

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Thursday, April 18, 1974

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the Honourable Members to the gallery where we have 29 students of Grade 9 standing of the Oakville Elementary School. These students are under the direction of Mr. McConkey. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

We have 25 students of Grade 8 standing of the Laidlaw School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Landry. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Charleswood.

And we also have 60 students of Grade 6 standing of the Butterworth School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Jones and Miss Bodnarus. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Logan.

On behalf of the honourable members I welcome you here today.

Presenting Petitions. The Honourable Member for Radisson.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Petition of Jessie Ellen Gillespie, praying for the passing of an Act for the Relief of Jessie Allen Gillespie.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other Petitions? The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Honourable Member for Wellington I beg to present the Petition of United Health Insurance Corporation Limited, praying for the passing of an Act to Incorporate United Health Services Corporation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Petition of the North Canadian Trust Company, praying for the passing of an Act to Amend an Act to Incorporate The North Canadian Trust Company.

MR. SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions.

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

MR. CLEEK: The Petition of Investors Syndicate Limited, praying for the passing of an Act to Amend an Act to Incorporate Investors Syndicate Limited.

The Petition of Montreal Trust Company, praying for the passing of an Act respecting Montreal Trust Company.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; The Honourable Member for Radisson.

REPORTS OF STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the First Report of the Standing Committee on Economic Development.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Oh sorry.

MR. CLEEK: Your Standing Committee on Economic Development begs leave to present the following as their First Report:

Your Committee met for organization on March 19, 1974, and appointed Mr. Shafransky as Chairman. Your Committee has agreed that, for the remainder of this session, the quorum of the Committee shall consist of seven (7) members.

Your Committee also met on March 26, 1974; April 4, 1974; April 11, 1974, to consider such matters as were referred to it.

On April 18, 1974, your Committee considered and approved the Receiver's Report and Audited Financial Statements of The Pas Forestry Complex in Receivership for the nine months which ended 30th September, 1973.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gimli, that the Report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Ministerial Statements; Tabling of Reports. The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

TABLING OF CORRECTION ON REPORT

HON. RON McBRIDE (Minister of Northern Affairs) (The Pas): Yes, Mr. Speaker, yesterday when I made a statement on the winter roads situation I tabled some documents with that report. On the very last page of those documents in one of the columns there was a mistake in the transferring of figures to the printed material, and I'd like to table the corrections to those.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other Ministerial Statements or Tabling of Reports? The Honourable Minister of Mines.

TABLING OF FLOOD REPORT

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I've just received a flood report. I haven't even read it myself fully but I'd like members of the House to have it. It appears we're having difficulty in some areas and others are not bad.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Any other Ministerial Statements or Tabling of Reports? Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Questions. The Honourable Member for Riel.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. It's in relation to the statement by the industry yesterday respecting gasoline prices in Manitoba. I wonder if the government can indicate at this point in view of the approximate 9.8 cents increase per gallon on gasoline, whether the government has yet decided what program it will undertake to offset these increases, and whether it may apply to fields other than just gasoline?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Well, Mr. Speaker, as I indicated approximately two weeks ago the government had under policy consideration the possibility of cushioning to some extent the increase in those fuels that are subject at the present time to provincial motor fuel taxation on a basis that would utilize the increase in value of oil produced in this province by means of the dedication, if you like, of the increase in value of oil and the revenues to the Crown, by dedicating those incremental revenues for the purposes of subsidization or some reduction in the motive fuel taxes as they presently apply.

And I might add that we have arranged to meet, to receive views from the oil industry and we should be in a position to formulate policy and announce it some time toward the latter part of this month.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. I wonder if the First Minister could indicate whether the agricultural petroleum products, namely diesel fuel, and so on, will be subsidized in a manner, or is it being given consideration for subsidization similar to Saskatchewan, which would indicate at this time that there may be a differential in price at the border for agricultural fuels as something in the order of 7 cents a gallon.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member asks if consideration is being given to it, and the answer is that it is being considered, and the probable result may well be a degree of offset of price that would still however leave some differential as between Manitoba price and Saskatchewan price, but somewhat lower than the price for the same product in the other sister province to the east. I can't give any more precise indication than that at the present time. That's being considered all within the constraints of course of the available funds with which to do this having to be generated from the increased value of oil and revenue to the Crown as a result.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the First Minister . . . attributed to us a statement about a week ago or ten days ago, that the subsidization would be in the order of four or five cents a gallon, I believe.

The announced increase, or approximate increase of 10 cents, it's unclear as to whether it includes this approximate figure or not; and has he any indication as a result of the statement yesterday as to whether it does or not include some program that the government may have had in mind ten days ago. In other words, is the actual increase going to be 9.8 with the figure that the government's bringing about or are we really talking about 14 cents a gallon without some subsidization?

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I can shed only some light on that particular question. The figure that is being referred to as 9.5 cents would be the total increase at the very maximum, and in that connection I did have some discussion with the Federal Minister of Energy to attempt to ascertain whether the federal authorities had a more precise view by now as to what the total all inclusive price increase would be. I might add in that connection that it was not 9.5 cents but a figure more in the order of 8.5 cents. Any provincial application of revenues to offset that increase certainly would not be in the order of four or five cents as we understand the ratios or proportions now, but something probably in the order of three cents, and I do not recall ever speaking in terms of four or five cents.

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

MR. J. PAUL MARION (St. Boniface): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct my question to the Honourable the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs. Has the Minister received a request from the Town of Powerview for financial assistance to reconstruct their destroyed arena?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs) (Springfield): Yes, Mr. Speaker. An additional grant through capital -- a capital grant, that is, through the lottery funds made available, is authorized as of today.

MR. MARION: Can the Minister advise the House of the amount of the grant being made?

MR. TOUPIN: An additional \$20,000.00.

MR. MARION: A last supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will the government undertake a supervision program once the reconstruction is undertaken to ensure that proper construction methods are maintained throughout the reconstruction program?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, that is not part of the responsibility of my department. Obviously some of this responsibility would fall under my colleague's department, the Department of Labour.

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

MR. TOUPIN: And, Mr. Speaker, . . . certainly would fall under the responsibility of the municipality that made application for the initial capital grant and the additional one that has just been authorized today.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARKY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable the First Minister. I wonder whether he could indicate to us what the present government's position is with respect to the sale of the Winnipeg Jets and the possible financing requests that have been made upon?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have nothing definite to announce in that respect. A proposal has been made to the province; the proposal has since been slightly amended. That matter is in its totality under consideration and when a position has been reached it will be announced; that may be within a matter of date. I would hope certainly early next week.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On another subject matter, I direct a question to the First Minister in his capacity as responsible for Urban Affairs. Is the government going to present any legislation during this session to reflect the recommendations of the Boundaries Review Commission report of Winnipeg that has just been tabled?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Honourable Member for Lakeside will find that in the legislation that is being brought forward with respect to the City of Winnipeg Act, there is included an amendment which will provide for the machinery by which any change in boundaries pursuant to the Boundaries Commission Report can be effected. In other words the enabling authority is in one of the two Acts, or bills rather that is before the House.

MR. ENNS: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. What is the vehicle that is intended to be used that will in effect bring about any proposed changes, boundary changes, as recommended in the report? Will it be done by -- authorized within the Act by City Council or by . . .

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the bill that is before the House -- there are two bills relating to the City of Winnipeg Act, to amend the City of Winnipeg Act, and one of the sections of those bills provide for the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to make changes in

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SCHKEYER Cont'd) boundaries and changes in name pursuant to the Boundaries Commission Report. I believe that it would be correct to say that this authority has existed with the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council in the past, since the inception of Unicity.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, if I may on this subject matter. Insofar as that some of the proposed boundary changes are pretty major, what kind of form will there be, if any, for public representation or presentation prior to the decision having been made?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I had discussions just earlier today with a member of the Boundaries Commission to receive advice as to the best mechanism for the presentation of views with respect to the report, and in that connection I have no definite statement to make at this time but again hope to be able to do so next week.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR (Virden): Mr. Speaker, I direct this to the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs. Can the Minister advise the House if the province is involved in the proposed purchase of Assiniboia Downs as an all-season race track by an interested purchaser?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. TOUPIN: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the honourable member for advising me of the question a couple of days ago. I've been able to check with officials of my department in regard to the involvement, or the non-involvement of the Department of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs, and I can inform the honourable member that the department itself is not involved in the purchase of the facility; would be involved in helping if at all possible the co-ordination of services being offered to the public by means of that facility, whether it be offered by the present or future owners.

MR. MCGREGOR: A supplementary. Then is the province seeking an equity position in the Downs?

MR. TOUPIN: Obviously, Mr. Speaker, the department having not been approached in regard to a shared financial responsibility in the facility, it is not seeking equity.

MR. MCGREGOR: Another question to the same Minister, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister inform the House if a decision has been made regarding the manner in which the hundred thousand dollars in horse breeder grants for 1973 and 1974 will be used to assist the industry in Manitoba?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, that's one question that I had not been advised of but I'll attempt to answer to the best of my ability. There's two \$50,000 that the honourable member is making reference to, one which was accepted by this House for the last fiscal year that ended on March 31, 1974, and has still not been allocated and is being held in trust. There's a new 50,000 before us now in the Estimates for this fiscal year that we're now in, and I'm expecting recommendation from the industry, from the Horse Racing Commission in regard to the allocation of these funds to best benefit those involved in breeding of Manitoba bred horses.

MR. MCGREGOR: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister assure the House that the grants will be divided equally between the thoroughbred and the standardbred industry of this province?

MR. TOUPIN: At this point, Mr. Speaker, and not having received the recommendation of the Horse Racing Commission and others involved and concerned, I cannot give that assurance. I will look at all recommendations that do come to me. All I do hope is that once the grant system is arrived at and the allocation made to all those concerned, that I hope that it will benefit all those interested in horse breeding in the Province of Manitoba, and I stress that point, Mr. Speaker, because it is not the intent of myself or my officials to make funds available to benefit those from outside of the province wanting to race in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources responsible for flooding. Would the Minister advise the House and perhaps the media, where can the people apply for emergency flood assistance during after office hours?

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I assume that as the Minister in charge of Natural Resources I'm also responsible for sunshine, but I will pass the question to the Minister responsible for emergency measures.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the division of reporting responsibility in this matter is quite clear-cut. With respect to the assessment that takes place in terms of forecasting flooding, that is through the flood forecasting committee which in turn reports through the Minister of Mines and Resources, which is a logical arrangement. Insofar as emergency measures operations are concerned to combat flooding, that is through EMO, and as such I report on behalf of that particular activity, and I can simply say to the Honourable Member for Assiniboia that Operational Order No. 1 with respect to emergency measures relative to flooding has been activated, and they are on 24-hour operations, and there is each morning a situation report that is made by the media to residents of the province, and there is direct communication with those areas of the province, those municipalities where the problem is most acute. The number of course is the Emergency Measures Operations' switchboard.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary. There is some misunderstanding, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps I can repeat my question. Is the EMO office now staffed on a 24-hour basis? I believe that's what the Premier stated; I don't believe this was the case last night. My further question is: Is it the responsibility of the Provincial Government or the municipalities to offer accommodation and assistance in case of emergency at night to find living accommodation for people? Whose responsibility is it?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, under the Emergency Measures provisions, the authority, there is a plenitude of authority to the Emergency Measures co-ordinator to make all those kinds of arrangements, and accordingly it's a case of contacting directly or through the local municipality, as the case may be, to Emergency Measures; they are empowered to make whatever arrangements for combating floods or emergency accommodation as is required.

MR. PATRICK: One supplementary. I wonder if the Minister is aware that people have been making some calls and they're referred back to, from Emergency office to the municipalities, and municipalities are telling them to call the Emergency office. I wonder if the Minister is aware of that.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend has some specific cases in point, I would appreciate receiving same, or he could directly communicate them either way, directly communicate them to the attention of Mr. Jack Miller, the EMO co-ordinator, or to someone at the EMO headquarters who will insure that he's made aware of it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable the Minister of Colleges and Universities. It refers to the circumstances surrounding the termination of Mr. Gonick's contract as Director of FOCUS. I wonder if the Minister would care to clarify his answers given on Monday, April 8th, in the light of the comments of Mr. Gonick suggesting that the Minister had misled the House as to the facts of the situation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Education) (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I really could say very little more than I said then. I would presume that the honourable member is referring to the statement made that there may have been some pressure exerted upon the government, or upon me, not to renew Mr. Gonick's contract for the forthcoming year. I did read the story that I believe the honourable member is referring to, and there was reference to a meeting attended by representatives of the Federation of Labour, representatives of the Northern Manitoba Communities and myself, and Professor Gonick was there, and the whole purpose of the meeting was nothing more than to discuss ways and means in which the FOCUS program can be made to operate most effectively to the greatest benefit to the people in Northern Manitoba. But the purpose of the meeting was not one to deal with the question of tenure or of renewal of Professor Gonick's contract of employment.

MR. MCGILL: Yes, Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. At the meeting to which the Minister has referred between himself and Mr. Gonick, Dr. Orlikow and Mr. Len Stevens, could the Minister say whether at that meeting there was any discussion of a matter of union

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. MCGILL Cont'd) control over the FOCUS Programs?

MR. HANUSCHAK: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. In the light of Mr. Gonick's statement that he was prepared to relinquish tenure at the university to take a one year position with the FOCUS Program, can the Minister indicate the basis for his earlier statement that Mr. Gonick wanted a permanent position and was unwilling to leave the university?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day. The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. Can the Minister indicate, and I would note that he has attributed to us a statement very favourably on the side of the people trying to protect Maple Grove Park in St. Vital. Can he indicate what powers the Provincial Government might be able to bring to bear, or what efforts they might be able to exert to make sure that the Manisphere operation and the proposed race track do not get placed into Maple Grove Park, but rather go to the present site of the race track in western Winnipeg?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

MR. TOUPIN: Well I believe, Mr. Speaker, that one of the most effective ways of dealing with people's problems is to discuss these problems with them and persuasion is one good way. There could be additional matters brought forward pursuing those conversations with those concerned that would bring government participation to a greater extent, that I can't elaborate on at this stage.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder in view of the program announced by the Minister's department of protection of riverbank properties, whether this might also be brought to bear in saving the Maple Grove Park area as a park area.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: Well again, Mr. Speaker, that has to be looked upon in an over-all picture in a sense, and in wanting to acquire and protect riverbanks one has to make sure that he doesn't spend public money unwisely, and not pay prices for land that would be out of this world. So it's difficult to say at this time how fast the plans for the protection of riverbanks and development of same would happen, but that is certainly something that the Department of Tourism and Recreation and Cultural Affairs could look at, tied in with the plan that we have before us now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the First Minister. In response to a question posed last week, last Wednesday by the Leader of the Opposition, he suggested that he would take into consideration the possibility of having the Ombudsman appear before a committee of this House. I wonder if he can now report to the House as to whether or not the government has given consideration to this question, and if an ombudsman will indeed appear before a committee of this Legislature?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, that is a matter which I will be in a position to respond to by Monday.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY (Fort Rouge): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to pursue further with the Minister of Tourism and Recreation his position in respect to the purchase of park land in the urban region of Winnipeg. I'm wondering, has the Minister or his Department yet taken any options or easements or negotiated any agreements with private owners for that riverbank, Red River bank land, so that in fact there is some legal or official obligation on the part of the province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, from the top of my head I can think of a few that I --(Interjection)-- I beg your pardon. Would the honourable member like to ask a question? Mr. Speaker, to be more precise I would have to take the question as notice, or if we do get all the estimates of the Department of Tourism and Recreation that I am quite sure that with officials here and with the report before us that we could be more specific.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister indicate to the House though whether the plans for the park are to retain the natural state or are they designed to be developed in terms of recreational athletic complexes, marinas, and so forth.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. TOUPIN: It will be some of both according to the recommendations before us. Some hopefully will be kept in their natural state, others will be developed for use of Manitobans wanting to use them for recreational purposes.

MR. AXWORTHY: I have another supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister tell us whether the province intends to provide for some form of public participation and involvement in the planning of the nature of these parks prior to their actual decision on the plans, so that they can determine the nature of them, particularly in those communities that are affected or in which the property is being purchased?

MR. TOUPIN: Yes, that is definitely the policy that I've had for myself in the last few years, although it didn't seem to work that well in other departments. I've done so in regards to Falcon Lake and West Hawk Lake, as the Honourable Member is quite aware, I gave him a copy of the letter where we've had discussions with groups that are interested in the development of the present facilities, and the same hopefully can be achieved with other groups surrounding the area that we are discussing now.

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

MR. MARION: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Honourable the Minister for Education. Does the Minister plan to take any initiative in an effort to keep both Tache and William Russell Schools in St. Boniface open according to the wishes of the parents of the children that attend these schools?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education. Order please.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Honourable Member well knows that to give effect to those wishes of the parents it's the School Board's responsibility and not mine.

MR. MARION: To the same Minister, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister advise the House if he has been given supporting material by the St. Boniface School Board to support their claim that \$100,000 would be saved if the two schools would be opened, would be closed rather?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question is asking for an opinion.

MR. MARION: I have another, Mr. Speaker, which I hope will be in order.

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

MR. MARION: Will the Minister accept the request, or has the Minister accepted a request by the parents of the children who attend both these schools to meet with them so that perhaps he can act as an arbitrator in this impasse?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. HANUSCHAK: . . . there is no provision for me in my capacity as Minister of Education to act as arbitrator in matters of this type. The Public Schools Act is quite specific on this matter, that the matter of selection of sites where instruction will be offered is one for the School Division Board to decide.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a couple of questions. I would like to direct a question in relation to the questions that were asked by the Member for Assiniboia. I wonder is it the intention of the government to pay compensation to those, particularly business places, that have been flooded, are now flooded in the Province of Manitoba? I refer particularly now to Melita where a large business area is now under water.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, this is not without some considerable recurring precedent in the past. There is a standing program to relate to that problem, and we would proceed in a manner that is consistent with the way in which problems of this kind have been handled before.

MR. WATT: I thank the Minister, First Minister for his answer. In the absence of the Minister in charge of Autopac and the Minister of Highways, I direct then my question to the First Minister. In view of the fact that the Minister in charge of Autopac, or the member in charge of Autopac has announced that there will undoubtedly be a further increase in the premium rates in Autopac, is this because of the no-fault section of the Act, or is it because of the condition of the provincial roads in the Province of Manitoba, which are now deplorable?

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to the spring of the year then quite a number of roads in this province, and the prairies for that matter, become in less favourable condition than during other seasons of the year. I think I share with the Honourable Member for Arthur the experience of being able to say that I've driven many miles over gravel roads, and some seasons of the year those roads are not as good as in other seasons of the year. We continue to try to make improvements, and you can never quite keep up with the problem.

Insofar as the other part of the question is concerned I would ask the Acting Minister for Autopac to see if he can give some more definitive reply.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs,

HON. HOWARD PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Selkirk): Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that the assumption that was being made by the Honourable Member for Arthur was incorrect. The Minister responsible for Autopac did not forecast an increase in rates, he only indicated that if present accidents increased in number would there be requirement for extra rate increases in future years. And I think that should be a self-obvious statement.

MR. WATT: Supplementary question then, Mr. Speaker. The Minister has already indicated --(Interjection)-- in charge of Autopac - that the accident rate has increased in the past two years. And my question is clearly, is it the no-fault factor or is it the fact of the roads?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, what the honourable member is dealing with is a nation, in fact a North American phenomenon, and that is the rapid increase in accidents due to additional vehicles, congestion on the highways, and the fact that a larger percentage of younger drivers in the 16 to 25 year old bracket are driving now, not only in Manitoba but everywhere else as well, though in larger proportions in Manitoba than ever before.

MR. WATT: Is it not correct, Mr. Minister, that when Autopac was brought in, it was brought in with the understanding that the rates would be less, that we would get - our rates were less and they've already increased, and there is a forecast of a further increase now.

MR. SPEAKER: Question please. The Honourable Minister.

MR. PAWLEY: The fact is that they are presently less in most instances than they were away back in 1971 even, even with the increase.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable the Minister of Labour. Can the Minister bring the House up to date on the strike threat situation at the Health Sciences Centre?

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Just to the effect, Mr. Speaker, there is no strike. The conciliation officers of the Department of Labour are meeting with the parties concerned hopefully of having the matter resolved before May 1st.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, can the Honourable Minister of Labour bring the House up to date on the situation at Tudor House Personal Care Home? Has there been a report released by the Industrial Inquiry Commission in that situation?

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have received a report from the Industrial Inquiry Commission and I will very shortly be transmitting to the union and to Tudor Homes the results of the report that was made to me by the Commission.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister be tabling that report in the House at approximately the same time?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, there is no requirement for the Minister of Labour to table the report in the House.

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

MR. WALLY JOHANNSON (St. Matthews): Question for the Minister of Mines. In view of the great concern shown yesterday by the Member for Wolseley concerning the Auditor's Report on Churchill Forest Industries, could the Minister . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. JOHANNSON: . . . could the Minister inform the House as to the reasons why the Honourable Member for Wolseley didn't bother showing up at the Committee this morning?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, on a matter of privilege.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: Of which?

MR. JOHNSTON: I don't want to have stand on the record the inference by my friend from St. Matthews that the reason the Member for Wolseley and our Leader was not at the Committee this morning is - the reason is he's not on the Committee. Well, my matter of privilege is that the inference is that every member of this House should attend every committee meeting whether or not he's on the committee or not. That's erroneous.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. That is not a matter of privilege. Order please. It is not a matter of privilege, so what are we debating? The Honourable Member for Fort Garry. The Honourable Member . . .

MR. GREEN: It stood on the record that because a member is not at a committee, is not a member of a committee, that he cannot attend a committee meeting. Well that is . . . He has been, Mr. Speaker, at that committee asking questions on previous occasions.

A MEMBER: That is right.

MR. GREEN: Of course. That's what I'm saying.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable the Minister of Labour. Regardless of requirements, will the Minister table the report into the Tudor House situation in the House?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney-General responsible for Manitoba Liquor Control Commission. Would the Minister request the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission to re-evaluate its proposal for a new Main Street store outlet in view of the official objection of the City of Winnipeg Council?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that - first I'm not informed as to whether or not the city has in fact disapproved the application. --(Interjection)-- In fact I hear from my colleagues that in fact it's been approved by the City of Winnipeg, and so if that is the case then I don't think there's anything further to answer to the Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary. Would the Attorney-General consider asking the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission to withhold entering into a long-term lease for rental of premises on Main Street until he re-evaluates to see if the store is necessary himself, to see if the new store on Ellice Avenue would not serve the clientele of that, the Main Street clientele?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have extreme hesitancy when it comes to determining whether or not a store, or an operation in one particular locality or area of the city is needed or not when I have a commission which has my full confidence, given my full confidence to make these type of determinations. I would be a little concerned that to personally become involved in evaluating the need for a particular store in a particular area after detailed analysis by the Commission, might be pretty irresponsible conduct on my part.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Under the Legislation is the Minister not entitled to ask for any report from the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission?

MR. PAWLEY: Yes, and to the Honourable Member from Assiniboia I have requested and received a report dealing with that store, and I am preparing to deal with that report either in my estimates or some other time pursuant to the questions the honourable member has asked previously.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the First Minister and ask him if he has received copies of letters, one dated April 15th and one dated April 18th, the most recent letter coming from the Canadian Association of Industrial Mechanical and Allied Workers signed by Mr. Patrick McEvoy, complaining about conditions, working conditions, in the Flyer Coach Industry plant which is owned and operated by the taxpayers of this province. They request an investigation into the management and I wonder if the Minister is going to take the matters that are raised in this letter into consideration and conduct such an investigation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, such a letter which would be making certain contentions with respect to conditions of work, or having to do with provisions of collective agreement, etc., would be referred to the Minister of Labour and to the Minister responsible for the particular Crown corporation. And I assume that my colleagues have, or will soon receive, will soon receive a copy of that letter for them to consider. I have no comment to make beyond that at this time.

MR. JORGENSEN: I wonder if the First Minister is aware that the Minister of Labour yesterday refused to do anything about the matter when I brought it to his attention yesterday.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. My honourable friend in his typical fashion referred to a letter presumably from Mr. Patrick McEvoy who is the representative of K-Mart. The matter that was raised by my honourable friend from Morris yesterday dealt with a letter that was not signed except with, "a few concerned workers" and not by an individual. I explained to my honourable friend yesterday that I couldn't answer the letter because I didn't know to whom to send it or to where. There was no address. And now my honourable friend refers to specific letters addressed to the First Minister by an individual. When they reach my desk, as I am sure they will in view of the reply of the First Minister, then they will be dealt with.

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . ask the Minister of Labour? When I raised the question yesterday, he refused to take any action.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. ORDER, ORDER. Order please. I'm sure the honourable gentleman is totally aware that the question period is not for making statements, yet he continually does that. Now does he wish to be named. I'm intelligent enough to realize he knows the rules. I don't know why I have to argue with him the most on this particular issue.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I disagree with your suggestions . . . on the question. But if somebody on the other side shouts at me I can shout right back, Sir, but when the Speaker does that I have no alternative. I suggest, Sir, that I have a right in this House to ask questions and expect at least respectable answers. My questions were based on two letters, one arriving yesterday and one arriving today. The second one which I have now drawn to the Minister's attention, I am asking if he's going to take action on it and that's all I can ask. And further, Mr. First Minister, I have the right to ask that question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, if the question is asked of one of my colleagues then of course I'm confident my colleagues will answer in the proper manner. It may not please my honourable friend the Member for Morris, the particular answer may not, but it will be dealt with. However, Sir, I must rise to your defence because Hansard will show that the way in which the question was addressed was prefaced by a very long preamble, completely contrary to the rules of practice in this House, and contrary to citations of Beauchesne. If someone must come to your defence, Sir, I certainly am prepared to because there was blatant violation of normal practice.

Now insofar as the specifics of the question are concerned, Sir, if the letters were addressed, datelined yesterday and today, to my office, they will presumably be in my office some time this afternoon and will be if they are - there's a problem with the mails I understand, but let us assume this afternoon or tomorrow, and copies certainly will be referred to the appropriate Minister or Ministers. I am confident that the Minister of Labour will take appropriate action which may not necessarily be the kind of action that the Member for Morris is anticipating.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BOB BANMAN (La Verendrye): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Honourable the Minister of Public Works. In light of the fact that spring is now here and some of the civil servants and public employees are energy conscious and riding their bicycles to work, would the Minister check as to the feasibility of providing bicycle stands for those employees?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

HON. RUSSELL J. DOERN (Minister of Public Works) (Elmwood): Mr. Chairman, we do provide bicycle stands and I'll see that they're put out.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: I have a question, Mr. Speaker, for the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Is the Minister able to confirm whether the Manitoba Mineral Resources Limited has made a significant oil discovery in the Kaufman Lake, Farewell Lake area which is northeast of The Pas. Is it prepared to announce that, or discover it very soon?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the President of the Corporation will be before committee very shortly and he will be able to tell the members of the House who represent the shareholders of his company, just what he has been able to achieve in the past year.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Brandon East):

Mr. Speaker, a short time ago the Honourable Member from Charleswood asked a question of me to the effect - he asked whether it was customary for the Department of Industry and Commerce to ask for prices from dealers in the Province of Quebec for equipment to help new business set up in Manitoba when this equipment is available in our own province. He says, I mean a direct request for prices from the Province of Quebec for products that are handled in the same trade name in the Province of Manitoba. I want to inform the honourable member that I can assure him that our procedure is first of all to determine whether or not equipment is manufactured and available in the Province of Manitoba, and in this case it was not. Therefore the Manitoba entrepreneur planning to set up the manufacturing plant asked us to obtain quotations on the required equipment from several out of province manufacturers, including the one referred to Joseph Poitras and Son in the province of Quebec. We also looked for a Manitoba dealer for the required equipment in order to ask him for a quotation, and in this case the entrepreneur, that is the potential manufacturer, nor ourselves could determine who the local dealer was for this company. If the machinery is not made in Manitoba, and we do not know the Manitoba dealer for the required equipment from outside of Manitoba, then we write directly to the manufacturer which was the case here, and this does not cut out the Manitoba dealer for the equipment however, if one exists, because the manufacturer usually refers the inquiry back to the appointed agents, and in this case Joseph Poitras and Son did not reply to us but referred our letter to the Manitoba dealer, his Manitoba dealer, T.S. Taylor Machinery Company, and he in turn got in touch with the entrepreneur. I should also mention, Mr. Speaker, we supplied information on requirements to local dealers of another Quebec firm and two Ontario firms, and copies were sent to manufacturers. This point, Mr. Speaker, it's up to the entrepreneur to decide where he's going to place his order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Honourable the Minister of Finance. Will the Minister consider bringing in legislation this Session to reduce the automotive fuel tax in order to soften the blow of higher gas prices to the consumer?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance) (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, I do recall that the Honourable the First Minister has made certain statement about considerations being given about the government in relation to the increased cost of petroleum products, and I think that I would rest on what was said by the First Minister and what will develop in the future as to government policy.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well can the Minister tell us whether or not anything will be introduced this session in that regard?

MR. CHERNIACK: At this stage I'm not prepared to make any forecast.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable the Attorney-General. It's with respect to the Ray Report on the recommendation not to sell beer in grocery stores. Could the Minister tell the House what the qualifications were of Mr. Ray, and could the Minister also inform the House as to the cost or the contract price for the study?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, in respect to the second part of the question I think an Order for Return would be most in order. Dr. Ray is inquiring into a number of different areas pertaining to the Liquor Control Commission, this is only one part of the total. He's still looking into some other aspects that require consideration.

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. PAWLEY Cont'd)

As to his qualifications, etc. they were enumerated I believe earlier. I'm prepared to obtain the list of qualifications and material. I would simply like to add that on the basis of what I thought was a very scholarly and balanced approach to the total question which he outlined the pros and the cons of the issue, I was impressed, not necessarily agreeing with the recommendations, but I was impressed with the input by Dr. Ray into the report.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Another question to the Attorney-General, Mr. Speaker. Will the government be following the recommendations and not introducing any changes in the Liquor Control Act in this regard?

MR. PAWLEY: If the honourable member is referring to the specific matter of sale of beer and wine in grocery stores, this entire subject matter still has to be discussed by Cabinet, or the Executive Council, and by our caucus. Let me say this, that I am persuaded by the need to first obtain public response to the report of Dr. Ray. I hope that the tabling of this report in the House yesterday will encourage participation and debate by the public. I am looking forward to obtaining letters and comments from the public, and then when obtaining a suitable degree of response, then I would want to at that time discuss the matters pertaining to Dr. Ray's recommendations at Cabinet level.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - GOVERNMENT BILLS - NO. 27

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would now call the bills, second readings, in the order in which they appear on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Bill No. 27 is open. Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. EARL MCKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words on the second reading of this bill and express a few thoughts of my own regarding the passing of this bill which will completely change the lottery in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, the passing of this bill I think that - I was one of the ones that voted against this bill in the initial stages and I would hope that maybe I was wrong at that time, proven wrong at that time, because many good things have come out of this lottery, and I happen to be one of those that bought tickets, not all the time but most of the time, never won anything yet, and I don't suppose I ever will win anything in this particular because I'm not that lucky, but I realize that people are gambling, people in this Province of Manitoba, and are willing to take a chance. And they're willing to take a chance for a very good reason that they want to improve their own financial position as free enterprisers. And I can never understand how socialists could go for lotteries because it's against their philosophy. Socialists have got the philosophy they want to make everybody equal; the last thing they'd want to do is give a man a quarter million dollars. But lo and behold the very same socialists want to make somebody in the province rich, and maybe that's where I was wrong at the time. I never really dreamt that they'd be paying out \$150,000 prize money, but socialists want to make people rich. I don't know why they want to make them rich only that maybe they think they'll get some of that succession duty tax money at a later date, or gift tax at a later date where they can get their hands in the individual's pocket.

But one of the problems may be that they weren't good enough salesmen in Manitoba. It watched over the last few years, most of the prize money has gone out of the Province of Manitoba with the exception of once or twice when the first prize money came into the Province of Manitoba. But most of the prize money went out of the province, and why did it go out, Mr. Speaker? Simply because 70 percent of the tickets were sold outside the Province of Manitoba. Seventy percent of the tickets were sold outside the Province of Manitoba. I cannot figure out why you would want to go for this new lottery over Western Canada. I can't figure out.

Mr. Speaker, the Government of Manitoba through their wisdom saw fit not to recognize the Olympic Lottery. I don't think much money came into the Province of Manitoba but I would assure the Government of Manitoba that many tickets were sold, many of those ten dollar tickets were sold. And I'm sure that some day if this Olympic Lottery continues that maybe that million dollars will come into the Province of Manitoba. Now I don't know whether that million dollars will come over here in River Heights where some of the

BILL 27

(MR. McKELLAR Cont'd) millionaires in the Province of Manitoba live, but wouldn't it be a wonderful thing if it did some into the Province of Manitoba and see somebody in the constituency of Transcona or Selkirk, or maybe the Minister of Finance's constituency, and God bless them if they won that million dollars. God bless them. I couldn't see for the life of me why Manitoba wouldn't want to recognize the Olympic Lottery. Do they not recognize the Olympic Games that are going to be played in 1976, or do they want to ignore that Olympic Games and not recognize the Olympic Games are going to be played. I think we're all Canadians first, maybe Manitobans second, but if we're in favour of lotteries let's be in favour.

Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons why I got up to speak is because one of the famous lotteries in the Province of Manitoba, the Wawanesa Sweepstakes will not be able to function in the year 1975, will not be able to function because of the laws that we're passing here under this bill. Mr. Speaker, the Village of Wawanesa, and I don't have to tell the people here because they know more about it maybe after I've finished speaking over the past number of years. Five hundred people, five hundred people with one of the most successful Lion's Clubs in the Province of Manitoba, and why are they successful? Because they've got dedicated people who are interested in their community, dedicated people. But what's going to happen to the lottery after this government gets finished with it? They won't be able to operate, they won't be able to operate; they can't function after this, because I tell you, this law is bad, the law is bad. Mr. Speaker, do you realize that the Village of Wawanesa through their Lion's Club have distributed seven tons of householder mail all over Canada this last week, and I only hope that it got there and not because of the strike that's taken place down here on Smith Street right today. Seven tons of mail went out, was sent out and distributed by the Wawanesa Lion's Club.

Mr. Speaker, they made over \$50,000 profit last year after paying \$50,000 in prize money, and commissions over top of it. This is the contribution that they're making to their village and their community, and hoping to construct a rink there in the Village of Wawanesa, which is badly needed. But after the year 1974 they will not be allowed, not be allowed to operate their lottery because they want a monopoly, the Government of Manitoba wants a monopoly. They want a monopoly, and I tell you I'm against monopolies. The only way, and the only successful way this country will ever function is competition, competition. And the best thing that could ever happen to lotteries in Canada in my opinion would be for every province to have a lottery. Let them sell them anywhere, let them sell them anywhere. My God, who's buying our Sweepstakes tickets? Who's buying tickets of every kind? There are Sweepstake tickets being sold, and I tell you there's nobody ever challenged yet that there are sweepstake tickets being sold in this country, and they're sold everywhere, you can buy them anywhere. They're not going to stop tomorrow. Whose worried about the Criminal Code? They're not worried about the Criminal Code, and I would safely say that a large majority of the tickets, of Irish Sweepstake tickets are sold in Canada, and they'll continue to be sold in Canada simply because the Criminal Code will not stand up, will not stand. And who's worrying about the Criminal Code? Nobody's worried up to now, nobody's worried up to now. Only the Minister of Tourism who is going in on this new plan, trying to set up this

. . . .
Mr. Speaker, I'm speaking for another reason. I'm speaking on behalf of the Royal Canadian Legion, which I'm not a member, but I'm speaking on behalf because I'm on the Board of Directors of the International Peace Gardens; I'm on the Executive of the International Peace Gardens. In the International Peace Gardens this year, there's going to be a building officially opened, a \$350,000 sports building, which will be used by all the youths of our province and other provinces in Canada, and we're hoping the states in the United States, to help make our youth better citizens in our communities; and I'm telling you this great program the Royal Canadian Legion has developed, a four week program, is really something to behold. And I would welcome everybody in this Chamber here to go to the International Peace Gardens this summer and when the Legioners' program in the month of August is functioning and it's really worth your effort, I'm sure, to see these boys and girls of our many provinces in Canada, operate and being trained to make them better citizens, as I mentioned, in the coming years.

Mr. Speaker, this building will be a great success I'm sure. And I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, it's the only time in history when Canadian money has been spent on a building

BILL 27

(MR. McKELLAR Cont'd) being built on American soil, built on American soil, and it's a half a mile south of the Canadian border, and it's really something when Canadian money has been expended on American soil. I think it's the best accomplishment that could ever have been done, and it was done through lottery money. And I see in the report that came out under Votes and Proceedings where they took in \$623,000 worth of money, commissions, and I understand they made \$400,000 worth of profit - \$350,000 of that profit's gone into that building, and another \$50,000 will go into equipment which is needed there in the functioning of their programs. I would say to George Phillips and Fred Taylor, the founders of this program, congratulations and good luck with the new building.

MR. TOUPIN: Will you permit a question?

MR. McKELLAR: Sure, sure.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable Member from Souris-Lansdowne, I mean Souris-Killarney, why would he assume that the bill before us, which is permissive legislation, would actually cause the Department of Tourism and Recreation and Cultural Affairs to set up a compulsory and a monopoly lottery scheme in the Province of Manitoba when I did indicate during the presentation of the bill on second reading that there would be agencies involved and keeping in consideration the same level of commissions paid, the commissions, or the revenues to the agency would remain the same.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I'll answer that question by saying it sounds good but they're only going to get the commissions that they sell on the tickets that are sold in their own province. Let's be honest. Do you think that the Royal Canadian Legion hasn't got people all over Canada selling tickets today? Do you think that the St. Boniface Mohawks haven't got people selling tickets all over Canada? Do you think that the Winnipeg Citizens', or Manitoba Citizens' Campaign Committee haven't got agents, people selling tickets all over Canada? This is competition. They're competing with each other selling tickets. Is this wrong? Is it wrong?

MR. CHERNIACK: Is it legal?

MR. McKELLAR: Is it wrong?

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes it's wrong. It's not legal.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you, there's good laws and bad laws, good laws and bad laws. If the law won't work, you change it.

A MEMBER: They should know that.

MR. McKELLAR: I want to say, I want to say that it just won't work. What you're saying is right in theory. What I'm saying, that only about 10 or 15 percent of our tickets are sold in Manitoba - 20 percent at the most. --(Interjection)-- Well 30 percent; you're saying 30 percent. They're going to get 30 percent of the commissions that they got previous, 30 percent. That's all they're going to get. If you fellows would cut the taxes, provincial income tax; if you cut the sales tax, people would have a lot more money to gamble with, and go to the racetrack, and buy sweepstake tickets. But lo, no; he takes 42 1/2 percent, and I've got to pay that Minister of Finance and about \$3,000 next week or I'm going to jail. So I tell, one of the finest things he could do to help community efforts is give more people more money to spend on their own. But he won't do that.

Mr. Speaker, you know the bill is drafted in such a way that everything's in regulation, everything's in regulation. Only the Cabinet will ever know what's going to happen. Only the Cabinet will ever know what's going to happen. And I tell you, I tell you, if you want to confuse it a little more than what it is, well let's put it all in regulation. Why bother passing a bill? Why bother passing a bill? They're going to prescribe the form of lottery. They're going to prescribe the amount and value of each prize to be awarded; they're going to prescribe the money or other valuable considerations to be paid to secure a chance to win a prize. They're going to prescribe the manner in which the lottery tickets, if any, are to be sold to the public, see? They're going to restrict the amount of money to be realized and the conduct and management of each lottery scheme, and so on down the line. So on down the line. But you've got to realize, there's three other provinces, three other provinces are going to have a say in it. Then I think one member mentioned that sure, maybe the Manitoba Lotteries Commission are going to run it right now, but it's safe to say the other provinces will be selling at least 80 percent of the tickets, 80 percent of the tickets in the four

BILL 27

(MR. McKELLAR Cont'd) western provinces. That's what will happen. That's what will happen. We'll be selling 20 percent. And it works out that -- You figure that out in proportion to the population. Twenty percent we'll be selling. They're going to tell whose side who's going to run the lottery after about 1975; 1975 they'll make that decision.

Mr. Speaker, the right thing to do, if you got a good thing going, why change it? Why change it? They say the Criminal Code wouldn't permit them to sell tickets. I'll bet you any money, Mr. Speaker, that there are receipt takers selling tickets in Canada ten years from now. I'll bet you any money there are. --(Interjection)-- You're the Attorney-General. If there is something wrong you are supposed to take action.

A MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. McKELLAR: Have you taken any action against Irish Sweepstakes? I've never heard the Attorney-General laying charges against the Irish Sweepstakes, because you know why? Do you know why? He doesn't allow this. He doesn't allow this, and I tell you he won't either. He won't. And the money will continue to flow to Ireland and the prize money will come back from Ireland, and everybody will be having them. Everybody will be having them. And you shouldn't ruin a good thing. Why change legislation? Why change it? Why change it? But the government wants to change it. The Minister -- and I don't know; you know, the thing that bothers me about this, I don't know whether to blame the present Minister of Tourism and Recreation or blame the former Minister of Tourism and Recreation. I don't know who to blame. The trouble is I can't get at the other one; the only one I can get at is this one here, and I think that he owes something to the Province of Manitoba for even suggesting a bill like this. For even suggesting it. In fact I think when we get to his Minister's Estimates, I think we should reduce his salary to \$1.00 and I think that is the way to get at him. In fact I think a dollar would be a little too much, maybe 99 cents. Mr. Speaker --(Interjection)-- well he sure is skating on this bill anyway, I tell you.

But the difference is he's playing games with the village of Wawanesa and he's playing games with all of the lotteries that are operating in the province of Manitoba, and this is not right. This is not right. Competition is the staff of life. The government have never learned that. They have never learned that. Compulsion will never work. Compulsion will never work; you've got to have competition, and only under those rules will our economy in our country work. My God, if I didn't have somebody to compete against when I get up in the morning and think that I've got to appoint a Socialist some day during that day, I'd never get through that day. That's the only thing that keeps me going. I'll tell you that, I tell you, if it was all compulsory then we are all Socialists in this Chamber. What would that be to live in? We'd be in Russia. We'd be in Russia. It's only the fact that we have something to work for, something desired to try to get ahead; at the end of that day and the end of that month and the end of our life will we survive. My God, why do the Hutterites -- you never see a Hutterite live beyond 65. You never see an old Hutterite. Why? Because he's got nothing to live for. There's nothing in his life. There's nothing lived. You never see an old Hutterite in the colony. So it's a simple fact of life.

That government, that government wants compulsion like you've never seen before, Mr. Speaker. They're going to get it because they've got a numbers game here, and I tell you, the people of Manitoba are going to decide this bill. The people of Manitoba are going to decide it, not us in here. They're going to decide it. Every member of the Royal Canadian Legion, every member of the Manitoba Citizens Campaign Committee, every member of the St. Boniface Mohawks, every member that belongs to every other organization is listed here in this year. They're the ones that are going to decide this bill, not the 57 members in here; and I tell you, God bless the whole works of them because they're great people. They're great people and they're going to be counted, the same as every citizen's got a right to vote. They're going to vote in the next election. Don't ever under-estimate that, Mr. Minister. They're the ones that are going to decide, and I tell you there's a lot of women in that list too, a lot of women in this list too, and they're powerful. In fact, we heard that through the . . . Womens Institute. I tell you, I tell you. You've got to recognize those people. You've got to recognize those people.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say right now to the government of the day, you've got a glorious opportunity. You've got a glorious opportunity. Let this bill die in second reading. You know, the House Leader doesn't even have to call this bill. You've got about 30 more days,

BILL 27

(MR. McKELLAR Cont'd) sitting days in this, and every day he can by-pass it. He doesn't have to call it. That's the easy way out. That's the easy way out. That's the easy way out, and I say to the government of the day, I say to the Minister of Labour, I say to the Minister of Labour; you are a member of the Legion. Yes. Have a second thought, and you suggest to the House Leader that he drop this bill. Drop it now. Because I tell you, it's the kiss of death for you. It's the kiss of death. In fact, you might think you are --(Interjection)-- Yeah, but I tell you, I tell you this is too important. I'm warning you and I'm serious. I'm serious. Because I tell you, there's a lot of people, a lot of people concerned and they have been phoning me, in large numbers too. And I tell you, I always heed the advice of the public because they're the most important people we have in the province of Manitoba. I suggest to the government they have second thoughts about passing this bill on second reading, because it's too important at this time to pass it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Souris-Killarney, that further debate on this bill be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, seconded by -- The Honourable Member for Killarney has spoken, you'll have to get another seconder.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I will call upon the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie to second my adjournment.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL 33

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 33, The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just take a few minutes on Bill 33, the Power Engineers Act, Mr. Speaker. I've gone through the bill and I have not noticed too many objections, I do have some reservations that I will ask the Minister and I know the legislation would provide for reciprocal agreements with other provinces. Naturally, Mr. Speaker, we have no argument with that. I know that such things as qualifications in the engineering field would be considered in this area. This Act replaces the present Operating Engineers and Firemen's Act and the Minister has called it the Power Engineers Act, and I would also pose a question to him why he is calling it the Power Engineers Act, because we've had stationary engineers, we've had operating engineers and the Firemen's Act and now it's the Power Engineers Act. If it is in line with what the other provinces have named their legislation, then I would have no argument with him. I know that I had before the House at the beginning of the session to change the Workmen's Compensation Act to Workers' Compensation Act, and it received some publicity and since that time I have received many letters from some people saying it should be called Employees' Compensation Act, so you may never be right. But I do believe on the Workmen's Compensation Act, if it had been changed in some of the other provinces to Workers' Compensation Act so that's what the Minister has chosen in respect to the Workmen's Compensation Act, but in respect to Bill 33 he has not indicated in his introductory remarks why he has chosen the Power Engineers Act. Is this in line with the other provinces? If it is, then I have no argument, but I hope that in closing the debate you will give us some indication why he has chosen that title.

The legislation would give the Minister right and powers to examine and issue and cancel engineering trade certificates, Mr. Speaker, and this seems to me some very extensive power given to a Minister -- and I am not particularly concerned about this Minister on putting it in any derogatory way, but I think that it's given him extensive powers. I do hope that the bill has enough appeal procedures either to the courts or to the Court of Queen's Bench where a tradesman, when he is suspended or has his certificate cancelled, that he has somewhere to appeal, because in this case it's not a board, the Minister has those wide discretionary powers, and I'm very concerned when there is no appeal and I hope there is appeal procedures.

The point that I would raise to the Minister is his discretionary powers in safety regulations in boiler rooms, and when he introduced the bill he indicated to the House that modernization in the field has resulted in explosion-proof boilers and full safe equipment with controls and, as a result, in many situations he will indicate or agree that there should be no qualified engineers in attendance in many of these places. Well, again, I have no argument with that but, Mr. Speaker, this is the point where I do caution the Minister and draw some concern,

BILL 33

(MR. PATRICK cont'd). . .because really, Mr. Speaker, the community benefits only through greater safety, the whole community, and to what extent have we in the Province of Manitoba and the other cities have now eliminated, say - what do you want to call them? power engineers or safety engineers - that they are not required, but I believe there should be someone on call if necessary, to be on call immediately on a 24-hour basis, and I would want the Minister in this area to proceed with caution because in many instances it doesn't matter how modern the equipment may be, but I think we must be concerned about safety in this field and I would like the Minister to perhaps assess the effects what has taken place in the area where there is no engineer required, what the accident ratio has been, and then what the safety record has been in these buildings, not only in perhaps our province but some of the other provinces. I'm sure this is the kind of information that his department must have available at hand, so I would like the Minister to give us some assurance that he will give us some indication and make sure that he is doing the right thing when he says, now it will be all new buildings, that there will be no requirement of a safety engineer on duty.

The other point, I understand, that he has also indicated to the House that this program, joint program, has been agreed to most provinces except the province of Ontario which, incidentally, has perhaps one of the better records as far as safety is concerned, and has he had any negotiation I would like to know why there has been no agreement with the province of Ontario. I meant Ontario, Mr. Speaker. Why there has been no, or is there still some indication that there may be an agreement. So with these points that I wanted to make to the House and a reservation, Mr. Speaker, I have no argument at all. I think that the legislation is progressive and it is in the right direction, but I do have two reservations and I hope that the Minister would be able to either give us the information or explain to the House about where I want to caution him in appeal procedures of work men, because the Minister does have very extensive discretionary powers that he will be dealing with.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour will be closing debate. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I first of all indicate the remarks that have been made by members in respect of this bill and the indication of their general support. I share with them that it is an important bill and that it is most desirable, if at all possible, to have uniformity across the country by way of examinations for people concerned in the field of endeavour that the bill refers to. I might say that the points raised by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, I can give him the assurance that the department is constantly inspecting power equipment and heating equipment in the buildings. It's an ongoing factor within the Department of Labour to inspect this.

I agree with the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, Mr. Speaker, that it does give wide powers to the Minister, and of course the reason, basic reason for this, Mr. Speaker, is because of the necessity of approval at the ministerial level of examinations and qualifications and the like across the Dominion, and that is the reason basically why it's vested with the Minister, that he is knowledgeable of other pieces of legislation and that uniformity can be achieved. It's my understanding that at the present time eight of our provinces have agreed to this type of legislation. Some of them have not as yet enacted the legislation, Mr. Speaker, but they have agreed with the general principles contained in this bill.

The Member for Assiniboia thought that there should be, seeing as the Minister had such widespread power that there should be an appeal from any decision he makes, and if my honourable friend will take a look at one of the sections in the bill on page 4 - I can't refer to the specific section - but he will see there that there is provision for appeal from the decision of the Minister insofar as refusal to issue a permit or to allow for an examination. So it's real there, it is in there and if my honourable friend is of the opinion that it doesn't go far enough, well then we can consider the matter further. Both the Member for Assiniboia and the member for Riel in their contribution to this bill made mention of the title of the bill and thought that possibly it should be called something else.

I want to indicate to the House, Mr. Speaker, I met this morning with four representatives of the Association of Power Engineers. They drew this to my attention and I assured them that we would give every consideration to possible change so that there will be no conflict and no misunderstanding as to the involvement of various people. At the present time we have in our Red River Community College a course which is a Power Engineers Course, and there is

BILL 33

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd). . . a certificate given as a result of completing the course. It may be necessary to even consider the possibility of a different title or description of that particular course.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I just have one question. If, say, an employee is coming in from another province, does he have to take examinations or can the Minister waive, at his own discretion, as to this person is required to take an examination in this province?

MR. PAULLEY: One of the purposes, Mr. Speaker, of the bill and the desires of the bill is uniformity of examinations and reciprocity of certificates across the various parts of the Dominion, and that is one of the objectives. If a person has passed an examination and is the holder of a valid certificate, he would not be required to take another examination in Manitoba. I think that would be the answer to my honourable friend.

As I indicate, Mr. Speaker, I have met with the Association of Professional Engineers and I have indicated to them that their proposal, similar to that of the Member for Assiniboia and the Member for Riel will be given every serious consideration to try and arrive at a name that is not in conflict with any other type of Power Engineers, having using that name at the present time.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry - I'm sorry he's not here because he is wont to sort of indicate to the Minister of Labour his fears, his apprehensions of the capability or the qualifications of the Minister of Labour. He is wont to rant and rave as to my deficiencies and in his contribution, if one can call it a contribution, to this act he was so ill informed as to consultation that had been taken with other people before this bill reached our desks at this session.

I want to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that this is not a bill that's just come out of the ozone in a short period of time. The bill has been in the process of drafting for two years. The Honourable Member from Fort Garry - and I'm going to quote from page 2473 of Hansard of April 16th: "My basic position with respect to the bill at the moment, Sir, is not one of opposition or criticism in terms of the principle of the bill. My fight, I'm afraid, as much as it pains me from time to time to say so, that my opposition is really with the - my fight really is with the Minister, and my opposition really is directed at him, because I think once again, Sir, the members opposite and the government opposite have demonstrated their amazing and their almost unchallenged capacity to act unilaterally without reference to anyone else in society in Manitoba. And this is what is happening again and again and now it's happening again." That's the contribution of a presumably intelligent member of this House, unknowledgeable of what had been going on over the past couple of years in respect of this bill.

Consultations, Mr. Speaker, have taken place with various groups of people who are concerned with this matter, over the last year or two. Consultations have been undertaken with the Operating Engineers Board, five members of the Association of Power Engineers, five members of the Craftsmen Council which deal with the matter of power engineers. Discussions were held with the Executive Secretary of the Manitoba Federation of Labour. Discussions were taken, held with Mr. D. G. Clooey of Vapor Canada in addition to these. Discussions were also held with Mr. Les Winder, Executive-Director of Mechanical Contractors Association of Manitoba; Mr. Hank Roy, Manager of the Mining Association of Manitoba; Mr. A. K. Stollard of T. . . Engineering Sales Limited, representing Claydon's Steam Generators; and Mr. Graves, President and the General Manager of the Saskatoon Engineers, Saskatoon Boiler Works. So there was widespread consultation, I want to inform my honourable friend from Fort Garry, and it is not something that has just, as I indicated a moment ago, come out of the hat, so as to speak. And I only wish to heaven that my honourable friend, before he goes into his usual tirades against me on a personal basis, would turn around and get the facts for himself because, as I have indicated, Mr. Speaker, consultations on a . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry state his matter of privilege.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, and that is a misinterpretation of whatever criticisms I may have directed at the Minister. I wish to assure him they are not now nor ever have been delivered on a personal basis.

BILL 33

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I again quote from Hansard of April 16, page 2473 in about the second paragraph attributed to the Honourable Member for Fort Garry. And I read back to him his own words: "I'm afraid, as much as it pains me from time to time to say so, my opposition really is with - my fight really is with the Minister and my opposition is really directed at him, because I think once again, Sir, the members opposite and government opposite have demonstrated their amazing and their almost unchallenged capacity to act unilaterally without reference to anyone else in society in Manitoba. And this is what is happening again and again, and now it's happening again." Of course, of course there's nothing personal. I only happen to be the Minister that he was referring to. Now how in heavens name can anybody take any other interpretation? And it's so typical of my honourable friend. But, Mr. Speaker, it's also very very typical that my honourable friend lacks any knowledgeability of half of his utterances and the statements that he makes in this House, and if that isn't an indication of direct reference to the Minister of Labour who introduced this Bill, I ask anyone else to give an interpretation of what that means. That doesn't really matter, does it? It doesn't really matter. I have simply proven to the House, or at least I think that I have proven to the House, that the criticism of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry was not founded on fact, that he didn't know what he was talking about, and that prior consultation had taken place over a considerable period of time between those concerned with the matter and as a result, Mr. Speaker, of those consultations, we have before us now a bill which I believe is acceptable to the industry as a whole. And it would not have been possible to arrive at this position had it not been for consultation with the Association of Power Engineers and those other people that I have mentioned that were consulted. I want to express my appreciation, too, Mr. Speaker. As Minister responsible for this department, I appreciate very much the involvement of the professionals and others in this particular area, and we have their support.

Now my honourable friend, my honourable friend, he was speaking, he made definite statements; he said, "to my knowledge and I stand to be corrected." Well, Mr. Speaker, that's very noble of my honourable friend and I am correcting him. And I repeat, I have checked with many people in the trade. There has been no consultation of a meaningful nature sought by the government. The craftsmen Council, for example, has not been consulted. Mr. Speaker, that was one of the groups that I referred to that weren't consulted by Mr. Lloyd Morrow, the Director of Engineering, Mechanical Engineering, in the Department of Labour. The operating engineers in the province have not been meaningfully consulted - another group that I referred to, Mr. Speaker, when I was documenting those that have had an input in arriving at the bill before this House.

The stationary engineers have not virtually been discarded. The trade union movement generally, I indicated consultation took place between the Executive Director of the Manitoba Federation of Labour, Mr. Arthur Coulter, as I documented a few moments ago.--(Interjection)--Well, I don't know. My honourable friend, speaking from his seat, says the rank and file don't know. That could be, Mr. Speaker. He didn't know. He didn't know either.--(Interjection)--No it doesn't make much difference, does it, Mr. Speaker?--(Interjection)--Yes that's right, sure. That's right. Meet the people. We're concerned with having an act that'll be able to allow the people to meet, not to be blown up, and that is the purpose of this particular act. We're more concerned with that. And if my honourable friend the Member for Fort Garry wants to take the approach that he does, and possibly the Member for Lakeside as well, that doesn't really jibe with me because we are concerned with safety in the equipment to be used in our buildings, and that is the reason that this act is here.

So, Mr. Speaker, I could, I guess, suppose I could go on and say a few more things about what has happened in the discussion on this bill. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a point of order?

MR. MCGILL: No, I wonder if the Minister would accept a question.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, sure.

BILL 27

MR. MCGILL: Relating to the powers under the regulations that the Minister now has, it's been brought to my attention that there is some problem arising from after-hours use of school buildings and the requirement to have an engineer on duty. Does this bill now give the Minister authority to deal with those specific problems as opposed to the regulations, which were somewhat inflexible I understand in the past, in that relation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I can't give a definitive answer to my honourable friend, but it is my understanding when there is high pressure equipment being used in a school in the evenings or the likes of that, it is a requirement that somebody competent be there or on immediate call, but I'd be glad to take--I would be glad, Mr. Speaker, to look into that more intensely for my honourable friend. That's my understanding. And I might say, at a meeting I held this morning with the Associated Power Engineers Association, one or two points were raised somewhat along that particular line, that I promised them too that I would take a look at, because of course safety is an ongoing concern 24 hours a day. So I thank my honourable friend for raising that matter and I'm sure that it will be checked into.

And I also, Mr. Speaker, should indicate that we've also had consultation with the Regional Director of Safety of the Federal Authority and one or two small points have been drawn to our attention and there may be amendments to be made in Committee to accommodate some of these areas that may have been overlooked, because of course I'm sure honourable friends will agree that every bill isn't perfect and of course that's why it goes out of the House to Law Amendments Committee for consideration of those concerned.

I do say, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the contribution made and the general support that is indicated for this bill in the interest of safety and uniformity across Canada.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL NO. 36

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 36. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to make a few comments on the bill and my comments are going to relate to, again, the lack of an amendment which I would like to see included in the bill that is before us, and that is the area which deals with the classification of assessments, and in particular where the assessment is classified as residential, agricultural land or others, and how it relates to the school foundation levy. It's my belief that the basic principle behind the differential in foundation levy for residential and agricultural land, which I believe is 9 mills or in the order of 9 mills, and the difference for every property such as commercial properties, golf courses, curling rinks and so forth that fall into that classification, that the basic reason for the differential, the 33 mills, is that at the time that the law or legislation was decided upon was that commercial businesses or commercial assessments would benefit directly by the technical abilities of the people working for them, by the educational abilities for the people working for them, and because the government was paying for the major portion of the education costs in our province they felt that commercial facilities or assessments should contribute at a greater extent to the education costs, and for this reason there was a difference between residential and agricultural assessments and other assessments as it's indicated in the act.

Now I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, how a curling rink or how a golf course which is a non-profit service or club in a community, in particular in the City of Winnipeg, how that basic principle could apply to such a facility. How are they making use of technical or educational backgrounds of people working for them and how are they profiting by them? I say, Mr. Speaker, that they are not. In the case of commercial assessment they are, and I can concur with the basic thinking in the present Act that there should be a differential and that the particular corporations or commercial assessments should pay some differential. But I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if, and the City of Winnipeg Council has indicated its desire to maintain golf courses, green areas within the city, and curling clubs to be able to continue to operate on their own rather than become under the control and financing and support of the city directly. They desire this feature, that we should give consideration to including such non-profit recreational facilities under that part of the classification of assessment which is charged the 9 mill levy rather than the 33. Because if, and I believe I am correct, the basic thinking at the time that a differential was struck in the Foundation Levy that commercial facilities who profit from

BILL 36

(MR. MINAKER cont'd) the educational and technical training of its employees, that they should contribute a little more than the residential owner or the family unit type of farm where it's basically done by the individual himself or his family.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that at the time the bill is before the Law Amendments Committee that we can receive an amendment to this bill that would include the classification of non-profit curling clubs and golf courses to be classified under that section that would be subjected to the nine mill foundation levy. And I would favour that if there are other communities, other municipalities, who have such curling rinks and golf clubs that they too should have this assessment classification, that they should benefit by this. Because, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion we do not, or I cannot see how a non-profit club of this nature profits and should have to pay a differential education tax.

And I can once again remind the members on the other side and my colleagues that what does this type of service contribute to our community? Well I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, in the City of Winnipeg that the curling clubs are probably the most used facility in the city during the months of September to probably the end of March, and they are enjoyed by the majority of people who take part in such activities in our city and if we compare them to publicly owned recreational facilities, we'll find that not all of our populace in the City of Winnipeg, or for that matter in the municipalities, in the rural areas, take advantage of the public-owned recreational facilities, yet they're paying for them and towards them.

And I suggest if we believe in the principle that the original reasons for striking the differential between commercial assessment and residential and agricultural is on the basis that a commercial facility profits from the people who work for it, the education those people have, then I can say this argument cannot apply to curling rinks or to golf courses, and for this reason they should not have to pay this differential; they should be considered as a recreational facility, part of the environment of a large urban centre, or part of the environment of a town, or part of the environment of a smaller city, and that we would like to see these maintained as part of the environment of these communities and not lost to land developers because of rising costs that are contributed to by this differential of the Foundation Levy. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that at the time we go into committee that we will have an amendment that will allow these type of clubs and services to be subjected to the same education levy as residential and agricultural lands. Thank you.

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

MR. MARION: Mr. Speaker, might I adjourn, move adjournment of this bill. I'd like to move, seconded by the Member for Assiniboia, that the bill be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 38

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 38. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address some comments on the bill before us, amendments to the City of Winnipeg Act. I'd like to begin by first addressing myself I think to the basic question that has to be faced by a provincial legislature when it comes to reorganizing or re-engineering the organizational structure of one of its constituent members, particularly one of its members which is a city of a half a million people, because in effect that governmental framework that is decided upon has a very major impact and bearing upon the ability of that city and that community to fend for itself and to manage and cope with the kinds of issues that it faces. That is a particularly crucial issue in this day and age when the problems and difficulties of managing the very strong and many times virulent forces of urbanization are upon us, and therefore the task of engineering, of coming up with a set of instruments and mechanisms that can properly give the power and responsibilities to the city residents to manage their own affairs, is an extremely difficult and extremely tricky kind of operation. I think that it stands the province, the government of the province in some good stead that they were prepared to, close to three years now, to undertake a very difficult task because it was obvious at that time that in many respects the management of the respective municipalities inside the Greater Winnipeg urban region were not functioning to supply the kind of government, the kind of management that was required to make sure that there would be effective services, delivery of services, and more particularly the ability to respond to new challenges.

BILL 38

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd)

Now the question I would like to raise, Mr. Speaker, is this, that when the time comes to do this kind of engineering work you have to make a very basic choice. You can either develop a very simple document, perhaps setting out nothing but the most rudimentary or elementary framework, and allow the constituent member, or the city in this case, to fill in the pieces, to allow it over a period of time to flush out its own rules and its own bylaws, and its own practices and its won customs. And for those people practiced in the art of constitutional making, they tend to recommend that is by oftentimes the far more satisfactory course to follow because it saves one, or eliminates from the senior level of government, the constant requirement to be returning back and amending, cleansing, redefining and reorganizing all the small details. Because if you make the other choice, Mr. Speaker, and that is, to develop a highly detailed constitution in effect where you're dotting all the "i's" and crossing the "t's", and specifying all the powers, you're constantly put in a position where you are trying to anticipate or judge future conditions; you're trying to apply an abstract set of powers to a very fluid and very dynamic political process, and it's very difficult to, and I don't think anyone has the prescience of mind to be able to properly kind of anticipate or see what the requirements exactly are. And therefore what one is often called in to do is to begin a constant and never-ending series of housekeeping efforts, and that, according to the First Minister who introduced this bill, is what we're into now. And I would only indicate to the members of this House that we should not expect that this is the end; that what I think we have to expect by the very nature of this bill itself is a constant progression of housekeeping efforts. Because what you're forced to do when you have a highly detailed constitution or framework is that whenever conditions change, whenever populations change, whenever forces change, whenever - personalities sometimes change - the City of Winnipeg is going to be back on the doorstep of this Legislature saying, "Look that particular part of that bill no longer fits; will you please change it for us?"

I think it is incumbent upon us that we pause for a moment to raise the issue about whether we should be agreeing by setting this precedent to commit ourselves as a Legislature, and I sort of speak as a collective body, to always be in the business of housekeeping measures because in fact that will cause not only frustrations on the part of government and members here, it will undoubtedly cause serious frustration on the part of city officials and city politicians who must live oftentimes with an Act which is always a little bit out of date, which is always a little bit sort of behind; that there is always going to be a time lag between the identification of a malfunctioning, or a piece of the statute, or a piece of the machinery, which no longer functions properly, and the ability to make recommendations that it be changed, to have those recommendations considered, to have them discussed, to get a Provincial Cabinet, to have it go through caucus, to bring it to Legislature.

And what I think has always been in part the beauty of the British system of parliamentary democracy has been the fact that in Britain itself there are very few British constitutions, other than a few basic rights, and in the Canadian system we have a British North America Act which is a basically very simple document. Strangely enough when we as a country have come to establishing documents to organize city governments, we have gone the American route and established very voluminous, heavily detailed, specific piece-by-piece setting out of the exact specifications of that machinery. It's a curious kind of ambivalence, or curious part of our Canadian tradition, I suppose, that in a sense we turned our back on the British tradition of constitution-making that allow for the informal evolution of rules and structures, and instead have adopted the American pattern which is . . . very highly detailed, and I suppose for those who take some interest in history, and I see that the teacher from St. Matthews, or the Member from St. Matthews who seems to like to pull out dusty historical documents, isn't here to take notes, we could go into the history of populism that infiltrated Canada about the 1920s or so, and which tended to infect in a sense our sense of what government should be.

Mr. Speaker, I simply wanted to bring up that point because I think it does say something about the nature of the amendments before us. The First Minister introduced these as a series of housekeeping measures. I suppose I feel a little bit in the position of one of those television housewives who is asked to come in after someone's done the dusting with new yellow globe, or something, and going back to see if there had been any corners left undusted. Has the housekeeping measures of this government really resulted in a very neat and tidy piece of homework? And in this case, Mr. Speaker, I would have to say that in many respects the amendments

BILL 38

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) do tend to clarify, and certainly improve what were difficult aspects of the City of Winnipeg machinery. In particular I would like to commend in a sense the whole range of recommendations that were forwarded by the Law Reform Commission, which I think make a substantial contribution to providing for better protection of rights of Winnipeg citizens in relation to the acts of the executive, or the commissioner, or the officials of that city in relation to the questions of warrants for search and entry, and the provision for proper steps of identification and communication on measures before council. But again I would say that if that was the intent - and I believe that it was - to try to even further open up the system of government to make it more democratic, to make it more responsible, then there were the series of housekeeping measures that weren't included and very well should have been.

I guess that comes back to my basic thesis that once you're in housekeeping you're in a never-ending process, because I would certainly have thought that the Ministers of the Crown who were responsible for looking at the changes that were required in this bill, should have looked seriously at the question of the openness of council itself, because as it presently exists some of the basic mechanisms that we in this House have adopted in terms of Journals of the House, which record statements and commitments of members, is not available in the City Council of Winnipeg. There are minutes kept; these minutes are not in any way distributed to members; they are available if you make a special effort and go to the Clerk's office, but in effect there isn't a public record, and that public record simply means that it is increasingly difficult, extremely difficult for a private citizen in the city to find out what his councillor stands for, which is a basic principle, I think, of any democratic society, and that is the accountability of elected officials.

Similarly, there is no amendment, which I am very sort of sad not to see, considering the whole question of the recording of votes in council, and as it turns out, the only time that a vote is recorded on City Council is when someone calls for it, when there is a special - as we do in this House - call for yeas and nays, which means that most votes in council are simply recorded as sort of, not even so many against or for, but simply voice votes. Now that is appropriate for a Chamber like this when there's identifiable groups in the House, Liberals, Conservatives, New Democrats, so that again the voter can say, that group of people were on that side of the issue, and that group were on the other side. In City Council, when there are no such identical groups - at least they don't like to identify themselves in that way - there is no way of saying who is for what, which means that a councillor can basically evade or avoid being accountable for the stand that he takes in many instances. And I can testify, and I don't want to go into any forum of--abuse this forum for any public paid advertising, but over the past years I was involved as one of the authors of a study on the unicity government, and found it extremely difficult to go back and try to determine the exact specifics, commitments or positions that respective councillors took on matters of importance. In fact the only technique that was available to us was to go back and interview the councillors themselves and rely upon their memory. As we all know, politicians' memories have a way of becoming very selective, and they have a way in many cases of rewriting history to suit what they on recollection think was the right stand to take, which meant that in trying to do a proper assessment of the actual positions taken by people on council, we found it extremely difficult to have any public record that would give us any service.

It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that if we were going to do housekeeping we should look very carefully at the question of how can we ensure that the Council of the City of Winnipeg, in terms of the record that it keeps and the kinds of votes that it is required to take, would have ensured that there would have been a proper basis for holding councillors accountable and responsible for positions. Because without that, if you don't have that singular fact, then the ability of a government to operate with any form of responsible decision-making is extremely difficult. It simply means that you can hide behind the record that says that councillors were for or against. And the councillor from a specific ward - and we have a few here who could testify to that fact - if they feel themselves part of the controversy do in many cases not have to be held accountable to their members of their own wards or their own constituents. So that is one area where I feel that in the thrust of these amendments which was designed, as I read the Law Reform Commission, and if I go right back to the original white paper, to make sure that city government would be as open and as accountable as possible, these were a series of housekeeping amendments which are sorely lacking in this position.

BILL 38

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd)

Now, Mr. Speaker, it's my own opinion that in evaluating or assessing a system of government, one can judge it by some basis of aesthetics whether the form has a nice symmetry to it, whether it fits some theory that was described by a political philosopher, or one you can choose on the basis of performance. Let me go back to actually, what does it do? And I think that the reforms that were introduced some two and a half years ago must be judged upon that criteria. Has, in fact, the City of Winnipeg, as it was amended and changed by this Legislature, resulted in better services for the citizens of Winnipeg, better tax bases, more accountability, better management, better planning, more and more effective development? In other words, if you could set up a series of criteria to measure it, you could begin to say in effect, what has the new City of Winnipeg done for the basic citizen of Winnipeg who wants to know is his city government giving him full value for the dollar he spends and for the services he put?

So that really is a very important question, and it was not a question that was raised by the First Minister when he introduced his amendments and I haven't heard other members address themselves in a general way to that issue; but again I think it bodes well in this House because, as I've said, we are not at the end of housekeeping, we are only at the beginning of housekeeping measures, to begin asking ourselves in a very strong way, has the new system really resulted in a better functioning and, as a result, a better system of services and a better cost basis for citizens in the City of Winnipeg? And on that, Mr. Speaker, I would only say that the record is a mixed one, but I think invariably there was some real value. Certainly in terms of the combination of the tax bases of the City of Winnipeg it was undeniable, and I think that any analyst that has gone in to analyze the new City of Winnipeg Act starts out by saying that was a distinct improvement. And I think that one could often say that the initiatives taken, even though in many cases they have been faltering, in terms of opening the system up through the resident advisory system and the community committee system, also are laudable to the extent that at least the intention was right, and I would certainly like to and I wish we had the opportunity in some amendments in this bill, to really debate that issue as to whether the objectives set forward in the white paper that the Minister of Finance introduced, have really been accomplished, because in effect I think it's again fair to say, through some of my own study and analysis, that there are some again serious omissions in the functioning of the community committee, resident advisory system.

To begin with there is still, in the minds at least, of the operators of that system, the counsellors, and administrators and resident advisors, a great deal of confusion as to the powers and responsibilities; and I would say this, Mr. Speaker, that if the bill had adopted, as I indicated at the outset of my remarks, a very simple structure which only set out in a sense that there would be these things, and then allow the City of Winnipeg and its constituent parts to evolve a system, they might have. They might have, and at least they would have been held accountable for it.

The point I'm making now is that we are now, I think, required to go back and look seriously at what are the distinctive powers and responsibilities in order to make that system work, and again I think that there is particularly a lack of power and responsibility and legal instruments on the level of the community committee to enable it to serve as a decentralized part of city government. I simply don't think at this stage that there is a full understanding and certainly I do not believe that there is a full willingness or spirit, as the Minister of Finance says, to make that decentralizing aspect of the City of Winnipeg work; that in order to make it work you need some legal instruments, and at this point in time there is a great confusion as to--if the committee on a local level make the decision on a development matter, is that where the buck stops or does it go up to Community Committee of Environment and from there to local council, and from there to the Minister, and from there to the municipal board? In other words, I think what this bill has done, has sadly fragmented the authority rather than consolidating it, where I would have liked to have seen it consulting others on a decentralized level, to have given more power and responsibility to the local community committee, and if there was a right of appeal, all right. Make it one right of appeal. But let's stop there. Let's quit sort of having an escalator where issues and decisions can go up and down and so the result is to completely freeze or immobilize administrators who are so, in many cases, afraid as they read through the detail of this Act, to take any specific action and they don't take any action at all. And that's been one of the consequences of an act which in

BILL 38

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) many cases has not clearly delineated the powers and the responsibilities of the community committee level.

I would say that that has been particularly apparent, Mr. Speaker, in what is probably in this day and age one of the most important, if not the most important function of city government, and that is to manage the development of the city. The whole question of urban growth is one that requires a highly sophisticated and very competent set of powers as well as a great deal of confidence and surety as to where you are going, and if there has been any one area of failure of the City of Winnipeg over the past two and a half years, it's been the ability to manage growth, to provide a development policy and a development plan and a development direction which has coherence and cogency and has some ability to make decisions, and we have received in this House all kinds of evidence. The Member from St. Matthews, the Minister responsible for Housing, have got up and said it's the Provincial Government that can't get decisions out of the City of Winnipeg on development matters. The house builders issued a report three months ago on housing, which said that the cost of housing in the City of Winnipeg has almost doubled over the past year, and one of the basic reasons is because the process of making decisions on development has also doubled at the same time, that it is simply twice as long as it used to be. Now that is an issue that is not a philosophical one or an abstract one, or is something to be argued about amongst political scientists, it's a real issue because it costs people money. It's making serious inroads in the ability to provide good and cheap housing in the City of Winnipeg. I think the evidence as we see in the downtown development area, where again the inability to make decisions is very serious.

I would point out some discussions I had just recently with businessmen in the city, who have basically said it is almost impossible now to get industrial land in the city of Winnipeg; that the industrial strategy of the Winnipeg urban region is being sadly frustrated or put off, again because of the lack of development decisions, and when those decisions are taken, Mr. Speaker, they are not taken by one committee or one commissioner or someone on city government, which says that is where the decision is made. It's made by a variety of officials. One businessman said that at last count, in trying to get some decision on a development matter, on industrial development matter, it went to something like 17 or 18 different people, and when it's a man that sits at this guy's desk and he may go on holidays and it doesn't get off his desk until he gets back, and, you know, you've got a number of departments and so there is simply no central direction to development matters. And as a consequence we don't have enough industrial land and therefore the efforts of the Minister of Industry and Commerce, if he is making any, to provide added industrial growth and incentive to the city of Winnipeg, is going to be frustrated, because when that new factory comes there isn't going to be an industrial park to go to and as a consequence we are going to lose business to other cities, because you simply can't make decisions quick enough or effectively enough.

It goes back again to that basic question of the fragmentation of authority and certainly a breakdown, as far as I can see it, on the executive level of the city of Winnipeg; that what has happened is that we got ourselves caught in a strange situation when the bill was first introduced, where we were going to elect the Mayor by council, and then for reasons that we can only speculate upon, that was changed to provide for the direct election of the Mayor. But as a result, the concept of developing a chief executive of the City of Winnipeg responsible to the council was all of a sudden broken, and we had developed a hybrid system, almost sort of while the bill was being debated in this House a new system was being evolved, or introduced. And I would have sincerely hoped that if the government, as I now see in Bill 46, is going to proceed with the direct election of the Mayor, then it was incumbent upon them to design a system of executive powers to fit that system. Because what in fact they are now adopting is a form of congressional or presidential system in effect, or it's a hybrid system, which means that if they were going to do that they should have done the same thing that you would look at if you were adopting the American form of city council system and given the Mayor some powers.

Now, I don't want to get into a debate on Bill 46, so I'm saying now that you have a chief executive, who has really no legal powers in the City of Winnipeg, having to be a chairman. So he doesn't have any powers really over budget, or appointment, or finance, or administration, other than whatever informal persuasion he might be able to bring to bear. He sits ex-officio in certain committees, but the point is you now have a Board of Commissioners, you have an Executive Policy Committee, you have a Mayor who, if he chooses not to, doesn't have to

BILL 38

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) exercise any executive responsibility, he can be a ceremonial Mayor if he so desires, and there is no coming together to say, "This is where decisions should be made," and particularly if you look at the issue, there is really --(Interjection)-- Yes, by all means.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I thank the honourable member for permitting me to ask him a question. Could he indicate where in Canada a mayor has greater authority than he has just described the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg would have under 46, or has today or had, say, five years ago?

MR. AXWORTHY: I'd like to answer the Minister this way, Mr. Speaker, saying that first, I don't think that we can necessarily use the standard of other cities as the best basis for judgment, because I think every city in Canada is presently struggling in an agonizing way with exactly the same kind of problems of about how to develop an effective administrative executive system to make decisions in a modern city. And certainly the Mayor had no powers before, but I would bring to his attention some of the issues being taken, for example, in the city of Toronto, where over the past two years, for example, the mayor's office has acquired certain powers of staffing, certain powers of overview of legislation, and certain powers of policy initiation. Now I would think that certainly . . . In this case they have asked, for example, the mayor's office, on the whole question of the heights of buildings in the City of Toronto, has gone to the Ontario Legislature and asked for those kind of powers, now the Ontario Legislature has not (now?) responded. So I'm saying, well, we can either decide that we are going to be, we are simply going to adopt the same poor standards that exist elsewhere or we're going to take this opportunity we now have before us, as the First Minister said, to housekeep, to houseclean, to make the system more effective.

And that's my point that I'd like to make, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Finance, that the kinds of requirements the City now has, mainly because of the increasing burden and kinds of issues that it must face, are no longer adequate which used to be a caretaker style of government. It was quite acceptable ten or fifteen years ago when a city the size of Winnipeg had very simple functions, it turned lights on, collected some garbage, you know, got into debates as to whether we were going to have a Pan-Am Games or something. That's very different from the kind of very serious social and economic development issues that modern cities are having to face. And all I'm saying is that the powers that are required to manage those issues effectively should now be introduced in order to help it along. And I would say, I haven't had a chance to peruse Bill 46 yet, but I would judge it in my quick reading that those powers are not there, and I think that that is a proper area for debate.

Let me hasten to add that I would hope that we may have an opportunity perhaps in the next session to get into that kind of instruction, because I agree; I think the Minister made a statement and in many instances it may be too early to judge the ultimate performance of the City of Winnipeg. But I am simply trying to zero in on areas which I think, at least in my own opinion and my own assessment, require and do require right now some immediate action, simply because the performance aspect, the actual impact it's having on the city itself, is where the suffering is going on, mainly in terms of he had the ability to make decisions in an effective way which has the basic impact of forcing up housing costs, of not managing the direction of urban growth in an effective manner, and in many cases I know from personal experience in work that we have tried to deal with the city, in terms of getting zoning changes and so on, has not really worked out. So I would say that, you know, the options that should be available to us at first, would be either to turn back to the City of Winnipeg the right to make its own bylaws in relation to development; that that - and I guess the Minister, as I would, might gulp at that - but the fact is that if they were given the autonomy, and I've heard the Minister of Finance speak on several occasions about the fact that this is almost a form of home rule for the City of Winnipeg, that they've got the power, they've got the responsibility, let them make the decisions - and I'm paraphrasing his quotes but I think I'm fairly accurate.

Well, if that's the case, then I would suggest because the field of development is one in which there needs to be a high degree of flexibility in the making of rules and bylaws, and how you come to making decisions, then we should have given that responsibility back to the City of Winnipeg to make its own rules and bylaws in relation to development, and perhaps eliminated what was the previous system of a whole kind of . . . work of appeals to Ministers and Municipal

BILL 38

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) Boards. And I think that that would have been a very important initiative to have been taken at this time if we had simply looked at that option of turning back the responsibility in the development field to the City of Winnipeg. Now that would be a point that I would ask the Minister of Finance to consider, because I know he is the Minister of the Urban Affairs Committee and I think that they would be well worth consideration.

I would also like to raise another issue with the Minister in this development matter, which I think is also important, and that is to look at the experience of setting up a whole new set of institutions to manage development in cities, that again we are in a stage where we have basically added on to a very traditional set of powers, where we have used the commissioner or committee system of government, we have simply tried to amend it to make it somewhat improving over the old system. I would say that perhaps if the situation required it, because the situation is drastic, is to begin to look at the possibility of using things like development corporations and to give the City of Winnipeg the power, either singularly or jointly with the province of Manitoba, to set up a downtown development corporation, to manage it so that you could take the areas of decision, which are now spread over a whole range of departments, and consolidate it into one source. And I would be glad to supply the First Minister or the Minister of Finance with evidence as to how that particular instrument is being used in other jurisdictions as a way of consolidating decision-making in a development area, providing for a proper recourse of appeal in all it's doing, but it means that you consolidate your resources and certainly have the ability and capacity to make decisions much more effectively.

I would even point out an interesting example, which is an extreme one but I think an important one. For example, in the City of St. Louis and in the City of Boston they now have Urban Development Corporation which is set up by the state governments of those jurisdictions, which have on them membership drawn from the different levels of government and from the private sector, who are given powers of land appropriation, powers to raise finance, and powers to undertake development. And the consequence of that has been this: that in effect decision has been speeded up in a far more effective manner and far more innovation can be used. Because in this stage what simply happens is a great deal of frustration is being exercised in making decisions in relation to development. I understand, and I can only--for example I would point out that we in the City of Winnipeg or in the Province of Manitoba, I believe in 1966, set up a series of development corporations to manage the appropriation of land and the building for the development of the Centennial Centre on Main Street. That development corporation is still on the statute books of the Province of Manitoba. It's simply inactive. It would be very easy to translate or transmit that particular organization that was used for development purposes, to bring about a very speedy or hasty combination or partnership between the public and private sector for the development of the Main Street area, to bring it to bear for the development of urban renewal areas, or downtown development areas, or industrial park areas, or new town areas. The point is that we need institutional innovation if we're going to do the job, and that is something in which there is no enabling legislation in this act or the amendments brought to it to allow the City of Winnipeg to undertake that kind of institutional innovation, nor is there any indication at this point that the Province of Manitoba is prepared to do it. And I am simply suggesting that if the concern of this House is, as it should be, the ability of the City of Winnipeg to manage growth now and in the future, then it better find new instruments to do it because it's not doing it very effectively now.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I'd like just to point to one small area of the bill which provided me with some discomfort and one in which I take some disagreement with, and that is the recommendation coming from the City of Winnipeg on the question of dedication. According to the amendments, they have the power now to accept cash in lieu of the ten percent dedication that a land developer or builder has usually required. But there is one basic flaw to that and that is it goes against the basic principle of dedication, which was always to ensure that there would be proper amenities reserved for the community in which new development was occurring. Now what is happening under the amendment is that any cash in lieu of dedication can simply go back to general revenues, which means that there is no guarantee that in fact that cash in lieu of dedication will be used to provide for some open space or for a plaza.

Now I can see the rationale for giving cash in lieu of dedication, because in a downtown area, areas where there is a heavy density of housing, there may not be the ability to provide 10 percent of the land, but certainly the cash that is going in replacement should not simply go

BILL 38

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) into general revenue to pay for some councillor to take a trip to the Canadian Federation of Mayors and Municipalities, but should be designed for a plaza or a fountain or some area in which the people of that community are able to use open space, or to have some public facility which would be to their benefit. Therefore I would recommend that as we get to Law Amendments Committee that that particular part of the act be changed to ensure or guarantee that any cash that is being given in lieu of dedication would be reserved for the use of public facilities or amenities in the community in which the development is taking place. Now that's a fairly small matter but I think it's an important matter, because it goes to the whole principle of the reserve of dedication.

Mr. Speaker, I've sort of gone over the basic issue of what I consider to be the lack of good housekeeping that was afforded us by the government. While they tidied up some areas, there are many areas of the City of Winnipeg Act which still have a great many cobwebs and dusty corners in them, and I would suggest--I again have not read Bill 46 carefully, but the perusal of that doesn't indicate to me that it adds much more to it. In fact, as I suggest, by simply formally inserting for a long period of time the concept of a direct election of the mayor, then it will simply act to further fragment the ability of the City of Winnipeg to make quick and effective decisions and simply fragment the executive authority which is already one of the major omissions and difficulties being faced by the City of Winnipeg.

So I would hope that we may have at least a chance to make some correction at Law Amendments, and certainly I would hope that we could reserve full well for another meeting of this House the ability to go back and take a much more serious look at whether the City of Winnipeg is really able to manage the contemporary issues with which it has to deal, in the most effective manner possible, and I think to eliminate some of the inconsistencies and inadequacies that have not been dealt with by these series of amendments.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Brandon West, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 42. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. ENNS: Can we have this matter stand, Mr. Speaker, please?

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. Bill No. 43. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON (Gladstone): Stand, Mr. Speaker.

BILL NO. 8

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 8. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Mines, that Bill No. 8, an Act to authorize the expenditure of moneys for Capital purposes and authorize the borrowing of the same, be now read a second time.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I've asked my department to give me a comparison of the 1973 and the 1974 Loan Act so that I can inform members of the House of any differences that exist between what was passed last year and what is now being proposed, and it appears that there is hardly any difference but I will indicate that at the beginning portions, the terminology, "Borrowing of Moneys" has been changed to "Raising of moneys by way of loan or loans," and that has been done as the result of legal opinion that felt that it was a desirable correction.

There is another section that has been deleted. It was section 15 of last year's Loan Act and was particularly required in order to redesignate the use of certain specific money of Red River Valley and Assiniboine River to Water Control Works and that is not being carried forward. And finally, members who want to look and compare the format of Schedules A and B will see that titles have been added this year to better identify the self-sustaining programs as compared with the direct government programs.

Mr. Speaker, normally I would invite debate and support for this bill in accordance with practise in previous years where the loan bill has been debated on general principle, but Mr. Speaker, you will recall that after a fairly extensive review of the Supply Resolutions in the Estimates Committee for certain of the first lines or first appropriations in the schedules, the

BILL 8

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) House, or the Committee, expressed an apparent mood to pass the rest of the Supply resolution without too much debate, and indicated several speakers opposite indicated that during second reading they would want to deal more generally with the government's borrowing policy and its spending policy, and that is apparently the kind of debate that faces us in connection with this bill.

However, several members of the Committee did ask some specific questions and, in the light of the mood of the Committee, I undertook then that I would try to get answers for those questions and give them during second reading. So, unlike previous occasions, I do propose to answer three specific matters that were raised by three specific members, and even though they are nothing related to any particular section of the act or the general principle of the bill, nevertheless I do propose to deal with these three questions so that the answers will be on the record.

The first question that I noted was that asked by the Member for Riel, who wanted to know how regional schools and community colleges construction were being financed as compared with the item for the public schools financing portion of the bill. Well, I would inform the member that under terms of the Technical and Vocational Training Act of 1961, the Federal Government allocated an amount of \$56.6 million to the Province of Manitoba, and these funds have been used primarily for new major construction of regional secondary schools and community colleges. Not all expenditures have been shareable under terms of the agreement and additional spending authority has been voted in various capital supply bills for both regional secondary schools and community colleges. In 1967 the original act was replaced by the Adult Occupational Training act. The expenditures for these purposes are reported in the cash payments of Capital Division, Section of Public Accounts, including details of shareability.

By 1971 a total of 30.9 million had been expended and claimed by Manitoba. In order to simplify the whole procedure, the Capital Assistance Accelerated Phase-out Agreement - all these are capital letters - was negotiated in February, 1971, and under its terms the Federal Government advanced the balance of Manitoba's allocation in the amount of 25.7 million dollars on the understanding that expenditures would be completed by March 21, 1975. As of April 1st, 1974, Federal funds in the amount of \$3,869,000 remained unspent.

The Member for Swan River asked a question which I did find somewhat confusing, dealing with grants re municipal sewer and water systems, the item being 3.1 million dollars, and he did ask and started to spell out more specifically the problem apparently which exists in Swan River, where they are spending substantial moneys and yet he reported that there was an increase in water rates projected in Swan River. He wanted to know what his constituents could do about that increase.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I did make inquiries and I find and would want to advise the Honourable Member for Swan River that included in the requested amount of 3.1 million dollars for grants re municipal sewer and water systems, is an amount of \$120,000 for payment of water rate subsidies to certain small communities. In these centers, the Manitoba Water Services Board both owns and operates the water supply systems, the water rates set for each community which will fully recover all operating and capital costs of these water supply systems. If the wholesale rates of the community exceeds \$3.00 per thousand gallons, then a subsidy is paid based on the previous year's experience in order to reduce the rate to \$3.00. The local municipal council then has the option of adding to this rate at the retail level to cover distribution costs. But, Mr. Speaker, a subsidy would not apply in the case of Swan River as that sewer and water system is owned by the Town of Swan River. I am informed that the estimated cost to extend the present water distribution system in Swan River, to construct a new water treatment plant and sewage disposal lagoon, is approximately 1.4 million dollars. Construction will be supervised by the Federal PFRA and the financing will be as follows:

The federal Department of Regional Economic Expansion will finance \$739,000 on a 50-50 loan and grant basis. The Province of Manitoba, through the Water Services Board, will finance the remaining \$660,000 by a grant of \$60,000 and a loan of \$600,000. In summary then, the Town of Swan River will receive the benefit of grants totalling \$429,000 and will have to assume the repayment of loans totalling \$970,000. Water and sewer rates are set by the Town Council, as necessary, to recover all operating, maintenance and capital costs, and they are really a matter for discussion only between the Swan River taxpayers and their elected representatives in Swan River. But they should know that if a taxpayer feels the rates are not

BILL 8

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) just or equitable, an appeal may be made to the Public Utilities Board, which can require the Town Council to provide justification for the utility rates established and can order rate amendments if deemed advisable.

Now the Member for Brandon West asked me about the new cost-sharing arrangement dealing with the percentage participation of the Federal Government in relation to general development agreements, and I find that the answer I gave was not correct, because I stated on Monday evening, on April 15th, that the Federal-Provincial cost-sharing formula was variable, and I want to correct that statement because in the early stages of negotiations--well in the earlier agreement there was that variability that I described, but in the early stages of negotiation it was proposed that on non-capital projects the sharing percentage would be 75 percent Federal and 25 percent Provincial. It was proposed the sharing on capital projects would be on a 50-50 basis, and in the interest of simplifying the administration of the general development agreement, it has now been mutually agreed that sharing on all projects to be covered by the three sub-agreements will be on the standardized basis of 60 percent Federal and 40 percent Provincial, and that that would be standardized and not variable as I had described the previous evening. I indicated on Monday evening that an amount of \$4, 611, 000 would be recovered from the proposed capital expenditures of \$7, 685, 000 which is included in this Capital Supply Bill which, if I had taken the trouble to do some arithmetic, would have confirmed that that is exactly 60 percent of the total amount.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, I have answered as far as I can check from reading Hansard of that evening, the questions, the individual questions raised by various members. I have pointed out that Bill No. 8 is very similar to the acts passed last year for Capital Supply. I am therefore now in a position to launch the bill on its course to the House for second reading in the expectation that there will be comment that we can discuss on the capital borrowing and capital spending of the government, and in the expectation that debate will proceed at a pace which will facilitate rather than hinder the ability of the government to take advantage of markets at the right time and to the best advantage of the people of Manitoba who will be borrowing. And I am reminded of the concluding remarks of the Speaker on behalf of the Liberal Party, who said that no way would the Liberal Party support any capital authority for the government, because no way was the Liberal Party prepared to see this government carry out the projects which it was planning to do during this term of office. Thus it was that it became clear that the Liberal Party, through its spokesman, the Leader of the Liberal Party, was not prepared to support Capital Supply. The Member for St. Boniface . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Yes, I have a point of privilege. I believe that the Minister was incorrect or misrepresented the statements of the Member for Wolseley, the Leader of the Liberal Party. He did not say in effect that support was based upon the projects that the government was intending, but that he felt the economic mismanagement and incompetence that the government has demonstrated didn't give us any confidence that they would be able to bring those projects about at all, let alone sort of do them in an effective way, and I think it would be very important to make sure that that is a very clear understanding as to his reasons, not the reasons that the Minister of Finance has put into his mouth.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I trust that as the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge becomes more familiar with the debate in this House and the rules, that he will take less and less advantage of your leniency in permitting him to make statement purporting to be of privilege but actually being a speech and a difference of opinion on what it is that is being proposed. Now the Member for Assiniboia, who has much more experience in the House, is now yelling from his seat in a way which I sometimes do but which I don't commend to him at all.

So, Mr. Speaker, may I say that I am glad I heard the Member for Fort Rouge speak because it's obvious to me that he didn't hear what I said, because what I said was very much in line with what he said, and that is that according to his leader, in no way was the Liberal Party prepared to give the authority to this government to carry out the projects it had planned to do during its term of office. And that's exactly what the Member for Fort Rouge said was the position of the Member of the Liberal Party, that he did not accept that this government was to be entrusted with the carrying out of its projects. He said it, I said it, and now I think we're agreed that his leader said it, and in no way was his leader going to accept the--and now these are my words--accept the fact that the people of Manitoba did, in the only real democratic

BILL 8

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) way possible, show that they did have the confidence to entrust this government to carry out its programs. And I want now to recognize the position taken by the Acting Leader of the Conservative Party which, as I recall it, was quite similar to positions that our own party took in the past in opposition, when we said that there is work to be done and we wanted it to be done. When we said that we didn't like the way the other government was planning to do one or another of the programs or how it was carrying it out, nevertheless, as the Member for Lakeside did say, the Hydro project such as it is with the weaknesses that he sees in it, is still one that the Conservative Party wishes to proceed with and that I consider a positive approach and one which should be helpful for debate in that I do expect criticism, I do hope for positive suggestions, but in the end I do expect support for this bill as was indicated by the Member for Lakeside.

So I now entrust the bill to the House for further debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 44

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 44. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY presented Bill 44, an Act to Amend The Workmen's Compensation Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to begin this Assembly's consideration on the second reading of Bill 44 amending The Workmen's Compensation Act. My comments on changes being proposed will be fairly brief, but I hope that it is not taken from this that the measures in this bill are unimportant. On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, several of the amendments will result in very significant improvements, particularly in the area of compensation benefits and pensions. Before going into the other changes, I would like first to note that this bill will change the name of the Workmen's Compensation Act and Board to the name, and henceforth it will be called, The Workers' Compensation Act and The Workers' Compensation Board. The term "workmen" of course has long been a misnomer, but never more so than today when women form a large and growing part of the labour force.

Mr. Speaker, the changes in this bill generally fall into three categories: provisions for the extension of compensation to additional workers, provisions for increases in certain benefit levels and pensions, and a number of administrative and technical changes. In recent years we have witnessed the development of local initiative projects, provincial employment programs, and work programs for students. Because of these kinds of programs, particularly student work programs, it is proposed in the bill that the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council be empowered to declare persons or any class of persons to be workers for the purpose of the act and to pass regulations for the inclusion of an industry under the Act in all or part of the province. These measures, Sir, will provide the required flexibility for dealing with the question of the application of Workmen's Compensation to persons and these and similar programs in the future.

As I mentioned a moment ago, Mr. Speaker, this bill also provides for increase in benefit levels and pensions. I will elaborate on each of these changes but I would like first of all to say, by the way of generally appraising the proposed increases, that they do truly represent substantial improvements.

As all of us who are here are actually aware, the cost of living has been rising very rapidly and may continue to do so for some time, while living costs have been increasing. However, benefit levels and pensions awarded to permanently disabled workers have remained constant at the levels where they were last fixed in 1972, and I do want to point out, Mr. Speaker, to the House, that since we became government I believe this is the third time that changes have been made in the benefits under the Workmen's Compensation Act.

The increases in this bill, Mr. Speaker, are partly intended to offset the eroding effects of inflation on fixed compensation incomes. In addition to this, it is my belief - and I hope that this is shared by other members - that pensions and benefit levels require upgrading because of the relatively low levels at which they were set in the past. The amendments in this

BILL 44

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) bill, Sir, are therefore intended, not only to deal with inflation, but also to produce an actual improvement in real income for some people to whom compensation is being paid.

The first such proposed change, I would note, is that the wage ceiling, that is the maximum earnings which may be taken into account in calculating compensation payable to an injured or disabled worker, is to be raised in annual terms from \$8,000 to \$10,000, an increase of 25 percent.

Let me give you an example of the effect of this change. With the existing ceiling, the maximum amount of compensation payable to an injured worker is about \$115.00 per week. With the proposed wage ceiling, the maximum amount payable would be almost \$145.00 per week or an increase of \$30.00. The change, which would take place the 1st of July of this year, would place Manitoba in line with the Provinces of Alberta, Ontario and Saskatchewan, where it would appear, where a bill to increase the ceiling to \$10,000 has been recently introduced, but Manitoba, despite these other increases, would be above the remaining provinces in the Dominion of Canada.

There is also provision in this bill, Mr. Speaker, to substantially increase widows' and children's allowances. First of all, the allowances payable to widows in the case of fatal accidents which occurred prior to 1974, will be raised from the current level of \$150.00 per month to \$250.00 per month, or in other words, Mr. Speaker, an increase of 66-2/3 percent. In addition, in respect of the children of these widows, the allowances for those under the age of 16 will be raised from \$60.00 to \$70.00 per month; for those 16 years of age and over, who are continuing their education, the allowance will be raised from \$70.00 per month to \$80.00 per month. These provisions, I repeat, Mr. Speaker, would apply to fatal cases prior to 1974.

For widows and children in fatal cases occurring during and after 1974, a new basis for calculating allowances is being proposed, which incorporates the maintenance of earnings principle. The widows' allowance is to be equivalent to the monthly allowance that the deceased worker would have received had he or she been permanently and totally disabled. --(Interjection)-- Pardon? That he or she if the woman had been--if the female had been the prime earner and was killed as the result of an industrial accident, 75 percent of 10,000 would be payable. The same amount, yes. In effect, this would mean that 75 percent of the deceased worker's average earnings at the time of the accident would be the basis for the compensation. Under this new approach there would not be any special provisions for other dependants' allowances and this would be in conformity with the act at the present time.

However, though, Mr. Speaker, I would like to add that there is an important safeguard in this bill in respect of allowances for widows and children of fatally injured workers who had low earnings, and it is this. If the application of the new formula, that is the 75 percent of the total disability pension based on \$10,000, that if the application of the new formula were to result in benefits lower than the Widows' and Children's Allowances payable in cases occurring prior to 1974, then the latter benefits would apply. In other words, by the application of the 75 percent of the \$10,000 total disability, if it were to amount to a lesser amount to those prior to 1974, then the prior application will apply. So there would be no possibility of loss to the widow or widower. In other words, the Widows' and Children's Allowance amounts applicable to pre-1974 cases will be minimums for cases occurring this year and hereafter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister will be able to continue later on. I am now leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 o'clock this evening.