Second Readings in the order in which they stand on the Order Paper.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I don't seem to have an Orders of the Day up here. Are we working off yesterday's paper? (No.)

BILL NO. 88

Bill No. 88. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY presented Bill No. 88, an Act to amend The Liquor Control Act (3), for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the amendments included in this bill relate to a number of specific areas of amendment to the Liquor Control Act, some of minor importance and some of a lesser than minor importance, and some of moderate importance. First there is a . . .

A MEMBER: No importance at all.

BILL 88

MR. PAWLEY: First, there is a change in respect to the term 'motor homes' and the definition for 'residence' in the definition section. The definition section will now include motor homes as a residence, in the same manner as, for instance, house trailer is now included in the definition category.

A motor home is used in the same manner as a house trailer, so constructed, however, that the position of the driver is within the area used as a living area in the vehicle.

A further section provides for a duty-free liquor store at the Winnipeg International Airport. Presently all international airports in Canada, except Winnipeg, have duty-free stores. The Liquor Control Commission does not expect any significant revenue from the operation but, from a public relations and image point of view for the City of Winnipeg and the Province of Manitoba, it was considered to be justified.

A further amendment reduces the appeal period from a disciplinary decision made by the Commission from one month to 14 days. This is for the convenience of the licensee and the people concerned. The licensee is now given 14 days' notice prior to implementation of the suspension or whatever disciplinary action has been decided by the Commission. The 14-day procedure has been established from the outset. For instance, a license is given 14 days' notice for the original hearing and, following the hearing, 14 days' notice prior to the implementation of the suspension or other disciplinary action. Therefore, an appeal period of over 14 days has little purpose and is misleading in that the penalty would have already been served.

A further amendment provides that alcohol sold under prescription cannot exceed 16 ounces. The smallest quantity of alcohol that is supplied by distilleries is a 20-ounce bottle.

A further amendment provides that an adult person may have in his possession, keep in his residence, home-made wine or beer lawfully made by him in his residence, and such wine may be consumed in a residence. Organizations of makers of home-made wine have testing competitions at the local, provincial and national levels, but the Act now requires that competitions be held in a residence. In 1974, the National Wine Testing Convention will be held in the City of Winnipeg. Members of these organizations are connoisseurs of domestic wine-making and perhaps the most responsible people associated with alcoholic beverages in the province. The amendment will allow these organizations and their members to hold their competitions in a public banquet room or public hall when specifically authorized by the Commission in writing.

Another amendment extends the hours that a beer depot may be open, from 12:30 a.m. to 1:30 a.m. Inasmuch as beverage room sales are now allowed until 1:00 a.m., this will allow patrons one half hour to pick up vendor beer following the closing of the beverage rooms. Prior to the passing of the amendment in 1971 which allowed beverage room sales until 1:00 a.m., beverage rooms closed at midnight and the beer vendor operation closed at 12:30 a.m. This amendment was inadvertently missed in 1971.

Another section was amended by deleting the reference to 'females' - and here I think I would emphasize for the benefit of the Honourable Member for Morris this portion - amended by deleting the reference to 'females' as being forbidden to act in any way in connection with the sale, handling or serving of beer in, on, or about a beer parlour, or acting as a beverage waiter in a beer parlour.

Another amendment allows the Commission to authorize a beer parlour licence to serve beer or permit beer to be served to and consumed by men and women together in a beer parlour. The repeal of the earlier section does away with the provision that a beer parlour licensee may establish separate beer parlours for men and women.

Another amendment does away with the restriction that females were not authorized to act as beverage waiters in a beer parlour. This has been a longstanding concern of the Human Rights Commission.

The bill will also allow service of liquor with or without meals in a private sleeping room on trains to bona fide guests in the same manner as is now permitted in hotel rooms. This amendment was requested by the Canadian National Railways, endorsed by the Liquor Control Commission, which foresees no problems with the amendment.

The bill also extends the right presently given to brewers to serve beer to their employees or to casual visitors, tourists for instance, to Manitoba Wineries at Morris and

BILL 88

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd). . . Gimli and the Manitoba Distilleries at Minnedosa and Gimli.

The bill has been amended to provide for transportation of liquor in hatchback vehicles or station wagons. Presently such sections provide that no liquor can be kept in that part of the interior of a vehicle intended for the accommodation of the driver or other persons. Now station wagons or hatchback vehicles can carry liquor as long as it is in the rear of the second seat of the vehicle.

The bill also relates to motor homes, where the same problem arises. Here the liquor must be kept in a cabinet away from the driver's area, other than where the motor home is being used as a residence.

The bill also restricts the consumption of liquor in motor homes to when the motor home is actually being used a residence and not as a motor vehicle.

The bill also clarifies the present provision which states that before serving any person proof of age may be required. A case has been lost in court because a proof of age was requested after the person had been served and not before.

The bill also requires only a licensee to be personally present to answer to a charge. This is in accord with all other summary conviction proceedings under the Criminal Code and Provincial Statutes. This will allow the accused to appear by counsel. Further, it will allow the Crown to proceed to trial in the absence of the accused where the accused fails to appear for his trial after being summoned to appear.

The bill also allows for the forfeiture of liquor that has had or been kept unlawfully, without a charge being laid under the Criminal Code. Where a person is accused of a serious offence under the Criminal Code, the Narcotics Control Act or some other federal-provincial statute, and in the course of investigation the police seize liquor had or kept in a manner not authorized by the Liquor Control Act, the court will now have power to order forfeiture of the liquor without the accused being charged under the Liquor Control Act.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Temperance Union, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Lakeside, that the debate be adjourned. (Agreed)

BILL NO. 90

MR. PAWLEY presented Bill No. 90, The Human Rights Act, for second reading.
MOTION presented.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the original Human Rights Act was passed in 1971 and during the past three years it's given opportunity for the Human Rights Commission, for the department, for myself now as Minister, to relate to the experience of this past three years and to make amendments, both procedurally and policy-wise, that would appear to be consistent with the experience of the past three years.

There was an important decision in the courts commonly known as the McGavin Toastmaster and Canada Packers case, which were the tests of the functions and powers of the Human Rights Commission and the Attorney-General, as well as a scheme in operation of the Act, and as a result of that case a number of important areas of direction procedurally were obvious. Other suggested changes have been proposed by the Chairman of the Human Rights Commission arising from its experience in administering the Act and from its concerns in general about human rights policy.

First, that we could deal with the areas in the Act dealing with prohibited discriminatory practices, dealing with discrimination prohibited in notices, signs, etc. - I should mention that the general provision in respect to age as being a prohibited discriminatory practice is deleted there - the discrimination in respect to notices, signs, include race, nationality, religion, color, sex, marital status, ethnic or national origin of that person.

In respect to discrimination prohibited in public places, the age has been added to that which existed before; and the same in respect to discrimination prohibited in occupancy of commercial unit or housing accommodation; and also the term "source of income". In fact I should mention that age has also been added in respect to employment practices. If I could deal just for a moment in respect to these two extended areas of discrimination. One, insofar as age is concerned. One hears repeatedly and has complaints frequently brought to one's attention where older people often when they're in excess of 35, 40 years

BILL 90

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd). . .of age - I should apologize, I didn't mean to include the 40-year old bracket as being one of the older category, but say slightly past the prime of one's life, or just edging over the prime of one's life.

A MEMBER: He's reached a level plain.

MR. PAWLEY: Right, that's well put. That we hear frequently of employers and others indicating that because of age, because of the person's age that they're not acceptable for employment, and has created frequent problems insofar as employment practices are concerned. And basically, Mr. Speaker, it's my view that there is no basis whatsoever to any discrimination of a person as long as that person has the physical and mental capacity and the ability, to prevent the employment of that person simply because of one's age. Added to this is the new area of prohibited discriminatory practice in respect to source of income. This relates specifically to private accommodation where frequently - not so frequently any more but complaints are received from time to time by the Commission. Landlords for no other reason, no other reason, not relating to the reliability of the proposed tenant's ability to pay, not related to the tenant's character or his record or experience, for no other reason reject the application from a tenant for accommodations solely on the basis of source of income. This is particularly true in the area of social welfare recipients and where once they indicate that their source of income is welfare find themselves rejected for that reason only, for no other reasons relevant except for the simple fact that they are one of a group of people that are receiving social assistance. And this is an area, too, I believe, Mr. Speaker, that is completely unjustifiable in present society.

Also, in respect to discrimination in respect to employment. You will note that the - I should mention discrimination prohibited in the purchase of property, the term marital status is added there. Marital status relates to the refusal to sell property to one simply because they're single, married, divorced, separated, for that reason only to refuse to sell one's house, one's property to someone that is interested in purchasing solely on the basis of marital status. That has been added as a ground of prohibited discrimination under the section dealing with purchase of property.

Dealing with discrimination prohibited in employment marital status has been added again, again relating to the question of single, married, divorced, separated.

Also a new provision has been added. That political beliefs are a ground of prohibition insofar as discrimination is concerned. One cannot be discriminated against in hiring simply because one happens to be a political follower of a party which is contrary to the wishes of the particular employer. This follows, Mr. Speaker, in line with the recent changes in the British Columbia legislation in which that ground of discrimination was added.

Under a further section of the bill there are exceptions which deal with employment in which it is indicated that sex or marital status do not apply where sex or marital status is a reasonable occupational qualification requirement for the position of employment. There are areas where it's reasonable, where one could think of reasonable areas where sex or marital status would be a ground, or a requirement in occupational areas. One might ask where? Well obviously I think that in the area of a couple wishing to obtain a babysitter during a period of holidays they might very well desire that an older lady, single lady or married couple look after their child in their absence while they're on vacation. So there are areas of exception in this bill which I think only reflect the practical circumstances of every day society, that there are reasonable bases in some instances for exceptions insofar as the general application of discrimination is concerned.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I think that, and though it's not included in the bill I think because of oversight in the final drafting, political beliefs would have to be added here because I think it's obvious that all parties in Manitoba would want to ensure that their organizers and people working in their committee rooms for pay, on staff, or within the caucus room would be followers of their own particular political party. So where the political belief is relevant to the job which is involved, that it must be relevant to that job, then I would propose to make a change to ensure that there too there is a qualification. But outside of areas where there is a political involvement I believe there to be no basis for political discrimination in hiring, promoting, firing or any other employment practice.

In respect to the administration and procedure of the Act there is a very basic change. And that is to deal with the removal of the present defects in the Act dealing with bias. The

BILL 90

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd). . . Courts held that the Human Rights Commission acting as an investigatory body, a hearing body, dealing with the investigation of the complaint, then coming to a decision, all in one was a form of bias reflected in the responsibilities and procedures of the Commission. And the present bill gives the inquiry function like in the Ontario Human Rights Bill to a Board of Inquiry rather than the Human Rights Commission in order to remove possible bias in the responsibilities and procedures of that commission and to eliminate the making of a Ministerial order to confirm the recommendations of the Commission, which was a difficult procedure. The method of appointing the powers and procedures of the Board of Inquiry are all set out in detail in the Bill.

Another provision authorizes a Board of Inquiry to make an order directing the payment of wages lost to the person discriminated against because of a contravention of the Act. Wages are defined to cover special damages. There's no authority for awarding general damages for discrimination because of the Constitutional difficulty of including such a power within the bill. The absence of a specific authority to make or award any payments for discrimination of existing Act was an issue in both the McGavin Toastmaster and the Canada Packers case.

Under a further section of the bill an Order of the Board of Enquiry may be appealed to the Court of Queen's Bench. Further sections state that Orders of a Board of Enquiry may be enforced as a Judgment of the Court of Queen's Bench or by way of an application by the Attorney-General to the Queen's Bench for an Order requiring compliance respectively. So that if I could just sum up the procedure here. The complaint is lodged with the Human Rights Commission, the investigations are conducted by the Commission, by its staff members, and if the complaint is not resolved at the complaint level by staff and by the Commission itself, then the complaint can be referred to a Board of Enquiry for a hearing and a decision, unlike at the present time where the commission holds the hearings. In this instance a Board of Enquiry has a hearing and then makes its Order or Finding; and the Order or Finding of the Board of Enquiry once made can be appealed to the Court of Queen's Bench. If it's not appealed within the thirty day period, then that Order becomes like an Order or Judgment of the Court of Queen's Bench. The period or the time limit for commencing a prosecution under the Act has been extended to one year from the six month limitation that exists at the present under the Summary Convictions Act.

I think, Mr. Speaker, these are most of the important details of the bill and I await debate and discussion. I don't think that it's necessary really during reading of this bill, because I suspect that all members would agree that I would be only preaching if I sermonized on the importance and need for strong human rights legislation in our present age, present community throughout, in fact throughout the world, with trends that have occurred that are so obvious to us all, that's important with the rapid development of technology and all that technology brings with it; sometimes the god of efficiency, the god of expediency, to develop within the very structures of society as powerful counterveiling forces as is possible in order to balance the unfortunate side of the development of technology, which as I say, brings with it too frequently that god of efficiency and that less than compassion for the rights of other human beings. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, before I adjourn the debate I wonder if I could ask the Honourable Minister a question. He read from obviously some prepared notes, I wonder if he could facilitate this matter by either allowing us to have the notes or a copy of the notes -- well Hansard will not be out for several days now and in order to really expedite the matter of the House, if it's possible I would appreciate if those notes could be made available to us.

MR. PAWLEY: We have no problem, the notes that I read from were preliminary notes; there was final notes that were to be ready for me Monday which would have been of probably better detail. I will make these available or the substitute notes which may be a better quality on Monday morning, if I have those notes on Monday morning.

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

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

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Adjourned Debates on Second Reading. Proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance, Bill No. 64. Proposed motion of the Honourable Member for LaVerendrye, an amendment that Bill No. 64, The Treasury Bank Act be not read a second time now but read six months hence.

BILL NO. 64

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID BLAKE (Minnedosa): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I might as well make a contribution to the debate on this particular bill. I haven't researched a lot of statistics and data because I don't think that is really that relevant to debate but I carry no particular torch for any of the financial institutions. I would like the Minister of Finance to realize that I'm speaking as an ordinary member of the Legislature even though I may have some knowledge of some of the financial institutions and how they operate. --(Interjection)-- Thank you, Mr. Minister.

I was somewhat disappointed in the introduction of this Bill by the Minister, because we didn't receive the information that I thought we might get on studies that they had done and the need or the real reason for the treasury branch system to be introduced into the provincial financial structure. We did hear that the banking business was a profitable business and it was a good business to be in, and I think the Minister was referring to indications to him by the credit union movement and not the fact that it was a good profitable business and that's why the government wanted to get into it, because I think he is well aware of the fact that when governments get into businesses like this that maybe the profit seems to disappear somehow and they don't become as profitable as they are if they are run by some other form of corporation or organization.

I don't particularly agree with the Leader of the Liberal Party's stand on regional banking. I don't feel that that is going to bring the desired increase in service that western Canada or particularly Manitoba is looking for; but I can agree with the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources with his stand, because he has mentioned in the House before that his one ambition is to provide public ownership of banks in the Province of Manitoba. I won't go into his reasons for that, it's a longstanding wish. He has told us more than once in this House that if he has anything to do with it this would be one way that he would move, and I won't fault him for that, although I don't particularly agree that it's required and it will provide better service to the people of the province.

I think the credit union movement has done a tremendous job in filling the need that hasn't been filled by the chartered banks, and I think there are many good reasons why the banks haven't gone into some remote areas and why the credit unions have, and why there are some areas today that aren't served by either. The members opposite are well aware that the banks have operated under the Federal Bank Act, and when you open a new branch you are required to open it with a certain type of structure. You must provide a vault, which is a very expensive addition to any building. You must open with a manager and an accountant and a teller and ledgerkeeper, so you have probably five staff to start off with, whereas the credit union movement is able to go in and possibly open up in an insurance agent's office or something like that, with a part-time service, two hours a day or three days a week or whatever, and I think they have provided a much needed service in areas that were not served previously and could not be served economically by a bank.

I don't think all of the bank branches make a profit. There are several that have been used as service branches and probably don't make money, but they would be very few because when a branch becomes uneconomical to operate, it's simply closed down and the business is transferred to a branch closer by. I think we have an indication of that in Thompson, Manitoba. There was a branch of the Royal Bank there and a subsidiary branch opened in one of the shopping centres close by, and over the years the business of the town didn't develop as was anticipated and that sub-branch or the smaller branch was closed down and the business transferred to the main branch.

I think the claim that has been made, or the charge that has been made, that the credit union movement has been somehow pushed into the foreground to fight the fight or make some representations favourable to the banking system, I can't really agree with that. I think the credit union movement have a good cause to fear the entry into the treasury branch

BILL 64

(MR. BLAKE cont'd). . . system because I think there's a conclusion to be gained from the Guidelines for the Seventies, and the conclusion is that the takeover of the Manitoba economy cannot be accomplished without the creation of a well-designed set of Crown-owned financial institutions, and I would suspect that this is one of the first steps to that longer-range plan set out in the Guidelines for the Seventies and I think the people in the credit union movement have probably read the Guidelines and are a little concerned as to the future of their organization. I'm well aware of their reasons for wanting a bank because the credit union movement has grown over the years to such an extent where they have a large volume of cheques and they're required now to deal with the bank in order to have access with the clearing system to facilitate the movement of their cheques, and this would happen with treasury branches also; they would have to deal with the bank in order to become part of the clearing system.

The formation of a bank by the credit unions would be a large step forward for them in enabling them to process their own items for their own customers in a more efficient and probably a more economical manner. I can't help but feel the treasury branches in Alberta - it was mentioned previously and I won't dwell on that - were set up under a much different set of circumstances than we have here. At that time, in the depression years, the banks were paying terrible wages. I started then and I'm well aware of the terrible wages they were paying. But the treasury branches, when they were set up, they were able to enlist great numbers of bank people that were well experienced. In fact, I think they ferreted away the general manager of one of the banks, so obviously he wasn't getting paid too well either. But this type of trained staff wouldn't be available now. The banks and the credit unions have become a little more sophisticated and they're competing extremely well with industry now, and it's going to be difficult for a treasury branch setup to ferret away that type of staff. I want the Minister to know that I'm certainly always open for offers. I don't want to close all those options off, but --(Interjection)-- No, I wouldn't think that you would pay less, but it would seem to me that that type of staff just isn't going to be available for this set of treasury branches, if it comes into being, as was available in the Thirties in Alberta.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that the treasury branch setup in Alberta, while they have continued through successive governments, have been just another form of competition for the banking structure and for the credit union system, but I would say the treasury branch system in Alberta has not been overly successful. It doesn't really worry the charter banks to any degree. In fact, I understand that there's maybe a little bit of a stigma attached to someone who's dealing at a treasury branch rather than at a credit union or a bank. It's suggested that maybe he might be a poor risk. It's the same feeling that dwells in some corporations that won't have anything to do with MDC, because they're afraid their creditors will say, "Oh, they're dealing with MDC. Watch it. They must be in trouble." And this feeling is prevalent in Alberta with the treasury branch system. I don't know whether that might have any tendency to weaken their competitive features or not, but nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, it does exist.

I can't help but feel there would be an influence on loaning policy with treasury branches. It's been suggested that that has been common with loans with MDC. Whether that's a fact or not I'm certainly not prepared to say. But throughout the treasury branch system over the years I think there has been -- political influence becomes involved. Whether it's a genuine desire to set up a company that is going to provide jobs and increase the economy, I don't know, that could very well be the case, but the influence nevertheless becomes pretty prevalent and it may encourage that particular treasury branch or set of branches to finance some enterprise that may be successful and may not be successful.

I think the need that was suggested for additional service cannot be taken that seriously. I cannot see the treasury branches opening up and going into the smaller and remote areas where even a credit union is reluctant to go, because it's just not economically wise, and I hope that the branches are not going to be set up to be uneconomical. Possibly a treasury branch agent could be set up much like an insurance agent and he could collect deposits and send them to a larger bank somewhere. This might provide a service, but I think the credit unions and the chartered banks have devised a very simple "banking by mail" procedure whereby someone in a remote area can fill in a very simple form and mail his cheques, or whatever, by mail and request cash, and they will mail it out registered mail. I think the service is provided now and this would be a duplication, and I think it's a bit of a myth to say

BILL 64

(MR. BLAKE cont'd) that these areas are not being serviced.

I don't think I would be hidebound enough to fight a treasury branch setup to any degree, but I just don't think they're necessary and I really don't think that they're warranted. As I mentioned, I had the privilege, I should say, of opening two branch banks, whereby you enter a town that is well-serviced by banks and credit unions, and it's rather a challenging experience and an interesting one to just open the doors without any customers and just see how much business is available.

The Minister of Finance in his introduction mentioned that he didn't think that there was a great enough degree of competition within the banking system or the credit union system, and I would hasten to assure him that that is not the case. I think you'll find competition is quite fierce. Mention will be made of rates being the same. Well, there's certainly some stability to rates created through the formation of the Bank of Canada, and that was touched on by the Member for Winnipeg North Centre when he made his remarks and delved back into history about the formation of the Bank of Canada. I think it's agreed, Mr. Speaker, that the Canadian banking system is one of the strongest banking systems in the world, and through the creation of the central bank there certainly were some restrictions that maybe didn't allow the regionalism that we would like to have seen developed.

Now, from my own experience I felt that quite strongly about the decision-making that was done elsewhere, and that has changed so much in the last ten years. I certainly wasn't one of those by-the-book type of bankers. When I was a branch manager, I was continually in trouble with head office and fighting head office, and you just had to accept certain situations that the banks were not prepared to get involved in, such as longer term mortgages, and I only mean 10 or 12 years; and it was unrealistic to try and set a chap up with \$20,000 or \$30,000 on a five-year term, which at one time was considered a fairly good term for a bank loan, commercial loan, and it was just unrealistic to try and have that customer pay back his loan in that particular time, so you would try and get him 12 years or 13 years or 10 even - which wasn't, in my way of thinking, wasn't an unrealistic time. In many, many cases it came to pass that I just couldn't get the approval of head office. They said that's not the type of loans that we feel the banking system should be involved in. We're handling the day to day commerce requirements, or the requirements of the commerce of the day, and we don't want to get our money tied up in longer range propositions such as the ones I was mentioning. Consequently I, on many, many occasions, directed the customer or phoned the credit union. This was the type of loans they were putting on the books - ten year loans were quite acceptable to them - and in branches, while we were in competition with the credit unions, there was certainly an arrangement that we were trying to service that customer in the particular area rather than having him go to a mortgage company elsewhere.

So I could understand the feeling whereby the decision-making in the east has led a lot to doubts and a lot of resentment, but I think that has been changing and the figures that have been thrown around about all our money being collected here and being funnelled down east and being used by the easterners, is simply not true, Mr. Speaker, and I think the presentation that was made to the Western Economic Conference certainly bears that out that the west has been getting its fair share of deposit funds.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . question?

MR. BLAKE: Yes.

MR. CHERNIACK: I appreciate the honourable member's agreeing to respond to a question. I'm wondering if he would care to comment as to whether there seems to have been a departure in the bank's attitude to its regional responsibilities in the last couple of years, and if so, what caused it?

MR. BLAKE: Mr. Speaker, I can certainly agree with the Minister of Finance. I think it maybe goes back a little further than a couple of years. I think that process was changing in an ever-changing field. The banking business has undergone tremendous changes in the past few years. Computerization has probably been one of them. And I certainly agree that there has been a change in their thinking about regionalism and regional decisions, and it could very well have been influenced in some degree to just such things as we're talking about now. I'm sure this has been mentioned before to the senior people in all of the chartered banks, that, you know, you fellows aren't really giving the west a fair shake, or, you know, in Manitoba I'm sure there's people have put pressure on the banks to maybe pay a little more attention to

BILL 64

(MR. BLAKE cont'd) Manitoba and maybe try and finance the industry of Manitoba a little better.

I would say -- I don't know how many loans in Manitoba would be over a million dollars, but I think the decisions being made in this particular division now are made locally and something to the tune of a million dollars. Now that would by and large handle pretty well all the loans in this particular area. You know, there are loans over a million dollars, I realize that, but they're larger, sophisticated corporate loans and it doesn't really matter whether the decision is made down east or here and a few days in the decision would not make that much difference. My colleague from St. James tells me their head offices are probably down east anyway.

I, as a westerner, certainly would like to see more head offices here; I would like to see the head offices of all the banks here; but it's simply not realistic. We all realize the influence of the east and it's accepted, Mr. Speaker, that the Toronto-Montreal area is the heart of the financial community of Canada and this is where the head offices have located, and it's maybe unfortunate that we don't have a head office here for a western bank but I can't help but have the feeling that a head office of a western bank here in Winnipeg would not change the financial dealings of the west or Manitoba to any great degree. It's extremely difficult, Mr. Speaker, for a bank to become chartered and start up and face the fierce competition from the big guns, if you want to call them that, and even the credit union movement, because the credit unions have become very, very strong in the last 10 or 15 years and are growing at a very, very good rate, and I think it would be very difficult for a bank to move in and compete. The Minister of Finance would like another question? Fine.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate this kind of opportunity. In the light of what the honourable member has just been saying about the strength of the credit unions, does he really take very seriously their fear of being destroyed by the passing of this bill?

MR. BLAKE: I don't know whether I would go that far and say they fear being destroyed, but I think they fear the competition that they might receive from a treasury branch, because the credit unions have been -- I don't want to use the term "favoured" but the credit unions have received a lot of funds in the past few years from government agencies and we have changed the Act two or three times to allow some more of it, which is part of the reason for their success, maybe to a greater degree than it might have normally been without that little push of extra funds to allow them to maneuver in a little larger field. There's no question about that. And I think while they may not have a fear of being destroyed, they certainly have a fear of losing some of the forward thrust that they have. And I think that this is -- I have just received a better answer from my colleague and I will quote from the Guidelines.

"At this point it might be worthwhile to consider whether co-operatives might not be a redundant form of organization. After all, if rational and extensive use is made of Crown corporations on both the provincial and municipal levels as a means of countering private monopoly, power and breakdown barriers to entry, is there any need for co-ops? Is there any way of drawing a line between the proper area for co-ops and the proper area for public enterprise?" This may be a . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Walding): The Honourable Minister of Finance on a point of order.

MR. CHERNIACK: The honourable member said he was reading from Guidelines. Does he mean Guidelines for the Seventies published by this Government, or is he saying that he's reading from a piece of paper, which may not be Guidelines? I therefore ask him to give us the precise - I'm asking him to give us the page in Guidelines and I will give him time to get his instructions from his Leader and the House Leader to tell him what to say. But I'm asking, was he reading from the printed Guidelines which were published, and if so what page?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Mr. Speaker, I was reading a quote that was taken from Guidelines. If I get the copy of the book I can locate it and I would forward it to you.

MR. JORGENSEN: Oh you won't find it there. Oh no.

MR. CHERNIACK: It is not there?

MR. JORGENSEN: No, that's right.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: As it has become clear, by the providers of information to the

BILL 64

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) Honourable Member for Minnedosa, who is sort of a gullible dupe in this regard, where he thought he was reading from Guidelines and wasn't, would he now please at least correct the record to show that he was not reading from Guidelines although he said he was?

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

MR. SPIVAK: There are two documents referred to as Guidelines. There is the printed document, three volumes of which were tabled in this House last year and for all intents and purposes have been disregarded by the Government, and there was a document called Guidelines which was prepared, reviewed by a sub-committee of Cabinet, by Planning and Priorities Secretariat, and referred back to them. There are two documents on the record, Mr. Speaker, in this House, referring to Guidelines for the Seventies.

POINT OF ORDER

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q. C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order and on the point that is being raised. Let us understand that the honourable members are referring to working papers which were in the course of preparation for a government document which was subsequently released. I really believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Minnedosa, when speaking, thought that he was referring to the Guidelines for the Seventies which were published as the government document relative to this program. The Member for Morris has on several occasions referred to the fact that this will not be found in Guidelines; he said this from his seat and if I'm saying something that's incorrect I'll welcome his correction; that he is talking about an unexpurgated version, and therefore he is talking about documents which went into the course of preparing Guidelines for the Seventies. Now, the honourable member may have one view of those documents, we have another view, and we can argue that. The only thing that the Minister of Finance wanted from the Member for Minnedosa was to know whether this was from Guidelines for the Seventies, the document that was published by the Government, or whether it was from the documents that led up to that publication.

MR. CHERNIACK: And published by his Leader.

MR. GREEN: And if so, Mr. Speaker, then there can be a great debate. The honourable members now feel that in order to make capital out of government policy that they have to find somebody's statement that was made, as it was done last year by the Member for Riel, who said that it was government policy to teach Communism in the schools because they found a paper suggesting that. If that is the fragility of their political position, then I welcome them proceeding in that way, but we all know that it's a bunch of poppycock.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition to the point of order.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes. It should be noted for the record that the document that was referred to as Guidelines, which is not the three-volume document published, contains the names of five leading members of the Planning Secretariat who were responsible for the planning and with respect . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Are you responsible for . . . ?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, the pattern of legislation and development since the publication of that document is consistent with that memorandum rather than the three volumes that were produced for public relations purposes for the election.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader to the point of order.

MR. GREEN: Just so that . . . because I think that this has to be dealt with, because I do think it underlines the fragility of the position of the Leader of the Opposition, that he is unable to attack government policy and therefore attacks what staff have done relative to preparing working papers. And the honourable member, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member does that because when the honourable member was in government it was more important to him that the staff created policy which he could hide behind, rather than that he be the person identified with policy. This government identifies itself with its policy and does not, Mr. Speaker, does not blame its staff for its policy, nor is it held responsible for the thinking of every staff member. That will be the case when the Leader of the Opposition - if he ever gets there and I doubt that he will - forms the government, and the people of Manitoba should know that.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

POINT OF ORDER

MR. JORGENSON: So that the record is abundantly clear, the original draft of the manifesto, the original draft of that manifesto came with a note attached to it to the effect that it had, the language contained in the original draft, had to be refined for public consumption, which is what the Government did, so that it didn't sound quite as severe as the original draft. But we know what the Government's intentions are. The Government's intentions are to follow precisely what the original manifesto says they're going to do, and this is really what the Government's intentions are right now in introducing these treasury branch bills, because it's the first of three steps, it's the first of three steps, Sir, to take over the Manitoba economy, and honourable gentlemen opposite know that. They don't want it revealed. --(Interjection)-- Speaking on the same point of order that you raised.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader to the point of order?

MR. GREEN: Yes, on the point of order, Mr. Speaker, and we may as well have it out. We now have, you know, confusion compounded doubly. Now we can't even rely on the staff document, we have to rely on a suggested note that was attached to the staff document, Mr. Speaker, without which even the position of the Leader of the Opposition cannot be made clear. Let us understand, Mr. Speaker, that there is only one government document and that is the Guidelines for the Seventies that is published by this Government, and if the Honourable Member from Morris has to concede and create an international conspiracy of some kind in order to bring his views across, then we know that that is the attempt that has been made for years and years to suggest that there is . . . You know, I've heard it in different forms. International banking financial conspiracy, or Communist conspiracy, which is hidden and which follows certain patterns which are created somewhere in the background and which governments which have been labelled as Socialist are identified with. Mr. Speaker, we have never resorted to, and I hope that we never will, trying to hang the Government, the previous government or any government, on the basis of documents which are created by staff in the preparation of government policy. If that is what the honourable members have to do because they find themselves in such a weak political position, then let it so be known.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. I think we are making a rather simple point of order unduly complicated and it seems to be getting into a separate debate. The Honourable Member for Minnedosa . . . Order please. Order please. I believe the Honourable Member for Minnedosa is aware that he is required to, or should identify a document that he is quoting from. The Honourable Member for Minnedosa. The Honourable Member for Lakeside to a point of order?

MR. ENNS: That is relative to the subject matter that has been discussed in the past few moments. I simply wish to put on the record that I have had numerous occasions to quote chapter and verse from this self-same document and never has there been any specific objection made by any members, any Minister of the Crown, as to whether it referred to the restructuring of municipal government, whether it referred to the restructuring of industrial development, or whether it referred to co-operatives or credit unions in the province. I just wanted to put on the record that I have personally often used this particular document, often read from this particular document, and it has never been objected to - that is, up to now.

BILL 64 Cont'd.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I may get off one of my first forty-minute speeches this morning. I am well aware of the document that I quoted from, Mr. Speaker. I may have inadvertently referred to it as Guidelines. It was guidelines of a sort and I don't think it's a secret document, it's been around and around. So I was quoting something that I thought was common knowledge.

To get back to the Finance Minister's question about the threat to the credit unions. I do believe that the credit unions feel threatened by the enlargement of government treasury branches because there seems to be such a desire for control, and I suppose I could refer to monopoly on the part of the Government, and the credit unions fear that this may grow and eventually encompass the credit union movement whereby they may be swallowed up to some degree and lose control of their own institutions.

I mentioned earlier on about political interference maybe creeping in or influencing decisions in some way and how it might affect certain things, and I think there's a good example

BILL 64

(MR. BLAKE cont'd) to be drawn, not to carry the case of any one particular bank, but Leaf Rapids was mentioned earlier on, and there was a good case in point there whereby a bank had been represented in the North for many, many years and had done an extremely good job and had put several million dollars into the house mortgage field in Leaf Rapids, and when the town was developed to the point where they required banking service, this particular bank was not allowed to go in and provide the branch banking there; another bank was allowed to go in. And I think it was a decision that wasn't taken carefully or thought out carefully enough by the particular government, and I don't know what department might have been responsible. I think in this particular case it was the Industry and Commerce branch and I think there was somewhat of an injustice done to one particular bank because they were interested in Leaf Rapids and had put millions of dollars into it. And that's an area where I think . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, just on a point of order so that there's no misunderstanding. I do not believe it was Industry and Commerce, I believe it was the Leaf Rapids Development Corporation that had control of that situation.

MR. BLAKE: It could be. As I say, I wasn't just too sure what department was involved, but there may have been some influence there and I don't think that is a good situation. I know when these Crown corporations are set up that they're going to have to be staffed and I just don't know whether the Government can attract the expertise that's going to be necessary. I know the Minister of Tourism has had experience in the credit union movement and he may also be in line for the job that may be coming open. I'm sorry that I can't get wound up in my particular contribution to this debate, Mr. Speaker, in the manner that the Minister did yesterday. He was in full flight, and I sat in some amazement at his delivery and he certainly made an enthusiastic contribution.

As far as setting the treasury branches up, Mr. Speaker, I can't see the urgency or the necessity for rushing the bill through and setting up a large branch, treasury branch, in the city. Maybe you might end up with one or two in the province in the larger centres; but I don't think there's going to be any great opening of a large number of branches throughout the province and therefore I can't see the urgency for passing the bill right now. I think there should be more discussion. I'm concerned when there's confrontations on all fronts, and I refer to the agricultural industry. It seems that every move that has been made there, it's burst open into a wide controversy with a large segment of people involved in the agricultural industry, and I think this is the case now with the credit unions. I think the Minister could sit down with the people involved in the credit union movement and make it clear, completely and abundantly clear, what their intentions are, and get the feeling of the membership throughout the credit union movement and not the senior people involved; get to the people that are actually the grassroot members of the credit unions throughout the province and find out if they're really happy with the provincial governing body entering the banking field, which I think may present a threat to them and quite justly so.

I don't know what really has prompted the necessity of bringing the bill in at this time. I know that a hoist has been moved and I think the Minister would probably be well advised to let the bill be discussed at greater length, possibly between Sessions, and if the desire is there to proceed with it, it could be brought in at the next Session when a lot of these doubts are either cleared up or confirmed to the point where he may abandon the plan altogether.

I'm always concerned, as I mentioned earlier, Mr. Speaker, with the government entry into ventures like this, because they just don't seem to be able to operate as successfully as privately-owned corporations seem able to do, and this is demonstrated in so many areas; and I'm not criticizing this Government for not being able to do it because I think any government would face much the same fate. I think if we were to set up companies and try and run them were we on that side of the House, I think we'd run into exactly the same fate, because there's a tendency on people if the government owns it there's just not that desire and not that thrust to do as good a job as there seems to be in industry. Just what creates it and causes it I'm just not able to say, but this is a fear that I have. I think one of the most lucrative businesses in the country today, Mr. Speaker, is owning and operating a bar. Far more profitable than banks. And the government operate a bar and I think it's the only one in Manitoba that's losing money. The Centennial Arts Centre. I understand they lose money and I'm not just too sure whether the hotel at Leaf Rapids is not losing money either.

BILL 64

A MEMBER: How about the one at . . .

MR. BLAKE: Well it may make a profit this year but it has lost money also, so if you can't operate a bar at a profit, Mr. Speaker, I think it's a pretty sad case to be said for the administration. Is the Hotel Leaf Rapids in the profit picture now, Mr. Minister? --(Interjection) -- I would withdraw the fact that Leaf Rapids is another bar that's losing money, Mr. Speaker. This is a real good indication of government involvement in business. They just don't seem to be able to turn a profit, and I'm afraid, Mr. Speaker, that if the government gets into the treasury branch system, the losses have to be picked up from some area. Whether they can carry them on and on such as Autopac may intend to do, I don't know, but I'm afraid the taxpayers of the province are going to be asked to pick up the tab somewhere along the line for any deficits that may be incurred, and I am just that apprehensive of the government getting involved and making money.

A MEMBER: They might print their own money.

MR. BLAKE: The treasury branches in Alberta are profitable but they have been established for forty-odd years and when you get a real good foothold such as they have, it's an entirely different ball game than going out into the world of competition in the financial marketplace today and setting up a series of branches and making a profit. I related earlier my particular experience in the banking field when I went into two particular areas that were well-served by banks and credit unions and had to carve out a branch for the particular bank that I worked for, and it's a challenging experience - and a rewarding one - when you're able to get the branch into a profit picture, but it's a real tough fight. I must say I enjoyed it but I certainly wouldn't want to do it for the rest of my career should I end up banking. And I just want to keep my options open, Mr. Speaker, and if the bill is passed and the government do get into the treasury branch business, I may be able to contribute something and I'm always willing to negotiate price.

I think, Mr. Speaker, my notes have been a bit jumbled, and I have not bored you, I hope, with a lot of statistics, but I cannot really see the need for treasury branches at this time and I support the amendment that my honourable friend the Member for La Verendrye has proposed. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY (Fort Rouge): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to begin first by saying how much I appreciated the last remarks by the Member for Minnedosa. I thought it was a very practical and useful exercise in judgment as to the problems to be associated in a working way with the proposals before us. It's unfortunate that once again we got somewhat diverted in our attention on this whole question that keeps coming up, like who has the secret paper? I'm afraid that the exercise south of us has somewhat kind of mesmerized our attention so that we're always trying to rescue something from the waste paper basket as proof of intentions.

But I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that we have to rely upon sort of refugees from the shredder machine to demonstrate the real and correct intentions of this government. I think that the statements that we have heard from the members on the other side of the House over a period of time have slowly peeled away the real intentions and we've gone kind of through a sequential striptease beginning first with that very safe Socialist, the Minister of Finance, who likes to appear as a good sort of cover for what is really going on, and he began with what I thought was a somewhat curious argument for the establishment of treasury branches, first saying that he was relying upon the experience of the Alberta system which, as we all know, was set up under a Social Credit government based upon the funny money theories of Major Douglas and the curiosities and archaic philosophies of that time, and the treasury branches emerged out of that peculiar concern of the Social Credit Government at that time to establish some kind of new millennium on earth, and of course it simply then has very slowly dragged down into being one more kind of adjunct of a bureaucratic department, but it was interesting that he was using that for one of his rationales. And, secondly, simply to say that the other purpose was to slowly provide some competition for other financial institutions to introduce financial agencies into areas where they're not doing.

But then his colleagues began to, as I say, slowly strip away the layers of cloth covering the real -- getting down to more basic bare, naked facts as to what this whole thing is about, that the Minister of Finance was not able to sort of provide a cover-up for it, because I think

BILL 64

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) his own colleagues did the undressing for him. And it simply came down that they were talking, not about agencies that were going to provide a little competition here or there or move into places where they weren't, but that basically they were attempting to establish the instruments of state management of the economy. Very simple, clear; set forward by the Minister of Mines and Resources. And then, in that very amusing and entertaining presentation by the Minister of Tourism yesterday, and I should say by way of diversion, Mr. Speaker, that I think that the Minister of Tourism must be somewhat concerned about the variety of tourist attractions that we are offering to the touring public this summer, because he obviously is trying to set up one of his own, and he's sort of setting up his own kind of Lochness Monster and he's got his own kind of Rube Goldberg machine. If you wave your arms enough and speak loud enough and sort of yell loud enough, then you're going to find enough entertainment that people will begin to sort of think that you've got something to come and see.

Now, the point is that the Minister of Tourism, within all that kind of sort of minuet and dancing and entertaining that was going on, did come up with what was probably the germ of his rationale. He said, "Look, we are doing this for the sake of the people" and "We are representing the people". And that became once again sort of the rationale that we have heard on many occasions as to why we get into this area of state management; that somehow this is to be what the people want, and there has been this mystical transference of the people into this government, and that that became sort of his whole reason. He said, "Now that's the difference between you and us. That the people are there and these aren't the people here." And that struck me, Mr. Speaker, as probably a fairly accurate definition, with one question. It does raise the issue as to who really is representing the people. Is this government sort of in its attempt to represent in some kind of abstract notion the people of Manitoba, sort of giving us a true mandate as to what those expressions are, or in fact are they simply using the people as again another form of cover-up for what is the real intention, that is a form of state control and management?

There have been so many transgressions of human rights conducted in the name of the people over the last 40, 50 years in the history of mankind, that one immediately has to become suspicious about the use of this word "people" because we have enough experience with people's democracies in this world to know exactly how they operate, and that they really do not represent people very well because they are simply become sort of entities unto themselves, they become powers unto their own right, far more concerned with the magnification and amplification of state power and control, which in many cases becomes, not serving people, but simply serving their own rights and their own interests, and that they begin to lose that connection with people, because I find it curious that all of a sudden these villains on this side of the House, who have been representing these kind of villainous interests over the years, are said to be sort of somehow conjuring up representations, false representations of what people are concerned. Yet I sort of have, as I'm sure other members on this side of the House have, a variety of communications from people in Manitoba who say they don't want this to happen.

The credit union movement is one example. A quarter of a million people in the province of Manitoba, and I don't think that there is anything, I don't think that the, for example, that the Winnipeg Police Credit Union is the social economic elite, and yet they say, "Don't pass this action." And I don't think that the federal employees of Manitoba are a social and economic elite and yet they say, "Don't pass this proposal." I don't think that the Fort Rouge Railway Employees Credit Union are some kind of social and economic elite, and yet they say, "Don't pass this proposal."

Now those are kind of the . . . I don't see in any of these communications that somehow we are defending the powers of small elite and you are defending the people. To my mind these are people. These are of wide variety and range of ordinary citizens in the province who are saying, "You are threatening what is a very important institution for us ordinary people to manage our own affairs and control our own activities. That we are to be given through the Credit Union system, some ability to manage financially and to create a kind of organization that gives us the basis for some self-respect, for some self-management, for some self-help, and we don't want the state moving in and providing unfair competition in that respect."

And so it begins to suggest to me, Mr. Speaker, that they don't represent the people at all; that they are simply again conjuring up their own imagination as to who the people are.

BILL 64

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd)

Let me point out, for example, Mr. Speaker, a very good example. Within the Province of Quebec one of the most important engines of social and economic change in that province has been the Caisse-Populaire movement, which is now a major economic enterprise run by ordinary people, because they are able to invest their own savings, have their own boards of control, and have become in many cases the supporters and promoters of a variety of new social experiments and reforms in that province. And the difference there is that they are saying, in that kind of an idea, that they want to have the opportunity to initiate their own activities. They want the power of some self-help. And I find, for example, the remarks of the -- Well, I think they're remarks; they sound a little kind of sort of, guttural at this time of the morning from the Member for Winnipeg Centre - that we are representing the people, because there are examples in his own riding, where groups of very ordinary and very low income people are now beginning to set their own credit union systems to try to use their funds to promote their own housing and their own small businesses. And what would happen if this bill went through is that they would not have the ability to do that, because the unfair competition offered by the establishment of the treasury branches would eliminate the opportunity of a group like the Midland Credit Union to become sort of a form of community self-help operation, to provide the basis of their own kind of reform. Because what would happen with the treasury branches is in an example I'm using, where one of the groups has a work activity project which has certain funds from the government, that is now being sort of transferred into the accounts of the credit union, is providing certain amounts of capitals so that other community enterprises can take place, what would happen in a treasury branch is that some civil servant down the line will say, "Well now, that's provincial money. We can't put it into a credit union. We have to put it into our treasury branch." Isn't that right? So that we can go off and invest in one of the kind of wild, sort of magical mystery tours of the Minister of Mines and Resources and MDC. So that the money would not go into that local community investment in that downtown area where people are trying a self-help operation. It would go off into creating more Crown enterprises, more businesses that are bound to failure as we have seen in the past four or five years.

Now that's not serving people. That is saying basically we don't trust people. We don't trust people to be able to manage their own money and their own affairs, and, as the result, we have to manage it for them. So that this is not socialism we are talking about, this is state management we're talking about. And let's make sure that there is a difference. So when the Minister of Tourism gets up and waves his arm and gesticulates that we're serving the people in the cause of socialism, he should be saying that we are serving the cause of state management. Because if you go back to the socialism of the Robert Owens and the English Fabians, they're not talking about setting up and increasing the powers of the state, they're talking about enabling people to service their own affairs. And that is the kind of socialism that makes sense and the kind that has made major contributions to this society over the past hundred years. The kind that hasn't made it is the kind that all of a sudden gets a twisted interpretation and through some kind of abstract theory or philosophy that comes in the . . . that the only way to serve people is by government serving people. Well I would propose, Mr. Speaker, that the best way of serving people is for government to enable people to service their own opportunities and take their own initiatives. And that doesn't happen through setting up a bureaucratic state.

Therefore, the objective - and I would like to answer the Minister of Mines and Resources in what he said. That objective can be partially served here, but it is a mistake to assume that everything has to be sort of diverted and channelled through the agency of government. In many cases the real, sort of the role of government should be to enable, to enhance, to stimulate, to give, provide incentive, so that people are able to help themselves in many cases. Certainly to change the rules that there is excesses by private enterprise. Certainly to sort of take action against transgressions. But the major incentive should not be to take over and manage, but provide for self-management and self-control and the help of a variety of communities.

The point is that this treasury branch proposal runs exactly contrary to that basic principle. It is not a measure of a kind of socialism which has been a positive force in this community, it has become a perverted, distorted form of socialism which assumes that government has got to do everything because somehow only the ministers of the Crown and their Planning and Priorities sort of people have the intelligence and the far-seeing knowledge to provide for

BILL 64

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd). . .

the people. And that has been the great tragedy of socialism as we have watched it develop and evolve out of this, is that somehow once that first sort of rein of power is put into their hands, they all of a sudden begin assuming, you know, that "we are the people". And the old statement the King of France once said about l'état c'est moi is beginning to be applied exactly to these kinds of individuals, that once we have the power, we will be the representatives, we will be the symbols, we will stand for the people. Well that becomes a highly dangerous, highly sort of -- and we have watched how that danger has become simply a way of exploiting the interests of people and stifling their abilities and capacities.

So we've watched the striptease take place and now we're down to bare facts, that what was presented by the Minister of Finance as a nice innocuous, innocent, simple addition to a new financial institution, in fact we see is a major sort of building block in the foundation of a more expensive and elaborate framework of state management in this province. And that is the kind of thing that has nothing to do with reform, because I don't think you can make the translation of good social reform into state management. In many cases it works simply contrary to those interests. And I would hope that some of the members of the back bench, which the Minister of Tourism has said have been so full of initiative and so full of good ideas - although as soon as he said it I checked the Order Paper to see how many private members' resolutions came from that back bench and I didn't find any, so I suppose that they must be doing it somewhere else other than in this Chamber - but the fact is that I would ask them to look carefully, that if they are sort of believers in the traditional and good kind of socialism, that they look at this kind of measure and just see sort of how they've been hoodwinked, that the striptease that's going on in this House is for their benefit as well as for ours, and should be for the benefit of everybody in the province, because I think we're now getting down to really what it's all about.

The problem with that, Mr. Speaker, is that I don't mind if the ministers of the Crown want to play their theoretical socialist games. They can do that. I think it's interesting that they should exercise their minds from time to time and play kind of a chess game of abstraction, but the problem is, while they're doing that, these kinds of little sort of diversions in trying to set up this scheme of state control simply means that the energies and capacities that they should be applying to some of the more serious problems in this province aren't being applied and therefore they're being ignored; that we in this House have tried to demonstrate that in this time, here and now, there are problems of things like housing. There are problems developing, sort of basic problems of how to do something about the growth and development of the province, but we don't hear anything from the front benches on that respect. We haven't heard anything about what they're going to do in the serious problem of how to control the cost of housing and how to provide enough nice housing for people. All we get are excuses and excuses and excuses for inaction, and I would think that their energies and their intellect would be much better applied to addressing themselves to real problems rather than engaging in some common-room exercise on how to build a socialist state. And that has been the problem of this government all along, is that they have been captured by their own theories and therefore unable to take and devote their real energies to real problems. That is what sort of disturbs me most about this, is that they are really sort of going off on another kind of Don Quixote chase down a sort of a path according to the textbooks of, I don't know, Jack London, whoever the ministers are reading these days as their latest seers as to how to build a socialist millennium. But the fact of the matter is, while they're doing it they are ignoring real concerns and real problems and the province of Manitoba is suffering as a result, so I would only suggest that rather than playing this peculiar kind of game, you know, do it on your own time, don't do it on the public time, because I think the public has a right to expect you to apply yourself to the real problems that are engaged right now in this community, rather than giving the sort of voluminous number of excuses that we've heard from the Minister responsible, and I point him only as one example for housing, who has done absolutely nothing in the field and we're suffering as a result.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would simply say that this is a fool's chase that we're into but it is a fool's chase which has a very unhappy ending, because the people who suffer again, once more are those people (that the Minister of Tourism sort of, we're raising the skies. This Act is not in service for people, it is in service -- the only people who are being served by it are the warriors in the government. They're the only ones who are going to benefit from it, they are the only ones who are going to find some satisfaction of it. In the meantime, the rest of the population, those people that the Minister of Tourism is so anxious to serve, are the ones who are going to suffer from this particular motion.

BILL 64

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

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of wasting ammunition on decoys which have no effect. I just, Mr. Speaker, feel that it is necessary to try to analyse what has just been said from the point of view as to whether or not somebody is engaged in a - I don't know what he calls it - a fool's venture, or things of that nature, and that we should be involved in thinking of other things. Now I know that the Member for Fort Rouge is associated with a political party that does not believe that its presentations to the people have any relationship or should have any relationship to the policy which it implements. He believes, and I believe that the Liberal Party has believed for many years, that your posture to the people, that your electoral position and your position in government need have absolutely no relationship to each other. As a matter of fact, the Member for Fort Rouge would have this House accept the notion that that party which went to the people on a certain platform and received 43 percent endorsement for its platform - which I believe is the highest endorsement for any political party in the province of Manitoba since the 1958 Roblin election, that that is the highest endorsement for any political platform - that that party, which has done that and has received that endorsement, when it occupies the treasury branch should then implement the policy of that party which went to the public and received - what was it? Did they get 18 percent? Pardon me? 20 percent - that the party that went to the public on a platform and got 43 percent of the endorsement, that when they came into office, they should adopt and implement that part of the platform of the party that got 20 percent of the people -- 18.9; we were both half right; 18.9 percent of the electorate, and that is the democratic process as identified by the Member for Fort Rouge, that the party that is elected should adopt the platform and implement the policy of the party that has been rejected; that if we did what he now says, that we would be better representatives of the people than doing what we have gone to the electorate about and said that we are going to do.

In making this presentation, there has to be some sort of justification for his position. I mean he can't adopt or project such an outlandish position without some authority for doing so. So what is his authority, Mr. Speaker? He has letters from the credit unions and the credit unions say that they don't want this implementation of treasury branches because it would, in their belief, interfere with their ability to operate within the province of Manitoba. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it's significant that I don't recall the credit unions having taken a serious or high profile position on this issue during the election campaign. Mr. Speaker, the honourable member says that we didn't talk about it in the election campaign. I would suggest that in every respect -- and I will bring you, at least once a week during the campaign, statements that were reported by the First Minister where he indicated that the major implement policy implementation that the government was going to go forward with, were competitive fire insurance, some form of banking, either through a chartered bank or treasury branches, or treasury branches in connection with credit unions, Mr. Speaker, I said, or --(Interjection)-- Well, you say that is different, and in the material, the last piece of material that went out, to my knowledge, to every citizen of the province of Manitoba, and I don't say that this is necessarily the first time it was raised because it was raised throughout, but the last piece of material indicated those programs, and indicated that the government would either be involved in banking or, if that was not permitted by constitutional handicap, it would be involved in treasury branches; and the honourable member to say that we did not raise this during the campaign. . . .

Of course, the honourable member has problems. I don't expect him to read our literature. I accept that, and I really accept the fact that he probably wasn't concerned with what our literature said because he had so much concerns about his own literature - and that is to the credit, that is to the credit of the Member for Fort Rouge. That is to the credit, because the last piece of Liberal literature -- and one, you know, he has been bandying about labels - and I'll throw one back - was as close to outright fascism as any piece of literature that I have ever seen in any electoral campaign, and to the credit of the people of the Province of Manitoba they did not buy it. And I don't know why the Member for Fort Rouge would insist that we should buy his position. I mean, I think that he should pursue his petition, I think he should pursue it and I think that he should try to indicate that, pursued long enough, it would commend itself to a majority or enough people in the province of Manitoba in order to obtain for himself a mandate, but to suggest that we, somehow, have rejected our responsibility to representing people as a

BILL 64

(MR. GREEN cont'd) government, trying to enact legislation in their favour, because we are going ahead with what we said we would do if elected, is surely a tenuous position. Surely he can't ask us to accept that position. Surely he can't say that because I went to my constituents and said that one of the things that we are going to do is get into financial institutions, and having received the report of my constituents I should now go back to them and say that I would not be representing you if I did that, would be a particular problem for me. Is that not something that he could see? So I would say, Mr. Speaker, that having thrown out that proposition, what is the rationale for it? And it is letters that have been sent to him by the credit unions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have no difficulty in understanding why the credit unions would, as an institution, wish to oppose this legislation. The credit unions are, as an institution, are the same as the banking community as an institution, and if I had a choice I would say that subjectively I would prefer the kind of work that is being done by the credit unions than I would the kind of work that is being done by the banks, but they are both institutions, and any institution which is well fixed in society tends to be conservative for the protection of that institution. The honourable member knows that. Is it not a fact that the institution of the church, the institution of the church is quite different than the religion which it is -- and I say every church, I say the synagogues, the United Church, the Roman Catholic Church, that any church, after it is established tends to move in the direction of protecting its institution rather than furthering the basis upon which it is established.

Is that not true with the trade union movement? Do the trade unions not think institutionally rather than the basis for which the members got together and formed the trade union? Wouldn't the honourable member be the first to say that? --(Interjection)-- Pardon me? Every institution works that way, Mr. Speaker. It is a social scientific fact and the honourable member, who is a political scientist, knows it; that every institution works that way. Why especially, why did he pick out especially? You know why? Because it suits his position, and I'm going to try to convince the honourable member, or at least expound it and let him then do what he can, I'm going to try to indicate to him that the one that is most susceptible to not being able to protect this institution is a democratically elected government with an informed electorate; that every other institution has built within it a system which makes it more difficult to undo institutional entrenchment, and that's -- pardon me? I didn't hear that.

MR. AXWORTHY: We can debate that.

MR. GREEN: Well we could debate that. All right. And, you know, I really appreciate the honourable member when he says that we can debate that, because I believe that all of these things are debatable. What I don't appreciate is when he gets up and says that these people have demonstrated that they do not represent the people, that they are now trying to destroy the people, that they are trying to get state management. Well, Mr. Speaker, that was tried. That argument was put, that debate was made during the election campaign, and having lost on the hustings, why do you now expect us to implement what you said? I mean, at least we should be given the credit of saying we did debate it, we won, and now we are going to pursue that policy, and if it's wrong, as the honourable member obviously thinks it is, then the debate will come up again and we will then go back and I hope that the electorate will be more and more informed, because as far as I'm concerned the presence of this type of government depends more and more on a better and better informed electorate, and the kind of debate that we are having now is useful to the creation of that informed electorate.

But we are talking about institutionalizing, and I say to you that every organization, after it is created, creates within itself the need to protect the institution rather than the people who created it, and the credit union system is no different, the trade union movement is no different. You will find suggestions coming from the trade union movement continually, that are not essentially now designed to protect the employee - and, you know, I'm not saying that they don't think that they are designed to protect the employee. The trade union movement believes that they are designed to protect the employee. The trade union movement will come out with a suggestion that a company that is on strike, that where there is a strike, the company shall not have the right to hire alternative workers. Is that a suggestion -- and they believe that that helps the employee who is on strike, and they believe that that helps the employee situation generally. They don't say that dishonestly; that's their belief.

But, Mr. Speaker, that is not trade unionism. That is not the basis on which the trade

BILL 64

(MR. GREEN cont'd) union movement was created. The basis upon which the movement was created was that there would be free collective bargaining, and the suggestion that comes from the trade union is not for free collective bargaining, but for government intervention to protect the rights of the employee. Isn't that right? And the reason that they do that is that it makes it easier for the institution of trade unionism; that now the trade union doesn't have to organize employees on the basis of working together and through their own militancy and unionism - that is, the unity of one employee with another - to have a better economic bargaining position and therefore to be able to get better terms and conditions of employment. That's not what it's for. It's so that the state will prevent the employer from hiring an additional person. Now, who does that protect? It protects institutional trade unionism, and I do not criticize institutional trade unionism any more than I would criticize the institutional church. Has it not been a fact on numerous occasions, and if one reads the history of the church, any church - I'm not talking about different religions - that in many cases the hierarchy of the church moved it in the direction of not getting what the reason that the church was created for, but protecting the institution of the church?

MR. AXWORTHY: . . . accept a question? In his remarks, would the Minister address himself to the question of the difference between large scale institutions, such as government, versus smaller organizations based upon a community basis, such as the credit union society?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I indicated that I was going to try to indicate to my honourable friend that the institution of government is the one that can least perpetuate itself, in my opinion -- Well, he asked me to address -- and if he says no, he says we can debate it, then I'm going to come to it. All I want him now to do is concede that the credit union movement, in dealing with its issue of treasury branches, is dealing with it from the point of view of the institution of the credit union movement, not why people went into the credit union movement; that it is trying to protect the institution, which I have every right to expect and which I believe that they will try to do. But that doesn't mean, Mr. Speaker, and you know, the honourable member should realize it, would he take a guess how many members on this side belong to credit unions as members, as against members on that side who belong to credit unions as members? And many more people belong on this side to credit unions as members than to that side. And . . .

A MEMBER: How do you know?

MR. GREEN: Well I am making a guess, and if I'm wrong I'll be happy to apologize to my honourable friend.

MR. CRAIK: You can't make the statement if you haven't taken a survey.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I did not make it as a statement of fact. I said to him that I would predict, and therefore I am entitled to make predictions the same way as the Honourable Member for Riel is entitled to make predictions. And I'm suggesting to the Honourable Member for Riel that if I am wrong I will be very surprised, but I . . .

A MEMBER: I won't.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am only mouthing, I am only mouthing the words that were made by the Member for Lakeside, the Member for other constituents in the House, who said that the credit unions have been supported more by our parties than they have been by the Conservative and Liberal Parties. Those statements were made by the other side.

A MEMBER: Right on.

MR. GREEN: And they were made, not as predictions, but as fact. Therefore why should someone . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside. Will he state his point of order, please?

MR. ENNS: . . . does not wilfully attempt to distort an honourable member's contribution. I, at least to the extent that it applies to me and I was mentioned, let the records show that I have stated philosophically, philosophically there has been and one could expect to have a greater degree of support coming from that segment of society that is generally in support of the co-operative movement and the credit unions, that philosophically that's where that support should lie. I never indicated, Sir, that that's where it actually did lie. In fact I would suspect just the reverse is true by the representation of rural members in this Chamber, whom obviously the rural people who have the greatest preponderance of numbers within these movements continue to support the Conservative Party.

BILL 64

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to try to pursue a position which is probably not as relevant as I was making it, nor do I want to get sidetracked into trying to figure out how many New Democrats are members of credit unions or how many members of the Opposition. So if that strikes a note on which I'm going to have any greater resistance, I'll forget about it.

I go back to where I know myself to be on firmer ground and suggest that the credit unions, in defending their own position now, are doing what any institution would do. It is talking from the point of view of institutionalism, not the reason for people to have gotten into credit unions. I say that the reason that people went into credit unions - and I repeat what I said the other day - that the reason that people went into credit unions, that the reason that Mr. Owens started co-operatives and the kind of socialism that you say is healthy, when Robert Owen was talking about co-operative societies and co-operatives he was talking about it in times when there was no universal franchise, when there was no possibility that the government of the day, which represented either the manufacturing interests or the landlord interest, was going to act in terms of creating a financial institution or industrial institution which were operated by the elected representatives of the people. The honourable member knows that. That that was the big push for the co-operative system. That the co-operative people who started co-operatives in here - and I am a member of co-operatives, there are other people here who are members of co-operatives - and the co-operative movement was a reaction to the fact that there was big business, big financial institutions, and that the public said that we will not be involved in interfering with these things.

A MEMBER: Right on. That's why they're redundant now.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I didn't say that they are redundant now, and the honourable member, you know, picks this -- I will repeat again that once you have to go and find what a particular civil servant said, or a group of civil servants --(Interjection)-- Oh yes. Mr. Speaker, I believe, I believe that the present institutions, both private and co-operative, are so strongly entrenched that a third institution, that is the public through its representative, will add to the options available to society, will give a modicum additional economic power to the people through their Governments, and do not pose a threat to the immediate existence of the extent of economic power that the other institutions have received. But I believe that the public institution, in my view, should be an aggressive institution.

Now, you know, the honourable member put a challenge to me and I indicated without the challenge, I indicated that I would take it on: That the Government is least susceptible to institutional protection than are the other institutions. And why do I say that, Mr. Speaker? I say that because the Government is under greater competition, under greater scrutiny, under more effective rules, to enforce the ultimate will of a majority of the people than are any of these other institutions. Certainly the private banks have hardly any responsiveness except from the point of view of their balance sheets, to in some way reflecting a people's will to change what they are doing. The private institutions have almost none. They have to gauge it by whether their actions do obtain economic success or do not obtain economic success, and the protestations or the agitations of small people's groups have almost no effect. The co-operative movement and those institutions have, I say, a greater responsiveness; perhaps less economic power, but a greater responsiveness. But their role in competing with financial institutions of the nature of the banks and the trust companies makes them, what I said the other day, makes them today the basis upon which some opposition members can say that they are protecting them when what they are really doing is preventing some of these people who originally thought this way from realizing something that is even greater than the credit unions.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what is so wrong with that thought? If you talk to those people who are members of credit unions, who --(Interjections)-- Mr. Speaker, if you talk to those people who have joined credit unions for the purpose of having a more public control through the ordinary working man, or through the ordinary producer, or through the ordinary professional, in a more democratic way than the control that is now exercised over the banks, and said "We can do this if we elect a Government and have a public bank," Mr. Speaker, I will not accept the fact that those telegrams that the honourable member is referring to reflects the views of everybody who went into credit unions, because I know it does not. I know that many people joined the credit union society as being an alternative to the private

BILL 64

(MR. GREEN cont'd). . . banking situation. And if they felt that there was a way of even having a greater participation and a greater opportunity to have public involvement in the financial institutions, that they would not reject that. But it does interfere, in the minds of institutional credit unions, with the power that they have vis-a-vis economic involvement in financial institutions.

Now it's not the duty of this Government to protect the status quo insofar as financial institutions are concerned, and I believe that it has been made abundantly clear that it was this Government that made available to the credit unions the opportunities of advancing their position within the role of financial institutions. Now why should those people be the ones who object if the public says that it is now going to do this as an additional form, and I say that I would have no objection if it becomes the major form, no objection - that's negative. I would be happy, although I know it's not possible, if it became the major element of the financial institution in the Province of Manitoba. Why not? Why would I not want the public, publicly-owned institution, one that is most subject to democratic control, the one that it has to be most responsive to what is said about it?

Well, Mr. Speaker, who has to be most responsive to what is said? If the public was in control of a banking institution, what other financial institution, credit union or bank, has to walk into the House every day, faced by let us say 25 - I hope it will be 23, 22, I hope the Opposition gets smaller - but whatever it is, there's going to be an Opposition and I think that that's good; and every day has to look at a group of people who are after their jobs, who want to throw them out of office, who have every reason to want to find out where they are going wrong and who have every day the right to challenge that and to bring to light what they are doing wrong, to bring to light their worst warts and to try to dismiss them? What other institution is subject to that kind of competition, to that kind of agitation, to that kind of vehicle for the people to make their minds known that they do not like what is going on? No other institution. And that's why I say, Mr. Speaker, and what has proved to be the case, that it is the institution of Government through the democratic process that is the most susceptible of change of all institutions in our society. And hasn't it proved to be correct, Mr. Speaker? Would the Honourable Member for Lakeside or the Member for Riel believe that I am the senior Minister of Mines in Canada. Now, isn't that an unusual situation? I have been Minister of Mines for not quite five years; December 1969?

A MEMBER: Four years.

MR. GREEN: Well it'll be five in December of '69 (?), but I think I was the senior Minister of Mines maybe a year and a half ago. Do you know what has happened in this country? Every single government, with the exception of one, has changed within the last ten years, and almost all of them have been changed within the last five years. The only one that has hung on has also changed, because John Robarts was a smart enough man to know that even he, who was probably considered one of the most capable premiers in this country, could hurt his party by perpetuating institutionalism, and he saw to it that when that year came along that he made way for --(Interjection)-- that he made way -- Well, mind you . . . --(Interjection)-- Pardon me? Mr. Speaker, the fact is that John Robarts went a considerable greater length of time than has the Premier of this province; and secondly, the Premier of this province is younger and even more flexible than John Robarts so that there is no problem in that regard. (Applause)

But the fact is that what I say is correct, the one Government that didn't change, the first change was Prince Edward Island. That was the first to go. I can't name them in order. Joey Smallwood went out. Joey Smallwood, who was trying to perpetuate institutionalism. The Nova Scotia - out. New Brunswick, Robichaud considered unbeatable - out. Union Nationale the Province of Quebec - out. John Robarts gave way to Mr. Davis and Mr. Davis may have a problem. However, that was the one political party. Walter Weir - change. Ross Thatcher, considered that had wiped out the NDP forever in the Province of Saskatchewan, lost to the New Democrats, the biggest electoral victory that they've ever had there against Ross Thatcher. I think they got 55 percent of the vote. Social Credit governed for 35 years in the Province of Alberta - out. Social Credit in the Province of British Columbia - out. And, Mr. Speaker, on that basis you have, what I repeat, that I am the senior Minister, and most of my colleagues are the senior ministers of their department.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable member has a good argument and it supports my position.

BILL 64

(MR. GREEN cont'd) I said that the Government, through the democratic process, is the area which is most susceptible to change in institutional. Let me prove it. What has happened in any of the church organizations which would be comparable to a change in that period of time as took place in government? What has happened in the trade union movement which is comparable to that kind of change? What has happened in the credit union movement vis-a-vis the institutionalism and the direction that it's going that is comparable to that type of change? What has happened in any private institution which breeds itself on institutionalism? And I say every one does. And I've been, Mr. Speaker, I've been involved in them. I've been involved in the co-operative movement as a director of the Red River Co-op, I've been involved in communal organization as a Director of the YMHA Community Centre, I have been involved in other institutions, and I say that those institutions are far more entrenched, far less susceptible to change, far less responsive to the agitations of the people that are within them than is the Government, that has to come in here, look across the hall, see arrows darting at them, knowing that everything that they do, every wart on their exterior is going to be printed in the newspapers, blasted out on the television, blasted out on the radio, talked about in the restaurants, and then made the subject of a judgment as to what happens to them in a period of four years in a general election.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the honourable member, who is a political scientist, that if one looks at all forms of institutionalism that they will find that the one that is most susceptible to change is an elected representative, provided that there is a truly democratic process - and nothing is ever 100 percent but I believe that our democratic process is probably as sophisticated as they become, and I hope that it gets better and better - and a reasonably informed electorate. And I think that the kind of debate that we are talking about is what creates a reasonably informed electorate. So don't tell me that because the institutional credit union movement, which I do not say in a negative way because I've tried to indicate that every single one of them is the same, that once an institution is created with a certain purpose, there is a tendency, it is a sociological fact that there is a tendency for that purpose to change towards the protection of the institution rather than protecting the reason why the people went into it in the first place. And for the honourable member to get up and say here that this party, this government, has no claim to talk about representing the people because somehow it proposes to implement its own program, which received the highest endorsement from the people, rather than by implementing the program of those people - and I refer to the group of Liberals in the House who received the lowest endorsement - is a demonstration that we have lost the claim to representing the people.

Now the honourable member says that there's a striptease going on; that, you know, the reasons have been given by the Minister of Finance and gradually the real reason is coming out that the Minister of Mines did a strip act in the House. What kind of strip act did I do? Have not the members of the Opposition for the last - since 1966 since I got into the House - said that the kind of thing that I am talking about - and have I not spoken on these things continually? - that the kind of thing that I am talking about is that I believe in a greater public involvement by the people of Manitoba in the control, ownership and direction of their financial institutions. Is that showing bare breasts? That's something that I've been saying for a long time. If another person within the same government benches favour the same proposition, the same proposition, because he feels that it can provide a better service and provide a more competitive interest rate, and provide for the service of areas which are not now being served, does that make it a split government?

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that that is an entirely consistent approach. Does the honourable member believe that political parties exist where both the programs and the reasons for the programs and the rationale for the programs exists to the same degree and in the same respect in every member of the government benches? Is that what you learned in political science? Because if you did, they'd better close up that school where you went, because that is not true. The honourable member had occasion, had occasion during the midst of an election campaign, and I credit him with this, to disassociate himself publicly from an advertisement which came out under the direction of his leader, and he had every right to do so. Maybe he believed that there had to be a more rational use of the social assistance dollar. I'm sure that the honourable member believes, as does every member in this House, that there should be a greater and more effective use of the social assistance

BILL 64

(MR. GREEN cont'd). . . dollar. But he didn't believe that all of the people who are receiving social assistance should be characterized as beggars, holding their hand out asking the government for money. Now I respect that, because I think he's right, but he will have to admit that that is - he will not only have to admit it, he was the one who brought it to the attention of the public - that that was the picture that was being portrayed by his political party and disassociated himself from it, and you know, I mean how much of a secret is there? Does the Member for Pembina agree in every respect with not only the program but the rationale for the program, which is what he is going through, of the Leader of the Opposition?

Now I think that it sometimes, that political process being as subtle as it is, it is often very difficult for a party to agree on a program that can commend itself, not only to all of the members of the treasury branches, but then receives the support of those people who are elected on the basis that they were going to support that administration; that that is a difficult thing. Is the honourable member really suggesting that the political process requires more? It requires not only treasury bench approval, legislative support, but also identity of rationale. Now, the honourable member knows that that is not true, and therefore he shouldn't introduce that as being some type of an attack on what we are doing. There are people in the New Democratic Party who are Social New Democrats. They are not much different than the Leader of the Opposition who is a Social Conservative. He believes that all of the direction of the government should be towards helping people who are disadvantaged, towards providing better housing, towards providing better pensions, towards providing greater advantages in terms of health, welfare and education. That's a very, very honourable and legitimate belief which I would associate myself with, but there are people in the New Democratic Party who are Economically Democrat, and I believe that the Social New Democrat will not be able to do the kind of thing that they want to do unless there is also an introduction of economic democracy, a greater involvement by the public in their economic destiny - - Let me finish the sentence yet.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I just have one short question for the Minister. Could he then tell us whether the reason for setting up the Treasury Board is what the Minister of Finance says or the reasons that he gives; and what in fact will the treasury branches do; what the Minister of Finance says they'll do or what the Minister of Mines and Resources says they'll do, because they are different?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I say that they are complementary. I say that they are complementary. I say that different people place different emphasis on it, and I say that the extent to which you operate once you have passed your bill in principle -- and, you know, this is where I think that the Leader of the Opposition is so wrong. We agree that treasury branches are a good thing and that we want to be involved with them for various reasons, and once the legislation is enacted then the honourable member wants to crawl into cabinet and find out whether a particular treasury branch is going to be set up on a particular place on the basis of what it can achieve, and I am telling you that that is a subject of cabinet discussion. Into that discussion will go various opinions, the kind of opinions that have been expressed by the Minister of Finance which I do not disagree with, the kind of opinions which have been expressed by myself, which it goes without saying I believe in, and those different considerations, neither of which are the antithesis of each other but are complementary towards producing the same result, will go into that type of consideration. That's the basis upon which the bill is introduced, and I do not believe that it is proper to characterize this as an indication that the government is doing a striptease, or that people have stripped bare the nefarious conspiratorial reasons of going into treasury branches.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The hour being 12:30, but before we adjourn, the Chair is in a bit of a quandary because the Honourable Minister's time elapsed at 12:30, so the motion will remain. . . The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The hour being 12:30, the House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:30 this afternoon. (Saturday)