June 4, 1970

COMMONS DEBATES

his riding. As it happens, the one fish plant half enough. If the plant were located in Winnow being operated at Selkirk is getting all nipeg on the main railway line, the transporthe business at the moment. There were three tation costs would be the minimum and a

closed down. Therefore, the decision of the fishermen, approximately half of whom are corporation to build its new plant in the Indian people, in western Canada. greater Winnipeg area and not in Selkirk is not a diversion from Selkirk to Winnipeg. In I would be remiss in my duty if I years gone by the operation has been more in were to turn my back on those fishermen in the Winnipeg area than in Selkirk.

corporation looked at the regional side of the has its heart set on Selkirk, let it put up a question. It was offered approximately \$1 million by our Regional Economic Expansion Department to locate at Selkirk. In reviewing the returns to the fishermen it found this was not enough. It found that it was only about at 10.35 p.m.

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

plants in Winnipeg all of which have been maximum return would be produced for 6,000

I believe that as Minister of Fisheries favour of an area of Manitoba which obvious-Let me now turn to the main point. The ly is uneconomic. If the Manitoba government few dollars. It obviously merely prefers to use words in this case, and its bluff has been called.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned

END OF VOLUME VII

7763