

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
10:00 o'clock, Friday, April 18, 1969

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Notices of Motion.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: I'd like to introduce our young guests that are with us this morning. We have 69 students of Grade 5 standing from the Peguis Indian School. These students are under the direction of Don Makymchuk, Mrs. Marlene Wuskynk and Mrs. Sheila Dyal. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Fisher. As a point of interest, I would like to inform the honourable members that these children are in the city for the first time and were brought here through public subscription through the good offices of Mr. John Robertson, a reporter in a local newspaper.

I should also like to introduce 140 students of 5 and 6 Grade standing of the Howden Elementary School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Pearase, Mr. Tiesen, Mr. Barik, Mrs. Bate, Mrs. Chateau, Mrs. Prestako and Miss Moodie. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

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

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry) introduced Bill No. 54, An Act to amend The Pipeline Act; and Bill No. 55, An Act to amend The Real Property Act.

MR. LEONARD H. CLAYDON (Wolseley) introduced Bill No. 79, An Act to amend The Winnipeg Charter, 1956.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Finance in the absence of the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Are there any further copies of the transcript of hearings that occurred with regard to South Indian Lake available? The Party caucus received one, and there is a demand for more if they are available.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Finance) (Fort Rouge): I will enquire.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question - or at least another question to the Honourable the Minister of Finance with regard to this matter. Are the solicitors who are engaged on behalf of the Indians at the South Indian Lake still being retained by Hydro to represent the interests of the people involved?

MR. EVANS: As far as I'm aware, yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JOE BOROWSKI (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I was speaking to some people over the weekend from Shamattawa, and I understand there's great difficulty there in making a living. This is one of the most depressed areas in Northern Manitoba and there's some talk about this government negotiating with the federal government of moving the whole community in much the same manner as they're planning on moving the people from South Indian Lake. I wonder if the Minister in charge could indicate if there's any negotiations presently going on with the federal government in respect of this matter.

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Commissioner of Northern Affairs) (Osborne): No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the First Minister. Is the Minister aware that difficulties have developed in respect to negotiations over the future of employees of Air Canada Winnipeg Overhaul Base which is being sold to Northwest Industries Limited of Edmonton?

HON. WALTER WEIR (Premier) (Minnedosa): No, Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of anything of recent date. I notice that Air Canada in some of the negotiations are having some difficulties in more than one sphere than that one.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's paper there was a report that Transport Minister Paul Hellyer said Wednesday some hitches had developed in negotiations over the future of the employees of the Air Canada Base, and this morning there was a news report on the radio that the President of the local . . .

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

MR. FOX: Yes, I'm putting the question, Mr. Speaker, but since the First Minister wasn't aware, I'm informing him of what is current at the moment. The President of the local has resigned, and that was the news this morning, and I'm just wondering if the First Minister will use his good offices to ensure the employees will get a fair hearing at the negotiations.

MR. WEIR: Well, Mr. Speaker, as a result of the meeting of the liaison committee, the efforts of this House and other members of the committee were used to try and have local representation on the negotiations. I'm not aware of any difficulties that have been created since that time, and certainly if there's anything that we can do we'll be more than happy to assist in any way that we can.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Health.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Health and Social Services) (Gimli): Well, Mr. Speaker, last week I was asked a question re coloured television and potential radiation hazard and I thought I should reply to that question to the members of the House. At the Dominion Council of Health last week this matter was dealt with very thoroughly, and I think the best answer is the press release which was made following that meeting by the Honourable John Munro, the Minister of National Health and Welfare. The report reads that "the Honourable John Munro said today that the health hazards of coloured television were receiving the attention of his department.

"The Minister's statement followed recent newspaper reports which indicated that potentially dangerous radiation had been noted in some sets in the U.S. survey. Since 1967 the Radiation Protection Division of the Department of National Health and Welfare have been checking the radiation levels of new model receivers as they have been introduced, and so far 61 different models of television sets made by 17 companies have been checked. The tests have ensured that the sets as marketed do not emit radiation in excess of the internationally accepted standards of five milliroentgens per hour at five centimeters from any external service. More recently it has been found in the U.S. that sets which have been modified subsequent to sale to the customer may be potentially dangerous. Modifications involving an increase in the voltage applied to certain components can give rise to an increased level of radiation. The department therefore recommends that the high voltage settings of coloured T.V. sets should not be increased.

"Although it is believed that the associated radiation fields are hazardous only over long periods of exposure, the department is extending its testing program to ensure that all factors are fully investigated. It is recognized that there is an increasing use of products capable of emitting potentially hazardous radiation. These include, besides T.V. sets, x-ray equipment, microwave generators and lasers. The Minister added that his department is thereby seeking suitable regulatory powers to establish minimum safety standards for such equipment sold in Canada."

I would also mention that the Radiation Protect Division will be testing sets in the home environment, as it were, and tests in contrast to tests made on new sets in factories, and we in Manitoba will be working with the federal department in a follow-up study of some sets in the home environment. Manitoba will be visited by the radiation protection division people and will work with our department in looking at this at the local level. So basically there appears to be no health hazard in the sets as produced and manufactured. It's only when these sets are boosted to a higher voltage, etc., that some hazards could occur.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, as you are aware, the doctors of Thompson have all opted-out of Medicare, and as a result of this action the Steelworkers Union and our council and many other interested groups have been interested in getting another clinic into Thompson. A building has been purchased this week, and in view of the fact that the government has got a policy that they're going to give grants for loans to doctors to move up to the northern areas - I think the figure is \$5,000 or something like that - I was wondering if the government could indicate if they would assist our community with grants to bring doctors from out of the province so we could break the monopoly that medical czars hold in Thompson?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, we're willing to entertain applications from physicians willing to locate in rural Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable the Minister of Education. There is considerable concern amongst the faculty members of the universities in Manitoba over the fact that in some parts of Canada there are government appointed administrators enquiring into the activities of its faculty members and firing them on the basis of what they call "bad attitudes," and some of these have been defined as pro-labour views. Could the Minister assure our academic community that there would be no government interference into the academic freedom enjoyed by our faculty members?

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Minister of Youth and Education) (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to inform the honourable member that I'm not aware of any such activities in the Province of Manitoba.

#### STATEMENTS

MR. CRAIK: While I have the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make two announcements on behalf of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. First of all, there was an announcement in Toronto this morning by the Sherritt-Gordon Mines Limited regarding a discovery in Northern Manitoba which I think should be brought to the attention of the House, and I'd like to read their announcement to you. "Mr. David D. Thomas, President of Sherritt-Gordon Mines Limited, reported this morning that current exploration drilling in Northern Manitoba on two parallel geophysical anomalies had intersected copper and zinc values. Two shallow holes have been completed on a section across the anomalies and indicate horizontal widths of 70 feet and 160 feet of sulphides separated by about 100 feet of partially mineralized rock. The third drill hole, 1,200 feet along the stripe, has indicated a horizontal width of 35 feet in the first zone. The average grade of all intersections to date is 1.08 percent copper and 2.91 percent zinc. The dip of the mineralized zone appears to be nearly vertical. The anomalies are about 2,500 feet long. The ground covering these anomalies was staked during August, 1968 as part of Sherritts' routine long-standing program of airborne geophysical surveying followed by ground geophysics and diamond drilling. And additional drill will be flown into the property as soon as possible. It will be some time before sufficient drilling has been completed to permit an assessment of the importance of the discovery." I believe a disclosure of this sort of information is required by securities regulations, however in terms of the potential it is very meaningful. I think in layman's terms what it means is that the indications are that it is a large deposit but of relatively low concentration. But it is important.

The second announcement, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is with regard to flooding on the Assiniboine, and the Water Control and Conservation Branch has advised me this morning that its blasting crews have cleared the ice jams in the Assiniboine River and the river is now running clear between Winnipeg and Portage. As a result of the ice jams and the subsequent release of water from storage, overtopping of the dykes in several reaches of the river has occurred and the situation is still serious. The flows have now receded below the dyke levels due to the large volumes of water from the first peak in the Souris River. The present flows in the river are higher than were anticipated, and with the flows from the upper reach of the Assiniboine watershed, the flows of the river will be maintained near 18,000 cubic feet per second. It is anticipated that these flows will be sustained for nearly 10 days. Now these sustained flows at this rate will cause a serious effect on reaches of the dykes which will cause weakening due to boil-outs and erosion, and arrangements and special meetings are being held through the Water Control and Conservation Branch for the setting up of co-ordinating bodies among the municipalities and the armed forces, who were called in yesterday to assist the civilian patrols and the work forces. The main problem area is located between Poplar Point and St. Francois Xavier.

And on this point I would like to draw attention to what I think are some unfortunate statements by the Member for Portage la Prairie who brought this matter up in the House the other night - and he's not here today - and then brought it up on one of the television channels I believe the night before last. Charges were that debris from the clearing operations on the Portage Diversion Reservoir had caused channel blockage in the Assiniboine River and attributed to the subsequent flooding; and secondly, that this was the first time that channel blockage had occurred in the river at this section.

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) . . . .

Now both of these statements appear to have no grounds whatsoever. First of all, prior to the breakup of the river, and as part of the preparedness for high flow conditions, steps were taken to ensure that brush piles and debris in the reservoir area would not become a problem. The project engineer on the site issued formal instructions to the contractor to the effect that he should take whatever precautions would be necessary to ensure that his operations did not contribute material which might cause river blockage. The project engineer and the contractor subsequently inspected the whole area and the contractor took action on stabilizing brush piles and moving debris so as to as far as possible reduce any hazards. There were blockages on the river with resultant overtopping of the dykes, as I have mentioned here, but I can assure you that the blockages were the result of ice jams and not because of any debris from the reservoir site or from any other source.

There were actually two major jams that contributed to the situation on the Assiniboine River in the reach between Portage and Headingley. These two occurred simultaneously, the one being located at a point two miles downstream from the Trans Canada Highway bridge and caused by fractured ice piling up in a bend of the river; the other was located in the area of Baje St. Paul bridge and involved the local ice. In order that the problem of flooding not be compounded, it was necessary that the Provincial Government crews blast to remove the blocks at approximately the same time. It was a very difficult operation because it was very difficult getting the helicopters in.

Now there was also the suggestion that this was the first time an ice jam had occurred in this area. Again this is quite not the case. The Water Control and Conservation Branch has supervised the removal of ice jams in the exact location in a number of occasions in the past, the latest being 1965 and 1966. These ice jams occurred at a point two miles below the Trans Canada Highway bridge for exactly the same reason the ice jam occurred this year, that is fractured ice becoming hung up in a shallow section of the river.

Now I give you that long and detailed explanation, Mr. Speaker, because the Member for Portage did go to great pains to accuse the government of negligence and a great number of other things in having helped cause the ice jams and the charges are, from all appearances, completely unfounded and unwarranted.

I might also take the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Department of Education, I would like to announce that the department is initiating for this summer an "Operation Headstart" to establish special preschool classes for children who need assistance in adjusting to school for the fall term. Many of these children in these classes will be of Indian and Metis descent. The aim of the program is to make available in a kindergarten setting, preschool setting, those preschool experiences which provide for a logical and easy introduction to primary grades for children in areas of the province where this need may exist. This experimental program will enable us to assess the values of these preschool classes to see whether they in fact help beginners make an early and positive adjustment to school. The program involves five weeks under the supervision of selected university students who are planning to enroll in the Faculty of Education in the fall. The plan is to engage a local assistant from each community who can help in the experimental program and can assist in communication between the children and the instructor. Locations of the programs will be announced later.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): I rise on a point of order. The Minister engaged in his statement what I would consider to be a debate on the subject of flooding on the Assiniboine River. I do not object to it, but I would like to point out that in the absence of the Member for Portage I trust that he will be given the opportunity before the Orders of the Day of continuing the debate if he so chooses, due to the fact that the Minister really did engage in a debate at this point.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, speaking on the point of order, I would doubt very much if that would be the case. My honourable friend the Member for Portage the other day, under the guise of a point of privilege, tried to debate this matter. The Minister is merely making a general report in which he gave the facts, the proper facts to the House in the course of his statement this morning.

MR. MOLGAT: I would like to point out that the so-called facts are the facts in the Minister's eyes, that the Member for Portage may have a different view of those facts from his constituency's standpoint and he should be entitled, due to the fact that the Minister wants to debate it before the Orders of the Day, that he should have the same privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Just a moment, if I may give an opinion. As I understood it, it was as has been outlined to the House and I felt that the Minister was somewhat replying to the statement that had been made, and I'm sure if the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie wishes to discuss this, there will be an opportunity to do so in other parts of the debate of the House. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on perhaps the same point of order, is it permissible when the Minister makes a short statement, such as was made concerning Sherritt Gordon Mines, that each of the parties is permitted to make a statement of similar nature? I take it, Mr. Speaker, when a statement is made that it is permissible to comment on the statement, and I would like to exercise that privilege at this time.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister made an announcement with regard to a mineral exploration strike in Manitoba and I am sure that this makes all of the members of the House happy. We receive such remarks with pleasure because it's always a pleasure to know that there is mineral wealth in the province. What I am concerned with and what I would ask the Minister to assure the House, or at least to attempt to obtain information, what I'm concerned with is whether the developments of this new strike will take place because it's a feasible development or because it will be proceeded with on the basis of the company having a three year tax holiday to develop that resource as against developing their existing resources.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if it indeed is a legitimate development which is not being taken advantage of merely because of the tax holiday, then we all have reason to be proud and reason to be happy about the increased wealth which will be coming to the province. If, on the other hand, the company will be removing itself from other operations on which they have to pay taxes in order to engage in new operations on which they have a holiday, then, Mr. Speaker, we can't receive the remarks with the same satisfaction as would otherwise be the case, and I would urge the Minister, for the benefit of the citizens of Manitoba, to determine just what is the situation if a new development does take place.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I too welcome the statement of the Honourable Minister, in the absence of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, giving us certain facts about new explorations. Indeed this is welcome news and I do hope that they will be developed for the benefit of the people of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, my comment was with the other statement that the Honourable the Minister made. I take it, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable the Minister of Youth and Education is the Minister who is reporting to the House on flood conditions during the absence of the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Is that correct? I wanted to comment on the fact, Mr. Speaker, that I had taken the opportunity two days ago to go out and visit along the river to observe the flood situation, and I feel that the report that the Honourable the Minister has given us this morning rather minimizes - I don't know why it should, and I know that my honourable friend is giving what the experts in the Water Resources Department give to him - but it seems to me that there is a tendency to minimize the seriousness of the situation that exists, because from my own observation, thousands of acres have been flooded. I saw the breach, the one breach in the dyke just east of Poplar Point the other day, and I can well understand the amount of water that must have gone out since that time, and I gather from the Minister's statement that some other breaches have occurred in the dyke as well. I also came in the other highway and saw the damage that had occurred on the No. 1 Highway as well. The question I wanted to ask my honourable friend is has he an estimate of the acreage that has already been flooded on both the north and south side of the Assiniboine River?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I don't have any estimate of the acreage at hand, but we could determine it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Education based on his announcement about this "Headstart" program. Is this program of providing educational training prior to kindergarten or Grade 1, is that a federal initiative or an initiative of the provincial government?

MR. CRAIK: It's entirely provincial, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DOERN: A supplementary question. Is the government considering going beyond this specific joint program to include the rest of the province or to include the rest of the public school system? Pre-elementary training?

MR. CRAIK: It will take place, Mr. Speaker, in public school facilities. It will involve a number of school divisions.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, just for further clarification, will it also include, for example, schools in the Winnipeg School Division or the Metro area in the future?

MR. CRAIK: I indicated, Mr. Speaker, we would be announcing the locations at a later date. At the present time I can't give them to the honourable members.

#### ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. Could the Honourable Minister inform the House, of the hearings of the federal Agricultural Committee, just where these hearings will be held in Selkirk, at what time and just what form will they be taking, and whether it's an open meeting and whether members of the House are welcome. And also one further question, are further meetings slated than the one at Selkirk?

HON. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Minister of Agriculture) (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I've had no formal notice of the meetings or the hearings of the Agricultural Committee of the House of Commons. What I have is indirect. I think I did reply to a similar question in the House the other day when I pointed out that I had called Mr. Beer, who was chairman of that committee, and the information that I had from Mr. Beer is that there will be one formal meeting in the Province of Manitoba and that is from 2:00 to 5:00 o'clock this afternoon at the Monarch Life Building, I believe it is, where submissions may be made, on request I suppose to Mr. Beer. But I did explain it to the House the other day, the form that the hearings were being held, and I should point out again that the submissions that are being made were by request of the committee and that is the Canadian Wheat Board, the Board of Grain Commissioners, the Canada Grain Council and the Grain Exchange, and I will be making a submission myself if they can find time to listen to me this afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture in light of the answer that he just made to the Honourable Member for Rhineland. I wonder if it is the intention of the Minister of Agriculture to put forward at the meeting this afternoon the same strong case for a floor price on wheat that Thatcher put forward apparently yesterday to this committee. The statement apparently warranted front page coverage on this morning's Globe and Mail, and I hope that my honourable friend will see fit to put forward a similar argument on behalf of agriculture.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. In his discussions with representatives from the United Health Insurance Corporation on Mediplus, did the Minister discuss the close tie-in of the advertising with the government Medicare plan? For example the nature of the ads, for example the name "Mediplus" itself, and the tone that it was almost government operated.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs) (The Pas): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I really didn't have any formal discussions with the group Mediplus myself. It was conducted by my Deputy Minister and I don't believe that this was one of the matters that was discussed.

MR. DOERN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Did the Minister make specific proposals on behalf of the government or was the discussion mainly relaying public complaints?

MR. CARROLL: I believe it was mainly to draw to their attention that some people felt that the advertising was misleading and they should look at their advertising program. We've had their assurance of full co-operation with respect to changes and we hope that there will be no further misunderstanding resulting from paid advertisements by the corporation.

MR. DOERN: A final question, Mr. Speaker. Was the corporation given a deadline from which time on their advertisements will have to meet government requirements?

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, it's understandable that certain commitments with

(MR. CARROLL cont'd) . . . . respect to ads have been made; we understand that they're going to change them as quickly as they can, hopefully by today. It may be too late for today but I suspect in the very near future their ads will be changed from what they were a few days ago.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains.

MR. MICHAEL KAWCHUK (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. He has indicated he will be making a written submission, I presume this afternoon, to the House of Commons Agricultural Committee. I was just wondering whether he is in a position to make copies available of the submission to the Members of this House, say Monday or Tuesday. He's probably running them off now so that will save him some time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Has he made or attempted to make an assessment of all of the bridges and culverts that have been damaged as a result of spring flooding? I was told on Saturday by one of the reeves that 50 percent of the bridges in the municipality were either damaged or completely out. I think an assessment should be made.

MR. BAIZLEY: What was the question?

MR. SHOERMAKER: I said, has my honourable friend made an assessment or attempted to . . .

MR. BAIZLEY: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SHOEMAKER: He has not? Well, will he attempt then to make an assessment of the damage done to the bridges in all of the municipalities affected by the spring floods.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, on the announcement of the mineral find in the north, I'm very happy to hear the news, as I'm sure the shareholders are of Sherritt Gordon. I wonder if the Minister could indicate how close this mineral find is to the area that will be flooded as a result - assuming that Bill 15 goes through. The second question is, in view of this announcement, will he recommend to the members of this House to buy shares in Sherritt Gordon?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I take it the Honourable Minister is answering the first question. The second question is out of order.

MR. CRAIK: All I can inform the honourable members is that this mineral find is not under any water.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOERMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I'm still waiting for an answer to my two questions directed to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I wonder, in the light of the fact that he had me repeat the questions, I wonder if he could answer them.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Answer it.

MR. CRAIK: I did.

MR. DESJARDINS: No you didn't. We are getting fed up with that . . .

MR. BAIZLEY: Read Hansard.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY - MOTION FOR PAPERS

MR. SPEAKER: Orders for Returns. Honourable Members turn to the foot of Page 2. The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan that an Order of the House do issue for a return showing all available latest fees and charges of Canadian Universities for the faculties of Arts, Science, Engineering and Medicine and shown in the following manner: (a) tuition; (b) medical and health services; (c) library; (d) Student's union; (e) board and room; (f) laboratory; (g) athletic; (h) books.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. CRAIK: We can accept this, insofar as we can provide the information.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate of the proposed motion of the Honourable the Minister of Finance, the proposed motion of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition in amendment thereto and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. John's in

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd) . . . further amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on this motion, not because I'm an expert on budgets. Like the government, I don't know very much about it. However, this gives me the first opportunity to talk about the things that I feel are important to the people of the north. Looking over the budget, starting on Page 1, I notice the first statement that the government makes at the bottom of the page, "The government of Manitoba is pledged in every policy to work for the creation of opportunity for all our citizens. This objective underlines our approach to federal-provincial relations to Constitutional review" and so on.

I would like to speak for a moment on this subject which I consider very important, because when they say "opportunity for all citizens," I don't believe they're serious, Mr. Speaker, because we know very well there's many Indian and Metis and a few Eskimos living in the north country and we know for a fact that there has been a very active immigration policy conducted by the federal government, also by the provincial government. The Minister of subsidized industry has spent a great deal of our money running off to Europe, trying to hire labour, most of it from around the Mediterranean area, and while they're doing this, the Indians and the Metis were refused work on these projects. Back in 1958-59-60 when the Thompson operation was being cleared and getting ready and geared for production, many of the Indians were employed by various contractors. And I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that those that were employed in many instances were employed at half the rate of white workers. It was only after the intervention of a local parish priest that these companies were - their arm was twisted into paying a decent wage. As soon as this project was over, they were let go and since then there has been no more than 10-15 Indians employed on the Thompson Nickel Mine.

In '63 there was a group of Indians got together and picketed the Inco Plant gate to show their displeasure about being discriminated against. And this discrimination, Mr. Speaker, carries on today. It carries on at Gillam. It carries on at Lynn Lake, at Flin Flon, at Snow Lake and at Thompson. We're spending a great deal of money through the various departments of our government to pay welfare and housing and medicare and hospitalization payments on their behalf, and at the same time, we're going out to Europe spending a great deal of money. I have no objection to having people come in from Europe; we need all kinds of workers. But it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, if we're going to talk about opportunity for all citizens, surely to heaven, the first responsibility of this government is to hire the local Indians. I don't know what the figure is, the government can give us that. I understand it's around 15,000 of them up north. Year after year, submissions have been made by church organizations, by union and other organizations asking the government to compel the various companies operating there to hire local help, whether they be Indian or Metis, and in the case of Churchill there's some Eskimos. The government has not done this and has consistently refused to make these various companies obey the law; and it is a clear violation of our law. It hurts, Mr. Speaker, when you consider that first of all they're foreign companies, and secondly, that we are paying welfare for these people and we could have them working. So when they talk about opportunity for all citizens, I suggest to this government it's a lot of hogwash and they know it.

On Page 4, the Minister is talking about the unwillingness of the Federal Government to do certain things and he's concerned that there may be a fragmentation in Canada. He condemns the government for imposing taxes, for example, the two percent social development tax, and they're very angry at them for doing this, and the next instant they go in and bring us a two percent medicare tax. It comes out to the same thing, \$120.00. Their objection is based on the fact that the government took this money and didn't share it with them. Well, it seems that they want the Federal government to do the taxing, or stealing if you like, on their behalf. As far as we're concerned, if they want the tax share of the dollar to develop their province, they can do it themselves. They've got all kinds of experts on that side. The Minister of Industry is one of the best experts at extracting money from people and giving it out to subsidized industry. So when he talks about fragmentation, I would suggest that they're the most responsible for it.

I would like to bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker, an incident that has occurred shortly after the February 29th by-election. You probably recall reading in the Tribune a feature article about a so-called independent party, there's another name for it up north, it's called a Separatist party, and you know the amazing part of this, Mr. Speaker, is that

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) . . . . most of the people, the key people in this party are conservatives. Now isn't that amazing? Their own people are so fed up with them, that they're responsible, they're the architects of a new middle class northern separatist party, the key people are conservatives, and one of them is the former Member of Churchill. They're talking about carving out an empire with five seats, and the way they talk about it, you'd swear that it's going to become a reality within the next few years. Whether this happens or not I can't say. But I will say when there's responsible people, pillars of the community and members of that government that sits across there start talking about separatism, this government better start looking into it. It's not the Liberals, or it's not the New Democrats that are complaining - I'm sorry; we are complaining - we are not the ones responsible for setting up this party, and I would suggest to this government if there is any danger of fragmentation it's not going to come from somebody in Alberta or Saskatchewan, it's going to come from the north, and it's going to be initiated and brought about by the very people, members of that government that sits on that side, and I would suggest they take a very close look at it. We're getting pretty sick and tired of being treated like second class citizens, as we have been for many years. I could read off a list, a sheet long of things that we feel that we should have. We are paying taxes the same as any other Canadian and we're not getting anything in return.

On page 5, the government makes a statement, "Concerted government action is essential requirement for easing the pressure of rising prices. Those pressures fall with particular severity on those groups which can least defend themselves - people with low or fixed incomes, such as widows and old age pensioners." Well, Mr. Speaker, if they're really concerned about these people, and I imagine most of these low income are in Winnipeg, one of the ways they can do this -- and I'll be speaking at another time when the Bill comes up under the Minister of Labour, I believe there's a motion and an amendment, and I'll be speaking on that -- if they want to do something for these people, they're not going to do it by imposing a \$120 or two percent tax on these people. They can do it by first of all raising their minimum wages to a decent level.

Listening to the Minister of Industry and Commerce, and I'm sorry he is not in here today, yesterday, talk about building a great Manitoba, building a solid base, and talking about Dr. John Deutsch, Chairman of the Economic Council of Canada, and the only way we can do it, and this is his quotation, and he attributed these remarks to Dr. Deutsch: "is to increase productivity". Well he knows that's a lot of nonsense because Dr. Deutsch has never made that statement. If he wants to build a better base for Manitoba and be competitive, and he's always talking about this great midwestern market which we must break through, we must build a base here in Manitoba and we must give industry incentive, we must give sufficient incentive first of all to bring in foreign capital.

Well let's just look at one case we discussed yesterday, and that's Simplot. We brought in approximately \$2 million in foreign investment Mr. Speaker, and in order to bring in this \$2 million he had to twist the arm of the federal government to give him a gift - of \$5 million. That's a pretty shrewd businessman our Minister of Industry and Commerce; to get a \$2 million investment from America he convinced the federal government to give him \$5 million; in addition to that we the taxpayers had to put up \$23 1/2 million at very low interest rates to get a Simplot chemical setup at Brandon. What do we get today? This very same company that came in here, and is supposed to help us raise our standard of living and sell on foreign markets to bring foreign currency - help our balance of payments in Manitoba and in Canada - this company is selling this same fertilizer that's produced at Brandon, about \$1.00 per cwt. less in United States. He must be kidding when he says that we've got to do these things to build Manitoba. How in heaven's name are you going to do it when you put up all this money, all the risk capital, and then this company goes across the line - same fertilizer, same company, and they sell it for a dollar a bag less? This is a company that we invested money in.

What about these other companies that we're getting in, like the Swiss Yodellers and the Winnipeg Tannery and was it Friendly Farms? - and there's a few other ones, that this government has invested money in - our money. I don't mind the Minister of Industry taking his millions and investing - he's a shrewd businessman let him do it - but it's our money that he's taking and this is one of the reasons our taxes are increasing Mr. Speaker. He takes our money and gives it out to these people at ridiculous interest rates. And to make things worse, these people instead of being competitive, they get themselves into such a situation that they can't even sell the stuff right here, because it's cheaper today to drive over the Border and pick up your fertilizer from the States and bring it back into Canada. This is the type of

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) . . . industry and the base that the Minister is talking about. Isn't that wonderful. What a brilliant Minister we have. He's going to spend \$28 million of our money so he can get \$2 million of foreign investment. What a clever fellow he is. With a Minister like that, Mr. Speaker, we don't need any bank robbers, or break-in artists, or stock swindlers. We've got the best one right in there, Mr. Minister.

The other thing this same Minister does - and I was cut off, Mr. Speaker, the other day when I tried to mention this recruiting drive that took place in '66 by Mr. Roblin and the Minister of Industry and Commerce, which is still the same one - when they went to Europe and at our expense along the Mediterranean area they junketed for about three weeks hiring labour, low priced labour from low priced labour areas, to bring into Winnipeg at our expense, Mr. Speaker, to work in the sweat shops of the garment industry in this community. I don't know the figures, of what it cost us, but I can imagine the way they're accustomed to living that it must have cost us a pretty penny. They brought these people in - and this is the same people that are talking about upping our standard of living - they bring these people in at our expense, put them into these sweat shops, of his buddies, in some instances, and not only do they get them to work at \$1.00 an hour but they subsidize these very same companies by giving them a dispensation order, if you like, for three months or six months because they can't speak too good English and they're not trained in doing the work that's required in the garment industry.

If this is his idea, Mr. Speaker, of building up the industry, and becoming competitive, we don't want no part of it. We don't want to be competitive at the price and the sweat of the poor working in these sweat shops. If this is his idea, and that is having 10 percent of Manitobans work at substandard wages in slums and poverty, we don't want this kind of growth. We don't want this type of productivity, we don't want this kind of base. He can take it to his millionaire friends and maybe they can make something out of it. The people of Manitoba I'm sure are not interested in this type of growth. This is a craft that this government has been handing to us across the way for too long. They can show us figures and they can show us statistics, and they can talk about budgets all they like. It doesn't take a very intelligent person Mr. Speaker, to realize that it's a lot of nonsense. It's not helping us little guys. As the speaker at the TED Commission Mr. Barkway said, in his speech there - "you can speak about all the averages you want, it doesn't mean a damn." But it does mean to some people, Mr. Speaker; to people that are at the bottom of the ladder, it means a lot. To you and me and people who make more money averages don't mean a thing. We're going to make a living no matter what taxes are imposed, and we are, most of us, in the unenviable position that we can pass on these increases to someone else. The little guy has no one to pass them on to. He has to every week, pay his bills, pay his rent, pay his groceries, and now he's got to pay Medicare. I wonder if any of those people on that side of the government know what it's like not to be able to meet a payment on a car and worry about losing it. I wonder if any have every been faced with the situation of where they go shopping and they pick the second grade items and put them in their basket and then when they come up to the cashier they find that they are still \$3.00 over and they have to pick them out in front of the people and put them aside. I doubt it, Mr. Speaker. These are the people that are being hurt by those asinine policies this stupid government brings into this province. If I had my way, Mr. Speaker, I'd have some of them swinging outside, because they're not worth a tinker's bell.

One last item I'd like to speak about, Mr. Speaker, is northern development and raising some money. All the speakers that have spoken up to now are trying to tell this government, and they're certainly justified in doing it, where to spend the money, how to spend it. Very few have suggested where to raise this money. Well as one who comes from the north I have a few suggestions, Mr. Speaker, to make.

And the first one, I'd like to read a clipping from a local paper, it's dated April 10th: "Falconbridge meeting hears gloomy report", and it says in part: "Tasu Mines, which went into operation last year would probably be reduced at least as much as five percent, the amount of taxes that were increased this year. Besides raising the mining tax to 15 percent from 10 percent, British Columbia also ended its three year tax exemption for new mines last year. Falconbridge officials said this change is also expected to affect operating results at Tasu."

We've all seen the report from the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources - the peanuts that we're given from our mines. And I think the figure for 1968 is \$208 million. That's an awful lot of money, Mr. Speaker. And what do we get out of it? Two and a half million dollars. I wasn't aware that the social credit government was getting this socialist but it looks like they've put the tax up to 15 percent. Can you imagine how much money this would mean to

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd)... Manitoba if we put on a 15 percent mining tax? On a basis of those figures, about \$30 million. It would more than pay for Medicare, Mr. Speaker. And there'd be some left over for the Minister's salary - which they don't deserve, I submit.

There's another report here come off the press - Seoul Associated Press. "South Korea and Gulf Oil Corporation signed an agreement granting Gulf rates to explore and develop oil resources in two off-shore areas facing Communist China" - a very dangerous area. One of the hot areas in the world. "Gulf received their initial exploration period of 8 years." It goes on further to say that, "Gulf also agreed to pay the Seoul government 12 1/2 percent of the total production either in cash or in kind, and royalties, and 50 percent of its net profit in corporation taxes". This is the most dangerous place in the world, Mr. Speaker, and they signed a deal that's twice as bad for the company, as the one that this great rugged free enterprising government has signed with these American horse thieves that are stealing us blind up there. Here's the most dangerous place in the world and this company went and signed it. Why? Why did they sign it? Have they got a special deal with China or are they just so brave that they don't care? But they signed it, because, Mr. Speaker, there's money in it. Even at 50 percent and 12 1/2 percent there's still millions of dollars to be made. Just as surely if we had 15 percent mineral tax that company would still be making millions - and nobody needs a gold mine.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, Gulf agreed to donate \$1 million to the government at the time of the agreement - signing and paying \$50,000 annually during the exploration period to help train Korean technicians. Isn't that wonderful! These great free enterprising companies are training Korean technicians. Do you see any of them spending money in this country, training any of our people? Gulf will pay the government \$5 million in a production bonus, Mr. Speaker - this is in addition, in addition to the royalties and to the corporation tax - a \$5 million bonus when daily production reaches 60,000 barrels, and \$10 million when daily production reaches 100 million barrels. The government plans to conclude similar agreements soon with California Texas Oil Corporation, a joint subsidiary of Texaco incorporated in Standard Dutch Shell group for the remaining four off-shore areas around the peninsula. Mr. Speaker, it doesn't take an intellectual heavyweight or a Minister of the Crown to realize that this is a pretty good deal for the people - for those governments. And just looking at that and looking at agreements we have in this country we must think they're nuts. How could they sign deals like that? They're giving half the profits plus bonuses to a government and a country which could be overrun tomorrow. And these are just two places I mention. There's other ones like Guatemala where Falconbridge is spending \$200 million developing a low-grade nickel deposit. There's Indonesia, and they're exploring Greece right now. And many other hot places - so-called hot places in the world - and they're signing deals that make us look like a bunch of idiots. And that's what this government is for signing deals like that.

I have a sessional paper No. 33 dated 1966 and '67. This is an answer to an Order for Return put in by our Leader and this shows the revenue received during the last calendar year. The International Nickel Company of Canada: (1) Royalties - 17,707.05. Compare that to that statement I just finished reading, Mr. Speaker. (2) Mining Tax - \$2,565,119.26. And (3) Leases - \$78,662.00. And (b) Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company Limited. (1) Royalties - \$100 lousy dollars. Isn't that a shame! You ought to be proud of yourselves - all of you on that side. The village idiot could conduct a better deal and negotiations than that. (2) Mining Tax - \$714,638.99. And (3) Leases - \$10,215.33. We don't need a government to sign deals like that; you can get the guy next door and he'll do a better job. And you sit there and you smirk and you laugh and you think it's very funny - using our money . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I believe I've given the honourable gentleman reasonable latitude this morning - a word that was used the other day - and I wondered if he might not keep that in mind.

MR. BOROWSKI: You're very kind, Mr. Speaker, and very tolerant. I'm happy you are because I do have difficulties in this area as I'm sure you appreciate.

I'll conclude my statement by asking this government - I know it's useless, it's just like talking to the wall or throwing peas against a wall, it won't do any good. But if they're serious about developing the north, we all agree this is a last frontier, this is where all the wealth is - and I'm not even counting the great millions we're going to make from Hydro at South Indian Lake, I'm just talking about the minerals and fur, trapping and fishing. If they're serious of developing this thing here, getting people to come into there, because you can't operate any of these things, you can't make any money unless you have people, as International

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) . . . Nickel has found out -- they're still having difficulty getting men up there. Even though there's 450,000 people unemployed in Canada, they still have difficulties getting men to come up and work there -- If they're really serious about doing this I would suggest they do several things. First of all, build us a decent bridge across the river in Thompson so you can have two-way traffic, with pedestrian walks, pave the highway to Lynn Lake - I'm sorry to Snow Lake and Thompson; finish or complete the highway from Grand Rapids to Ponton; build a hospital, or extend the hospital in Snow Lake which is terribly overcrowded; build a hospital in Lynn Lake, which is badly overcrowded and outdated; put in a high school at Gillam - a growing place. And again I guess I'm being very optimistic; I expect that the government's going to go through with their Hydro project. Build a high school over there and speed up as fast as possible the construction of the highway to Lynn Lake.

We had an announcement here this morning, Mr. Speaker, saying they found additional minerals there. I don't know if they're going to go ahead with it or not, but we know there's a lot of minerals there, the potential is there and as the years go by I'm sure there'll be other finds in there, and if we're going to "exploit" this to the fullest extent - I use this word properly because that's all it's going to be - as long as this government's in office, Mr. Speaker, it's going to be pure exploitation. But as long as this continues we're going to have to get men up there and I would suggest to this government to do these things in here and maybe we could vote for some of the expenditures they're making in their budget.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words on this budget debate about the course that the Government of Manitoba is following with respect to federal-provincial relations. It appears that a deliberate attempt is being made by this government to blame the federal government for all its troubles. The government of Manitoba is actually distorting the facts when it reports to the people of this province on the state of federal-provincial relations. And there was a good example last week on Channel 7's weekly program "Broadway Beat," when representatives of the Liberal Party, the Conservative Party and the New Democratic Party were discussing the provincial government's 1969-1970 budget.

It was pointed out on the program by the Minister of Finance that he spent half his time on the budget clubbing Ottawa over the head, but neglected to even mention the fact that 1.88 million of his estimated 377 million revenue came from the federal government. To this the Minister of Finance replied: "We are only getting some of our money back because the federal government is taking something in excess of 400 million out of Manitoba annually in taxes." The clear inference was, Mr. Speaker, that we're getting less back from Ottawa than we pay in, and that therefore we are being cheated in some way by the federal government.

MR. EVANS: I didn't say that.

MR. GUTTORMSON: I said the inference was there.

MR. EVANS: That's your inference, not mine.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, to begin with, the budget doesn't give a true picture of the revenue we receive from Ottawa. To the budget figures must be added 25.8 million for medicare and 35 million dollars for hospital insurance, making a total of \$249 million that we expect to receive from Ottawa in revenue this year. So the gap between what we pay to the federal government in taxes and what we receive in return from Ottawa is not as great as might appear at first glance. Well what about the difference? What happens to the balance of the money we pay in federal taxes? Contrary to the impression left by the Minister of Finance the other evening, we are not being robbed of this money by the federal government. Mr. Speaker, it represents Manitoba's share of the annual cost of running the country. It represents our portion of that cost of defence, the CBC television, radio, the RCMP, agricultural programs, rural development programs, health programs, old age security, and the list is endless. As well as the cost of running parliament itself. This is our price for membership in Canadian Confederation. To even suggest that we're being robbed is patently absurd. I'd be the first to suggest that we should continue to press for better federal-provincial tax sharing agreements and revamping of our tax laws; but this is a far cry from suggesting that we should get back every cent we pay back to Ottawa in taxes. If every province took the same position, the provinces would be wealthy and the federal government would be bankrupt.

MR. EVANS: I must correct my honourable friend. I never left any such implication in anything I've ever said.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance obviously doesn't know what he said.

MR. EVANS: And neither do you.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Who would then pay for the cost of running Canada? This is a foolish and ridiculous suggestion. We can never expect to get back from Ottawa every cent that we pay in federal taxes, just as within Manitoba the municipalities and school boards can never expect to get back every cent that local taxpayers turn over to the province in provincial taxes. More and more the statements of the Manitoba Government are sounding like they're tinged with separatism. If the government of this province wants control of every cent it pays in taxes at all levels, separatism is the only course. Then we could do what we like with out tax money. But it must be remembered that it would then be our position of having to set up our own defence policy, our own provincial police force, our own broadcasting system, our own pension plan for the aged, and there's so many other things we'd have to do. These are the things the Government of Manitoba conveniently forget to mention when it talks about federal-provincial relations; and when it infers we're not getting a fair shake from Ottawa. It's time the Manitoba Government showed sincerity of purpose in its dealings with Ottawa. Unless there is trust on both sides in federal-provincial relations, there will continue to be a climate of confrontation in the discussions instead of understanding and good faith. Short term political advantage and political fencing may produce headlines today but they won't produce results tomorrow. As a province we must be devoted to obtaining a better deal for Manitoba, but this result will require that we prove our case with facts and figures and not shouts and screams.

Too often we have gone to Ottawa without documenting our cases as well as should be documented, and instead have put up our emphasis on staging a dramatic performance to impress the news media when we should be trying to impress the Federal Government. This kind of situation cannot continue. We must chart a new course of political honesty in our dealings with Ottawa and we must expect reciprocal treatment. People in Manitoba and people all across Canada are tired of the old style of stick handling politics where you always blame the other guy and roar and thunder for what you want. It's time for a style of politics marked by frankness and openness, with a businesslike approach of administration of public affairs to get the best value for our tax dollar.

Mr. Speaker, it's my hope that for the good of Manitoba the present government will adopt this style and that it would alter the course of confrontation with the federal government. If we don't, federal-provincial relations can be expected to deteriorate. In addition, we will be known as the cry babies of Confederation. The tragedy of this is the people in other provinces will soon stop listening to our legitimate grievances and we'll be in the same position as the boy who cried "wolf."

MR. LYON: Would my honourable friend permit a question?

MR. GUTTORMSON: Why not, Red.

MR. LYON: Would my honourable friend tell us whether or not this speech this morning in which he appeared to infer the applicacy of separatism, was the opening speech in his campaign for the Liberal Leadership?

MR. GUTTORMSON: Red, you'll know very soon.

MR. LYON: Can I be your Manager?

MR. GUTTORMSON: Well I don't know, after the success you had last year maybe I'd better get somebody else.

MR. LYON: That's why I suggested it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead. Order please. Order. The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to participate in this debate today. However, in light of the fact that some members have made certain statements that in my opinion bear some airing out, or requires some airing out, I thought I would rise to my feet and refute some of the things that have been alleged by the members opposite.

The other day the Honourable Minister of Transportation got up to his feet and decided to - or at least attempted to accuse the New Democrats of being inconsistent in their approach to taxation policies in the sense that we are proposing that the cost of medical care, for example, would be borne out of general revenues, adopting the concept of ability to pay, but that we indeed were inconsistent, so he stated, in that Saskatchewan when it introduced its Medicare plan some years ago that it introduced the premium concept itself. Mr. Speaker, I

(MR. USKIW cont'd) . . . recognize that this is the case, the Province of Saskatchewan did introduce a premium concept to finance their medicare program, and I'm not suggesting that that was a bad idea under the circumstances of that day, because if you recall, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan truly pioneered the idea of Medicare as far as the whole North American continent is concerned, that they were the ones to bring it about and they were the ones that pioneered the scheme which is giving medicare provisions for the people of Saskatchewan, and indeed set the pace for all of Canada and indeed all of North America. I think it's a question of time, Mr. Speaker, before we see Medicare throughout all of this continent and the credit must go to the Province of Saskatchewan for having initiated and pioneered the program.

Now why, Mr. Speaker, was a premium introduced in Saskatchewan some years ago under the premiership of Tommy Douglas? We must recognize that at that time there was no federal Medicare program, that the federal government did not offer one red penny towards the financing of Medicare to any province that wanted to institute a Medicare program in Canada, and that indeed again I want to point out that Saskatchewan took a very bold approach and said: If you don't want to participate - and they were pointing their finger at Ottawa - we are prepared to insure our citizens in Saskatchewan for their medical needs without your help and they proceeded to do so. And the same applies for hospitalization, Mr. Speaker, if we go a little further back in history. They pioneered the hospitalization program and again they introduced the premium concept in Saskatchewan, but we recognize, Mr. Speaker, that as a result of their work in the early days that the rest of Canada has subsequently benefitted from their pioneering, or their spirit of pioneering in Saskatchewan, and that indeed we are going to provide a better standard of health throughout all of Canada as a result of the groundwork that was laid down in the Province of Saskatchewan in both the case of the hospitalization program and the Medicare program that we now are adopting.

So Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that we have introduced, our Party in Saskatchewan has introduced a social program financed partly through a premium, I'm not apologizing for that in view of the fact that at that time they had to do it alone, that the federal government was not participating in the cost and that it is indeed a credit to the Province of Saskatchewan for being bold enough to launch that kind of program on their own.

Now let's take a look at what happened, Mr. Speaker. Even though they introduced the concept of the premium as a means of paying for social programs, they did take into account the ability to pay, because the programs which were announced, in the hospitalization program and the Medicare program, the premiums that were introduced were very small premiums, minimal premiums, and that those premiums did not cover the total cost of those services, that the largest portion of costs were covered by indirect revenue out of the Consolidated Fund, unlike what is proposed by the present government in Manitoba to finance their share of the Medicare program. So Mr. Speaker, I want to say for the record that Saskatchewan did take into account ability to pay and introduced a program which didn't penalize the low income people, which made it very easy for people on low incomes to finance, and that it was a very progressive form of tax measure, unlike that which we have introduced in Manitoba. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, now that the federal government has gone into the program and has given Saskatchewan the 50 percent cost of their program, that if the New Democrats were to be the Government of Saskatchewan today that they may further adjust the question of premiums and transfer some of the vast costs back to the Consolidated Fund, if not all, Mr. Speaker. I'm not sure whether they would go all the way.

But nevertheless, in keeping with that principle, I want to refer honourable members to Page 13 of the Orders of the Day wherein I have a resolution on the question of Medicare and how it should be financed, and I want to quote it for the record, Mr. Speaker: Whereas the proposed premiums chargeable to Manitobans under the Medical Care scheme are an inequitable form of taxation in that they tax all citizens equally despite the unequal ability of citizens to pay the tax; Whereas the said form of taxation is neither necessary nor desirable; Therefore Be It Resolved that the Government give consideration to the advisability of financing the provincial share of the cost of the said plan preferably out of general revenues, or in the alternative by the creation of a graduated premium related to ability to pay.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we didn't in this resolution suggest that if the government refuses to accept the idea of financing the scheme out of consolidated revenues that we would be opposed to a premium. We said if we must have a premium - although we oppose it - if we must have one, let's have one based on ability to pay. If we can't finance it out of consolidated revenues, let's have a graduated premium so that we would take into account ability to pay, in recognition

(MR. USKIW cont'd.) . . . . of the fact that many people in Manitoba don't earn a very substantial income, that we have a large percentage of our population below the poverty line, Mr. Speaker, and that it is unfair to ask those people to pay the same premiums for those services as most affluent citizens pay.

So we have not been inconsistent, Mr. Speaker, on this particular point and the government is not being truthful when it suggests to us that we are not consistent on the question of financing social programs on the basis of ability to pay, and so just for the record I thought I would draw this to your attention, to remind my honourable friends on the opposite side of the House that there is a great deal more consistency on this side of the House than there ever was and probably ever will be on that side of the House.

Now Mr. Speaker, in the amendment which we proposed the other day there is reference made to the problems of agriculture, and I want to touch a bit on that area. We have had a great deal of debate in this House on problems related to agriculture, and I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that agriculture has been one of the areas that has not shared in the wealth and development of this province fairly enough. They have always been behind in this area. They have not always moved up their standards of living as much as other sectors in the economy and that there are certain reasons why this has been so. And largely, Mr. Speaker, the reasons are that both the federal and provincial governments have never adopted an agricultural policy, a planned program for the development of our rural people so that they too may share in the better standards of living than other sectors of society are able to share in and that their standards move in accordance with the rest of society, that there be some process of upgrading and levelling so that we would ensure a rural community would have the same affluence as do most of our urban centres. And I'm not saying that there is no poverty in the urban centres, Mr. Speaker, I recognize there is, but I want to point out that this government has been negligent; it has not participated in any policy development program over the years that would ensure the betterment of the standards of living of people that make their living out of agriculture, and we are long overdue, Mr. Speaker, in formulating an agricultural policy that will ensure that this does in fact take place.

We have had a number of conferences recently on the whole question, and as has been admitted by the Minister of Agriculture in this House, his participation in those conferences was very minimal. He had very little, in fact he had nothing to suggest at the recent conference on agriculture, and we're told today, Mr. Speaker, that he is not going to be meeting or at least making any representation on behalf of the farmers of Manitoba to the Agricultural Committee of the House of Commons that is visiting this province today.

Now Mr. Speaker, I say that this government is lazy; they haven't the fortitude and the ambition to initiate programs to ensure the development of society. They haven't recognized that we all live in one community, that being the community of Manitoba, and that we should try and bring in social progress to all sectors of Manitoba on a more or less equal basis as much as is possible - humanly possible. And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, it's because that they are philosophically oriented to the old idea of those that have will have more - and that's their privilege under this free enterprise, or I don't call it a free enterprise system any more because I think it's degenerated to a monopoly enterprise system - but nevertheless they are still oriented to that way of thinking whereby those that are in a better position find themselves in that much more of a better position to continue the exploitation of those in society that are less affluent, that have less bargaining position and that have less fighting power, if you like, in the competitive system that we have, and therefore that only means, Mr. Speaker, that those that have accumulated wealth are in a better position to accumulate greater wealth and those that haven't any wealth are going to be further pushed to the rear and will suffer greater reductions in the standard of living than they have to date.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is not in the best interests of Manitoba, because in the long run it is a self-defeating one, in that the more people you have on the poverty line the more you have to load taxation on the rest of the people, so as your percentages of poverty groups increase, your numbers of people in that category increase, you will find that a smaller percentage of those that are more affluent are going to have to bear greater burdens to finance government programs in that the taxation revenues will then be coming from a smaller number of people. To those people, Mr. Speaker, that do have incomes below the poverty level - as has been defined - to those people, Mr. Speaker, the situation is no different than it was to almost all of the people of this country during the 1930 depression years. It's just

April 18, 1969

(MR. USKIW cont'd.) . . . . as difficult for them, Mr. Speaker, to purchase their basic necessities today as it was for many people in those days, and this government has not seen to it to enact programs to develop Manitoba in a way which will enhance the well-being of all its citizens as fairly and equitably as possible.

And this is what taxation really is, Mr. Speaker, it's a method of distributing wealth as well as the method of distributing the costs of government services, and where we find that we have sectors that are falling behind in the economy, we can use the tax lever to transfer money from one sector to another in order that we may have a more even development of society all across this province. And this is what this government has failed to do, Mr. Speaker, although I realize it's in keeping with their philosophy, even though that philosophy may be outdated somewhat and belongs in the dark ages of past centuries, Mr. Speaker.

I would hope that the honourable members opposite would be somewhat enlightened by remarks coming from this side of the House and that they would reassess their philosophy and their approach to mankind so that we do have fair and equitable development for the people in Manitoba and that we do have fair and equitable taxation to pay for services which the people require.

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

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, a while back in the beginning of the year, I went to a meeting down on the lower end of my constituency with the members of the Government of Manitoba and also the City Council. This meeting was concerned about the poor conditions of housing and it took in an area which I am going to describe to you.

This area, the area lying between the CPR tracks and Notre Dame Avenue from Main Street west to Sherbrooke Street is one of the oldest residential districts in Winnipeg, and for most of its long history it has been one of the most seriously blighted. From the beginning, the value of residential property in this location was depressed by the proximity of the railroad, the greatest attractiveness of the Hudson's Bay Company reserved lands to the southwest, and the inclusion of industry throughout the area with a particular concentration on its northern and eastern edges. When the city was incorporated in 1873, the streets in this part of the municipality were already in existence and the enclave between Main Street and Isabel, north of Notre Dame, constituted Winnipeg's first residential area. Property in this general location was developed on narrow lots and no attempt was made to exercise any form of land use and development control.

As a result, when the land of the Hudson's Bay Company reserve lying west of Main Street and south of Portage was opened for development in the 1880's and development there was subjected to control of building types and size of lots, this area was identified as superior in quality and immediately attracted more expensive class of dwellings. In addition to the advantages created by regulation, the land itself afforded some natural attractions. It was at somewhat higher elevation than the land to the north and was less liable to flooding. Property values in the older residential district were never able to rise to the levels of those to the south and west, and the character of the former area was thus, from earliest times, that of lower economic status. Then the railroad came in which depressed it more. Then they opened up the Weston shops, and through that area there various people came in and built and they built for the people that were coming in to work in the railroad yards and so on. Well, Mr. Chairman, through all that time this district has taken a beating.

Now I went the other day to the Indian - Metis Conference, and they were talking about their people and how their people were discriminated against in outer Manitoba. My colleague from Churchill spoke of that this morning. Well these people have had to come into this area in the district to the north which they call Area 3, and they have started on urban renewal. These people want to go out of there. They have destroyed homes - they have had to destroy homes otherwise the bedbugs and rats would carry them away I presume. Well where do they have to go? They have to go to another area, and as they come into another area which is over-crowded, what does that mean to that area? It is getting more depressed than ever. And who are the people that live in there? The new immigrants coming in, the Indian people coming off the reserves; these are the people in there. When we talk of housing, as I point out to you in this one particular part of the city, but we go on to say, Mr. Chairman - Mr. Speaker, I should say - there are over 4 1/2 million occupied dwellings in Canada. Of these, more than 255,000 are in need of major repairs. Most of them are so badly in need of repair that they should be demolished and replaced with new dwellings. Nearly a million do not have their own flush toilets and over a million do not have their own shower or bath.

(MR. HARRIS cont'd.)

In the Province of Manitoba, a study conducted in 1962 indicated that there were about 247,000 occupied dwelling units at that time. About 10 percent, or 24,700 were in substandard condition and about one-third of these, or over 8,000 were in such bad condition that it was not feasible to repair them. They could not be made fit for human habitation and should have been torn down and replaced. And in Winnipeg, a recent housing study indicated that about 32,000 dwelling units are needed to replace substandard housing to relieve over-crowding, to reduce excessive rentals and to provide everyone in the Metro area with a dwelling of decent standard. Even in terms of the hard core of blighted housing there are about 5,000 dwellings in Metropolitan Winnipeg which are in such bad condition they should be removed and replaced with new construction.

There is no doubt that virtually all of the substandard dwellings are occupied by poor people who cannot afford better housing, but this is by no means the full extent of housing distress in this country, province and metropolis. It is estimated that about one million Canadian families, representing between three and four million people, earn so little that they can never improve their housing conditions by their own efforts and must have some form of public assistance if their situation is to be improved. Added to these facts, the continuous and rapid increase in the cost of housing in the last few years is making it increasingly difficult for middle income families to acquire homes on the open economic market.

Well, Sir, I would say that with regard to housing, we know how conditions are all the way through, but then I go back to these people that live in that area, that have come in, and show to you why these people are like that. The Indian, the new immigrant coming, he has no chance, because he can't go and compete against the people that are city wise. Today we were introduced to a class here of Indians from the Fisher constituency and they were brought in here by public assistance. Never been in the city before -- not by public assistance, public subscription I should say, not assistance. These children have never been in the city before. How far is Fisher Branch away from Winnipeg? Not so far as far as Canadian standards are concerned. We have transportation here and everything else that goes, but no, these people out in the reserves and everything else, they don't see the kind of life that we have.

Mr. Speaker, before the current bout with inflation, most economists designated an annual income of \$3,000 as the poverty line for Canadian families. How then can we believe that, as of 1965, 55 percent of Indian families received an annual income of \$2,000 or less, and during the same year, 47 percent of Indian families earned \$1,000 a year or less. Of course these are only statistics. The greater number of Canadians never come face to face with the wretched suffering which these statistics represent. While most Canadians live in highly industrial urban centres, most Indians live in remote underdeveloped rural areas, thus we simply do not see their despair with our own eyes, nor do the great majority of us ever experience the bitter cold which is so prevalent in many Indian communities. Suffering occasioned by their poverty is intensified by temperatures of 40 and 50 degrees below zero. Being so far removed, we cannot feel the horror which lies beneath the fact that the Indian preschool mortality is eight times the national average and school age mortality three times the national average. Even those of us who go to conferences and seminars with Indians meet Indians on our ground, in our well heated, well lit hotels, colleges and board rooms; rarely do we see them in their habitat. Most Indians ...

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I don't object at all to the member quoting, but I think that it would be well if he would give us the source of his quote.

MR. SPEAKER: ... the honourable gentleman to complete his remarks and I was going to ask him that question.

MR. HARRIS: The source of this, Mr. Speaker, is the "Packinghouse Worker."

MR. SPEAKER: And the date?

MR. HARRIS: The date is 1964.

MR. SPEAKER: 1964?

MR. HARRIS: Yes, February 1964. Wait a minute I think I am wrong there. This is February, 1967, pardon me - the "Packinghouse Worker." This is on Page 8.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable gentleman may proceed from where he left off.

MR. HARRIS: -- (Interjection) -- Yes, we'll do that, we'll have a picture of it next time. "Most Indians we meet are those who live closer to us and have begun to develop more economically in their community, in their towns. Indian poverty has a quality of unreality for us. The most sympathetic and imaginative Canadian cannot fathom the depths of human suffering

(MR. HARRIS cont'd.) . . . . through the medium of bland statistics. Since the beginning of the white man's reign on this continent, Indian life has undergone a steady deterioration. We have virtually deported the natives of this country to small parcels of land - reserves - far away from the main stream of our civilization. Then we began from every side to assault their culture and ways of life. Our tourist industries encroached on their hunting and fishing resources. Our fur companies invaded their traplines. Our dams flooded their wildlife fields. Our churches undermined their religion.

"When the Indians withdrew from the reserves to seek their fortunes in white society, they were beset by severe handicaps. Many Indian reserves are not culturally in tune with the demands of industrial society. Punctuality, for example, is not always accorded the reverence in some Indian communities that it receives in our society. Thus planned racial prejudice creates a widespread reluctance on the part of employers to hire Indian labour. When Indians did get jobs their industrial naivety often made them vulnerable to vicious exploitation." For example, I have known Indians in the 1960's to work a 15 hour day and a 7 day week for as little as \$250 per month.

Well I won't go very far on that, Sir, but the reason why I go on this tack, I have listened here to people say of all the various things that goes on in this province, here is something that is right with us, but no, we by-pass that. Now these people go to the city of Winnipeg, they go to the City Council, they go to their alderman. So they go to their alderman and they come here, they come to me or each member here, wherever they feel they should go, and what are we called in the various status of these municipality, provincial, federal, whatever you might call it. Well, we might say you call yourselves parliamentarians. What is a parliamentarian? What is a parliamentarian? Can any of you tell me? What is a parliamentarian? He's a politician so you say. What is a parliamentarian? In a discussion of this nature a good deal depends on the definition of the term "parliamentarian".

And then it goes on to say when we talk about welfare, when you go on to these people, they come into this town from the outback of Manitoba. They come into this town and they cannot make a living so they have to go onto welfare, and people start to talk about welfare and the welfare state. Fine, but what is a man going to do? Are you going to shoot him? No, you are not going to do that, but you are going to starve him to death, all right? You have a city here governed, you have people there that know what they are doing, or should know, so we say what is a welfare state coming down to that? What is a welfare state? Well, Mr. Speaker, in the broadest sense of all, all groups of people in a defined area with governments are welfare states. The governments, whether they have governed much or governed little, are responsible for and are concerned with the welfare of that group. They are responsible for the defence against invasion, all domination by other groups, for the degree of inter-relationship with other groups, and for the general advancement of their own group. What is meant by a parliamentarian? Does it mean only a member of a particular parliament or does it mean a member of any governing body such as a state, a provincial Legislature or a municipal council.

The ordinary conception of a welfare state is one in which the governing body introduces and administers legislation intended to protect the individual members of the community from the dangers of which the individual has little control. We see that every day in this Chamber, our people getting up and talking and pointing out whether it is right or whether it is wrong. We discuss it in this Chamber and we try to draw some conclusion out of it. Last night I listened to the Leader of the Opposition talk and he was pleading a cause. Well, that is up to this general body whether they would listen to him or not. I don't know. But I say this is what we are here for, this is the role of a parliamentarian. And I listened to our Premier there the other night when he spoke at that dinner of TED. And I wish him well, that he gets this report over and does something for this province, because I would really like to see that because I believe we have something in this province that is worthwhile, but it is up to us to do it. We are the people to do it.

Sometimes we are a little group and we talk to you people and you say: Oh, we don't need to listen to them. And sometimes, as I have heard this last couple of days, they call names. Well, that's fine, "sticks and stones can break my bones but names can never hurt me." That's an old child's saying. You know what I was thinking? You know, Mr. Speaker, I was thinking there the other day of a term - I heard the term socialism called - all right, I will go beyond that yet. Some of you look down in the dictionary and see this word - a radical

(MR. HARRIS cont'd.) . . . . - a radical. What does a radical do? He digs down to the roots and he wants to know all the answers. You can have different definitions in there but the radical is the man that does it, he gets down into the roots if he want to know. He wants to know -- (Interjection) -- Now, Sir. This is a great thing, you know, when you and I are across there and we talk to one another.

But to go back to what I have to say. -- (Interjection) -- This source has no source at all. -- (Interjection) -- Oh yeah? You know, the ordinary conception of a welfare state is one in which the government body introduces and administers legislation intended to protect individual members of the community. In addition to community defence, it would include protection from loss of employment, protection from the costs of accident and illness, protection from the hazards of old age. This I like - I'm getting that way too. It also includes protection of person and property by maintenance of police and fire departments. Who is it that employs them? Is it any private employer? No, it is the welfare state that does that. Too bad, but that is so.

Now it goes along and protects our water supply. We are protected by a fire department. All that is done by this wonderful welfare state. All this is done by that wonderful welfare state, so in a sense the sooner we get down to that and use the general revenue for everything that is going to go along and use our money rightly. Like I heard my friend here, the Member for Lakeside say, Yes, you can only use so much money. He always uses the old country money. Well, I'm not going to do that. I'm going to say if you have a dollar, if you can spend 95 cents, fine; but if you go over that, it's not so good. This is what you people across the way should do. This is what we can do. But it's like everybody else. You know, if you took a bunch of people out and you had 50 pounds of flour, and you went into that bag and you stood them people up in a line and you took a handful of that flour out and you give the first man and told him to do down the line, at the end of the line how much flour would you have left? This is what is happening here. We have the money; we could have the money, but down the line it is getting lost. For some reason or other it is getting lost.

Well, Sir, I have gone and preached on this thing here and I believe in everything that should go with this welfare state, because I believe that Medicare and everything else like that, it concerns our people and the healthier we have our people the better it is for our own province, because through illness, not you or anybody else will suffer but the man that is concerned himself through ill health and through the little money he's got. How many of our people, before any protection came at all, had homes and someone suffered a very serious illness and that man had to mortgage his home to pay for the medical services this person had and eventually lost everything. This is what I believe should be looked after in the proper manner. This is what we always try to achieve. I was never under the old country scheme; I come out of there before that time, but I remember from early times we worked, three and four and five thousand people in a little town, and we each paid two cents a week. That paid that doctor, and from that and the various schemes that have been put together, this Medicare in the old country came into being. Now we have made a stab here. It might not be everything we should have but at least it is a start. I thank you very much.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: I'd like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gladstone, that the debate be adjourned.

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

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Labour)(Flin Flon): I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Transportation, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following Bills: Nos. 4, 5, 8.

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

#### COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 4, An Act to amend The Fires Prevention Act. Section 1-- passed; 63 (a)--

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to have some clarification to make sure that I'm fully aware as to what this section will entitle the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to do.

April 18, 1969

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) Do I take it that under this section the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, without reference to municipalities and without reference to other jurisdictions, could for instance require the installation of fire prevention and fire detection equipment in either rooming houses or private homes, if necessary, without any jurisdiction intervening?

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, we could by this but we wouldn't. We would consult with the municipalities as we have done and it has been the practice of the department to do so over the years. These are really minimum standards which are being met by nearly all of the municipalities in the Province at the present time. It's just really for clarification that the inspectors, when they have to do their inspection job, they're able to call for these standards.

MR. GREEN: I don't want the Minister to misunderstand me, I'm not even at this point afraid that he would do that. As a matter of fact, I would think that this would cure a lot of the difficulties that have been occurring with regard to the requirement for fire detection equipment in rooming houses which had such a hassle at the municipal level. We would welcome, if the Minister told us, that in addition to having this authority that he might use it. In other words, we have a situation where we have had serious difficulties arising from rooming houses without proper fire detection equipment. There was an attempt at City Council to try to get something passed in this regard. It never happened and I want the Minister to know that we're not afraid of this occurring. Therefore, when you say that you have the power but you won't use it, could you give us any indication as to whether you might be induced to use it if representations were made, or under what circumstances would you use this power which somehow hasn't been able to clear the red tape of municipal councils up until this time.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, we would use it as the need arose, and with respect to the nursing homes, I believe that most of them now do meet the minimum standards that are called for in many of the standard codes.

MR. GREEN: Did I say nursing homes, Mr. Minister? I meant to say rooming houses.

MR. WITNEY: Rooming houses. Well, I believe that most of them now, and I may be subject to error here, but I believe that most of them are meeting certain standards, and in this case we just want to make sure that the standards that are being called for can be called for by the inspectors. There has been some question that they can be and we're clarifying it in these amendments.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to indicate to the Minister that my understanding is, and I hope that he would be able to check this, that some years ago, and for the past several years, there has been a bitter dispute at the municipal level whereby the fire department recommended certain requirements with regard to fire detection devices, that these fire detection devices were recommended to be passed into legislation, but as a result of a long dispute that it never came about, and therefore, although they do meet certain requirements and certain building standards, the requirement on fire detection devices, as I understand it - and if I'm wrong, I welcome the Minister's advice to me that I am wrong - that the fire detection equipment which was recommended by the fire department and by the then Chief of the Fire Department, Mr. Dutton, was not made a requirement. If the Minister is in a position now of overcoming the problems which prevented the Fire Chief's recommendation from in fact becoming law, then I would urge him to look into this problem. He's given himself the authority and we have no qualms about him using it. We would welcome him using it, and if he doesn't use it, we would like to know why.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Mr. Chairman, I don't rise to oppose this Act but more to enquire of the Minister as to whether or no his department has reached any conclusion as to whether it is in agreement with certain recommendations made by certain Fire Chiefs regarding keyed elevators in high rise apartments, and as to whether or no your department intends to enact and pass certain regulations covering that particular matter.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, I understand that these regulations are being formulated within the department now in consultation with the various fire chiefs.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, just a last parting word. If the Minister is not acquainted with the full history of the matter, I am sure that the Member for Wolseley could acquaint him with the inhibitions that municipal councils ran up against in trying to require the fire protection equipment to be used in certain establishments in Greater Winnipeg.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Wasn't he against it?

MR. GREEN: I can't recall.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (The balance of Bill No. 4 was read section by section and passed).  
Bill No. 5, An Act to amend The Vacations with Pay Act. Section 1 --

MR. FOX: Mr. Chairman, I spoke on this Bill in second reading on principle and it was also discussed in Law Amendments. I would like to introduce an amendment, but before I do I would like to make a few comments in respect to the amendment.

This amendment is to do with vacations with pay of three weeks after five years. I'd like to say this, that the government had recognized that this is a current practice. It is invoked in many agreements and it is also granted by the government itself to its civil service employees. I'm informed that they have three weeks right after one year. Now here we are discussing an amendment to The Vacations With Pay Act and we don't want to even consider it after five years, but I do think that it should be in this enlightened day and age that people should have vacations with pay of three weeks after five years.

Therefore I move, Mr. Chairman, seconded by the Member for Inkster, that Section 5 of subsection (1), Vacations With Pay Act, be amended by adding thereto after the word "pay" in the end line thereof the following: "And every employee who completes five years' service with an employer is entitled to a vacation of three weeks with pay."

MR. CHAIRMAN presented the motion.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment. If you refer to today's Orders on Page 13, Resolution 41, the resolution that I am proposing to this House, is almost along the same lines, to extend the vacation with pay. I think it is the general practice now established in some of the other provinces that legislation is in force where after five years the employees will be allowed to have three weeks vacation with pay. I think it is also known that in many collective agreements this is the established practice today, that after five years the employee will have three weeks holiday. So I think, Mr. Chairman, that it's the right time and that we look and give consideration to this, because if you recall last year in the Labour-Management Conference, at that time it was pointed out that many employees are leaving this province for other areas or other parts of Canada where they can obtain better wages and better benefits.

So for these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I wish to support the amendment. I think it's a good one and I feel that the government should give it serious consideration, and I hope that most members of the House will support this amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE: I wish to support this amendment, Mr. Chairman. I think it's only right and proper. I'm an employer; I give my employees three weeks vacation with pay after one year's service and I don't think we're asking the Province of Manitoba or the people of Manitoba to go out of their way when it's after five years, and I would ask every member in this House to support it.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to hear from the Honourable Minister on this point. Would this amendment if it were passed, would it have any effect on the budget that we're also considering this year for the province of Manitoba, and to what extent would it be affected? Because, by bringing in an amendment like this, you're automatically increasing the salaries of people across -- salaried workers across this province where this particular thing is not in effect. That is what it amounts to, and in my opinion, if an amendment of this type should be considered, I think notice should be given to the people of this province so that this would go into effect -- naturally, since this was already proposed in Law Amendments Committee and the government I think defeated it on that occasion, probably have the same pledge right now. But it would be my opinion if we were considering such a thing that certainly notice should have gone out to the people of this province so that they would be aware of what is being considered by this Legislature. I did not oppose this Bill when it went to second reading. Naturally it didn't contain the clause at that time. I would certainly be open to consideration of this but I would feel that the public should have notice, previous notice to such a change if it would be contemplated.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister - I'm not sure whether he's honourable or not, but the Minister - should make a few remarks about this amendment, particularly the point that was raised by the Honourable the Member for Rhineland. I don't think it will affect the budget of the province because, as has been pointed out in one area, I think we're providing it now in the terms of our agreement. But he does bring up a point as to the numbers of people that it might affect, and I know that when we pass this, not pass it but when we submit this resolution, basically what is being thought of is they're thinking of it in terms of the larger employers. Now I grant you that perhaps the Honourable Member for Selkirk is not in the class of a larger employer, but for the most part they're thinking of it in terms of the larger

April 18, 1969

(MR. WITNEY cont'd.) . . . . employers. And I feel when we've had so much lecture given to us during the past three or four days on the ability to pay, that we also have to consider the ability to pay of the small employer of this province who is employing people and giving them an occupation, and we can't just, in the term of 24 hours or so, pass an amendment which will add to the cost of the small employer, and there are many of them to whom we must pay some consideration and, I suggest, some respect.

When we take a look at the agreement that we have in the Province of Manitoba, those that are signed now - and we have analyzed about half of them, and yesterday I didn't talk on this matter because I wasn't too sure of what the statistics were, and besides I knew that this matter would come up in the Legislature again today at any rate, and why have to say it twice - but in the agreement that we have, and we've analyzed about half of them that we have, there are at the present time about 13 percent of them that provide for three weeks' holiday after a period of about three to five years. But I think it's noteworthy to note that there are some 43 percent of them that provide for three weeks with holiday after a period of five years - sometimes between 5 and 10 and in some cases up to 20 years. I think it is also noteworthy that there are some 44 percent of them that have just a straight two-weeks period with pay.

Now, first of all, if we adopt the amendment we're going to make some very major changes in those agreements that have been hammered out between the employer and the employee, and there should still be left some room for the employee and the employer, either at the level of the big company and the union or at the level of the small employer and his staff, such as the honourable Member for Selkirk, to negotiate on some of these matters.

We have provided a minimum benefit here of two weeks which is acceptable pretty well across the country. The only province to have made any change in it has been the Province of Saskatchewan. We consider that the Vacation with Wages Act or the Vacation with Pay Act we have now is a good Act. It has worked well over the period of years, and we can see for the reasons that I have given: one, that if we make this change now we are going to be affecting some - well a large number of agreements where there has been a debate between the employer and the employee; and secondly, and all of a sudden on the small employers in this province who do provide a service in employing people, we are going to put an added cost.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Chairman, I wasn't going to speak on this, Mr. Chairman. I've already spoken in Committee. But after listening to that circumcised logic coming from the Minister of Labour I can't help but get up and say a few words. He started off by saying he's concerned about the big employer - that was a slip of the tongue - and he quickly side-stepped and he started talking about the small employer. And you know, Mr. Chairman, when he talks about the small employer it's the same argument, the same garbage he's been giving us when he talks about the minimum wage. He's always so concerned about the little employer, but it's not true. That's just half the truth. But, in order to sell this nonsense in this House, he's got to come out and say: "I'm so concerned about the little guy." But once in awhile he slips and he tells us what he really means. These same people that aren't paying the three weeks' vacation are the very same people that are paying a lousy minimum wage, which is economic slavery and he knows it. And he's got the gall to get up there and defend these people.

You have union agreements, and one of the first things in the union agreement, they negotiate higher wages, so these employees have reasonable . . . of compensation there. On top of this they get three weeks vacation. The people who can least afford to take a vacation, he wants to deny them any vacation at all. Now if you go along with this -- and it's only after five years. I don't know how many employees this would affect but I thought sure your department could find this thing out. It's not asking too much to give these employees three weeks with pay after working for those miserable wages throughout the whole year. I don't know how you could sit there and talk the way you do. It's nonsense! It's the same nonsense as the former Minister talked for the time he was in there. I don't think he's got a clue what he's talking about.

There's also the people involved in -- oh I'm sorry, this is on 11 (a) I was going to talk. That's all I have to say on this matter.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, just before the matter is voted on, I would like to rise and state that I will oppose the amendment because I feel previous notice should be given in such cases as this, because this would be a mandatory pay increase and a matter that requires notice.

MR. GREEN: . . . the honourable minister indicated that there were 13 percent of the agreements that provided for the three weeks after five years, now? Am I correct in his statement that 13 percent of the agreements provided for three weeks after five years at the present time? Did I get that correctly. I just want to make sure?

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, we have analyzed about half of the agreements that are present in the province at the moment, and of that half we have found about 13 percent of them are in this position.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, this statistic doesn't mean very much and I wish the Minister would have been able to say how many employees are now entitled, by collective agreement, to three weeks after five years, because I think if we were dealing with a number of employees rather than the number of collective agreements, we would probably find that there are a great many more employees who are entitled to three weeks after five years than 13 percent, and I don't really place a great deal of stock in that particular statistic even if it was very favourable in my direction rather than in the Minister's, because that's not the question that we're deciding here. The Minister appears to suggest that we're interfering with the free collective bargaining process, but Mr. Chairman, all of the standards which we set with regard to wages - and we must remember that only roughly 33 percent of the employees in the Province of Manitoba are organized - that all of the standards are meant to provide minimum standards; therefore every time we legislate minimum wages we, to some extent and for some of the agreements that are on hand in the labour department, we legislate a change in those collective agreements, because those are the -- some collective agreements, as indicated by the Minister of Labour last year, provide for the minimum wage, so I really don't think that the question of interfering with collective agreements is involved.

I think what is involved here is: what do the legislators of Manitoba consider to be a fair vacation period for a person who's worked five years? And once that is set, Mr. Chairman, that will affect every employee in the province including those covered by collective agreements, which may be 33 percent of the people. It will include the other 67 percent of the people and it will include some people whose collective agreements now don't provide for that advantage. So I don't feel that the Minister need fear. He can take it from someone who -- with all modesty, Mr. Chairman, I think I know something about the collective bargaining procedure, and I know that the employers who are involved in collective bargaining and the employees who are involved in collective bargaining would not consider this to be an interference with the collective bargaining procedure. Some of the employers may be annoyed that the standard is raised somewhat, but I don't think that they would say that you have interfered with the sanctity of their agreement as between them and the employees, and I would venture to say, Mr. Chairman, that not a single trade union which is involved in collective bargaining would complain that the standard - that is, the minimum standard - from which they could then bargain in addition - after all, the Minister knows that there are many collective agreements which now provide three weeks after one year. They provide something in addition to the Act. So if he is concerned with interfering with the collective bargaining procedure, let me, as one who knows something about that procedure, assure him that this is not the case, and let him consider the matter strictly from the point of view: what should be the holiday period allowed for a person who's worked five years? And I think that certainly three weeks is not too lengthy a period.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to add a few more comments. You know, I would agree with my colleague the Member for Inkster. If the Minister had given us a percentage figure of the number of employees involved who have the three weeks after five, we certainly would have been doing this House a service, but just speaking from figures that I have been able to ascertain, I am informed that the greatest majority of the labour force today enjoys three weeks after five, or even after less than five years. You can take your bank people, you can take your civil service, which is one of the largest sections of our labour force here in Manitoba alone which enjoys this. In almost all of the office areas of employment this is the case, and there are no agreements involved in these, like the Member for Selkirk mentioned. I'm sure he doesn't have a working agreement with his staff but nevertheless he already provides this -- (Interjection) -- After one year, or after two years. Nevertheless he already provides it under the five-year period that we are asking, which is only a minimum.

Now, if this province wants to be progressive, I think it's time that they did something

April 18, 1969

(MR. FOX cont'd.) . . . . of this nature. The Executive Secretary of the Federation of Labour was here before the committee the other day and he too stressed this point and requested that it be done. At a number of conventions that have been held in the past by the Federation of Labour, this point has continually been stressed. It will not affect the agreements that have been concluded to date because almost all of them already have it. There are the odd one that doesn't, that's true, but in most cases they have bargained for things in lieu of this and they can always turn around and get it if they need it where they have a working agreement.

Further, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say that we are here trying to legislate for those people who cannot negotiate for themselves, and if we want to be progressive, if we want to raise the standard of all our people, then this is the type of legislation we should be passing so that all our people can enjoy the sun once in awhile in Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN put the question.

MR. FOX: The Ayes and Nays, please, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the members. The motion before the Committee is the amendment to Bill No. 5, an Act to amend The Vacations with Pay Act, moved by the Honourable Member for Kildonan that section No. 5 of subsection (1) of The Vacations with Pay Act be amended by adding thereto after the word "pay" in the end line thereof, the following: "and every employee who completes five years' service with an employer is entitled to a vacation of three weeks with pay."

A COUNTED STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being: Yeas 21; Nays 27.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the motion lost. Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee has passed Bill No. 4 without amendments.

#### IN SESSION

MR. DOUGLAS M. STANES (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Brandon, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

BILL NO. 4, an Act to amend The Fires Prevention Act, was read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: It is now 12:30. I am leaving the Chair to return again at 2:30 this afternoon.