

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Monday, March 15, 1965.

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

MR. CLERK: The petition of George Copeland and others praying for the passing of an Act to incorporate Transcona Curling Club.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills.

HONOURABLE OBIE BAIZLEY, (Minister of Labour) introduced Bill No. 51, an Act to amend The Employment Standards Act.

HONOURABLE GEORGE JOHNSON, (Minister of Education), (Gimli) introduced Bill No. 79 an Act to amend The School Attendance Act.

MR. JOHNSON introduced Bill No. 28 an Act to amend The University Act.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS, (St. Boniface) introduced Bill No. 60, an Act to validate Bylaw No. 140 of The St. Boniface School Division No. 4 and to repeal An Act to validate By-law No. 117 of The School District of St. Boniface No. 1188 .

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Labour.

MR. BAIZLEY: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Public Works that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider the following proposed resolutions standing in my name and in the name of the Honourable the Provincial Secretary.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the Member for Winnipeg Centre took the Chair.

MR. BAIZLEY: Mr. Chairman, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolutions recommends them to the House.

IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: The first resolution for consideration by the Committee is: Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure respecting the safety of employees in their employment and providing, among other matters, that the administration of the Act be a responsibility of The Workmen's Compensation Board, and that the cost incurred in the administration of the Act be paid from and out of the accident fund for which provision is made under The Workmen's Compensation Act.

MR. BAIZLEY: Mr. Chairman, along with all members of this House and with labour and management and the general public we have been concerned about the increasing number of industrial accidents. First of course because of human suffering and second because of the cost. During the year the Department of Labour within the authority given it by existing legislation has substantially strengthened its enforcement procedure both by adding staff and by adopting a more vigorous policy of prosecution. The department has also carefully looked into safety programs in other parts of this country and in other countries. We have examined closely the approach made by other authorities to improve safety programs based upon close consultation with both labour and management. This consultative approach where it has been applied has been shown to be most effective. Some months ago we undertook several pilot projects based upon this consultative approach. The progress of these projects has been carefully observed by a small committee composed of myself and a representative of labour and one from management. They have been undertaken with the complete co-operation of contractors, superintendents, foremen, and workers on the jobs concerned. The results indicated by these pilot projects and based upon the consultative approach have been most encouraging indeed and these new measures will make possible an effective overall attack upon industrial accidents. The attack will be made on three major fronts: by careful and meticulous research into the best ways of preventing accidents where employees are at work, by education and co-operative action through the consultative approach and by strict enforcement where necessary.

We believe Mr. Chairman that the safety program provided for by this Bill will result in a substantial reduction in accidents to workmen. Now the transfer of authority and responsibility to the Workmen's Compensation Board will of course involve expenditures, but these expenditures must be looked upon as an investment which should return far more than is expended.

(MR. BAIZLEY, cont'd). . . . It would seem reasonable that the agency which levies and pays for compensable accidents should control the accident prevention program. The Board will thus be acting as a guardian of the employers fund as well as a protector of the employees' rights in this area. We feel therefore that it is reasonable that the Board should, in their total operation, be charged with the reduction of accidents which will in turn ultimately effect a reduction in compensation levies and human suffering.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY, (Leader of the NEW Democratic Party), (Radisson): Mr. Chairman, this is a matter that we in this particular group have raised on a number of occasions in the past whereby there should be more activities in the field of safety in industry and I am glad that in this instance that the government has seen the wisdom of the representations which we have made in this corner of the House from time to time. We like the Minister and I am sure all members of this House have been greatly concerned with the number of fatal accidents which have happened over the past number of months, particularly in the construction industry. We note that on a number of occasions construction industries have been brought before the courts and fined for violations of the various acts pertaining to the industry.

I trust and hope Mr. Chairman that in the Act that will be forthcoming dealing with this matter of transferring the responsibility from the Department of Labour to that of The Workmen's Compensation Board, I sincerely trust and hope that there will be more severe penalties levied against the industry and the operators in industry for violation of the rules, because I think it is true to say Mr. Chairman that it may sometimes be far cheaper for the industry concerned to pay a fine than to make the provisions that are necessary to ensure as far as may reasonably be possible that safe working conditions are adhered to. May I say Mr. Chairman at this venture, in this orbit, this is one of the areas where it is most unfortunate when the worker concerned has not got the advantage of being a member of a trade union organization. I am referring Mr. Chairman to many workers particularly in the construction industries who are relatively new to this country, who do not belong to trades unions and are afraid of their masters in industry. I am sure that the Minister of Labour has from time to time had this drawn to his attention, well maybe not as specifically as I am attempting to do now, Mr. Chairman, but recognizes that this is a situation that is prevalent --and I would suggest not only here in Manitoba but also throughout the construction industry, where you have a chap that does the digging say for a sewer line excavation. He is on his own or the two or three of the individuals working under a representative of management, they haven't the benefit of protest to the same degree as the individual would have if they belonged to a trade union organization. Saying this Mr. Chairman, I recognize that by and large most of the larger construction companies have trade union agreements and the men therefore are protected, but there are a considerable number of smaller units that I think who have to be instructed, possibly very forcibly, that they must adhere to the rules of employee protection.

Having said that Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask of the Honourable Minister of Labour a specific question. Will those organizations or companies for which The Compensation Board only act as agents for the Dominion Government come under inspection insofar as safety is concerned with the proposals that the Minister will be introducing? I am thinking of the transportation industry in particular Mr. Chairman, who are covered by federal legislation and I am asking the Honourable the Minister of Labour whether they or The Workmen's Compensation who act in this instance for the Federal Government will be able to impose on the, not an imposition, be able to control the safety devices that are used in those areas of employment that come under federal authority directly.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON, (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Chairman, we too in this party agree that this legislation is certainly in the interests of the workers, the industrial workers of the province. I would like to draw to the attention of the Minister some of the submissions that were made by the Manitoba Federation of Labour. One of them is doing with compensation and it's particularly to do with the miners of the province where a very serious situation continues in the problem of silicosis. These people feel, quite rightly so, that this problem of silicosis should be covered more clearly under The Compensation Act and also the fact that the ceiling on earnings that is in existence, there should be some consideration given in raising the ceiling from \$5,000 to \$6,000 a year on the earnings of people who are on compensation, the percentage thereof.

MR. STEVE PATRICK, (Assiniboia): Mr. Chairman, I rise not to oppose the legislation. I would like to say that I'm happy to see the Honourable Minister implement it because for the last few years or since I've been in the House, this side of the House, we have always requested

(MR. PATRICK, cont'd).and thought that safety measures should be placed under The Workmen's Compensation Board because I feel that they're more qualified to do this type of a job. I know there's many labour people in the City have been asking that there be stricter rules and regulations as far as safety measures were concerned in the construction industry and under the Workmen's Compensation Board it has worked much more favourable in other provinces, for instance, like Ontario, and I have just --in the Free Press here of January 14th, 1965, it says; "\$100 is a lenient fine says Magistrate," which was in a safety regulations fine, so by having this legislation placed under the Workmen's Compensation, I think it's the right thing and I'm sure they are more equipped to-- as far as education in different industries and plants, films and so on, they can do a much better job than the legislation we had previously.

MR. J. M. FROESE, (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, my purpose in rising is just to ask for some information. I am wondering is there more than one fund as far as The Workmen's Compensation Act is concerned? We find in the public accounts of '63/'64 this account has some \$796,000 in the kitty. Are there any additional funds besides this? Secondly, through this Act are we farming off some of the administration expenses that would normally follow the government, to this fund? And thirdly, the legislation that has been proposed is it as a result of the committee's work that sat here last year and because of their findings?

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER, (Gladstone): I don't know whether this point has been raised or not but I understand that all farmers now can make application to Workmen's Compensation Board to cover their employees and I suppose members of their family. I was wondering if this new proposed legislation would affect the farm operators, be they large or small? I, too, Mr. Chairman, I am presently in receipt of a letter from a lady at Neepawa pointing out exactly what the Leader of the NDP has already said that it appears that it's much cheaper. She says; I quote: "I should think it is much cheaper at \$350 a head for the companies than to abide by safety regulations. It makes me real upset." That's the end of the letter and she encloses a clipping from the Tribune, February 16th, headed "Man died in Excavation" and the court fines the firm \$350, and it suggests that it's a whale of a lot cheaper to pay a fine of \$100, \$200 or \$350 than it is to abide by the regulations that were existing at that time. So I certainly hope Mr. Chairman, and I'm sure every member of the House does, that there will be a real tightening up of the regulations in this regard.

MR. BAIZLEY: Mr. Chairman, first in answer to the Honourable Member the Leader of the New Democratic Party, I doubt very much whether this will apply to the workers who are under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government; I think that it will apply only to those workers that are under provincial jurisdiction. I am quite sure however, that with this consultative approach Mr. Chairman, that all employers will avail themselves of this approach and the new techniques that will go with them.

The Honourable Member from Rhineland is suggesting that the government is sloughing something off. I'm saying to the honourable member and to members of this House we are sloughing nothing off, we are trying to bring about an improved situation within the industrial employment safety practices. That we are retaining the responsibility for public safety.

The Honourable Member from Gladstone mentions the construction industry and I think that if we wait until we see the details of the Bill we will see where the regulations have, or the proposed strengthening and tightening of enforcement procedures.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution passed. Next resolution is: Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Civil Service Act by providing, among other matters, that the government may enter into a collective agreement with the association representing the members of the civil service respecting compensation for certain employees.

HONOURABLE DUFF ROBLIN, (Premier and Provincial Treasurer), (Wolseley): Mr. Chairman, as my colleague the Provincial Secretary is indisposed this afternoon I might venture to explain this measure to the Committee. What is being done here are really two things. First of all the Manitoba Government Employees Association is being recognized, or authority is being given to recognize that association as the bargaining agent for the employees of the Civil Service; and secondly, that we are asking for authority in this statute to be able to enter into a form of collective bargaining with the representatives of the employees in dealing with certain matters connected with their pay and working conditions.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the First Minister a question. I'm in favour of this resolution, but the thing that comes into my mind is this: would this collective agreement be under the ordinary Labour Relations Act or under

(MR. HILLHOUSE, cont'd).the ordinary labour law of the province and what would happen in the event of the Manitoba Government Civil Service Association being displaced by another organization?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to be repetitive. I was able a few moments ago to say to the Minister of Labour, thanks for at least taking into consideration or introducing measures that we in this corner have felt desirable. May I say the same to the First Minister and the Minister, the Provincial Secretary in respect of this matter, because this too Mr. Chairman, is one of those items that we of the New Democratic Party have felt should be a right of the employees in the province. Having said this Mr. Chairman, I do not expect, however, that when the legislation is before us for our consideration that all of the points that we have advocated will be contained in the legislation. I say this advisedly that we do not expect this, but we are however, happy in knowing, maybe I shouldn't be saying this the way I am because I haven't seen the legislation, but we are happy to know no matter what is in the legislation that a step has been made in this direction of recognizing a collective bargaining unit within government service.

Now the First Minister mentioned that this establishes the rights of collective agreements between the Manitoba Government Employees Association and the administration and I would suggest and hope that within the legislation when it is tabled for our consideration, that there will be provision that if the present association is displaced by a vote of the employees within the Civil Service by some other organization, I'm thinking of their national counterpart, that there will be provision for this, if this is what the employees here in Manitoba are desirous of having. So I say to the Honourable First Minister, we appreciate the introduction of this legislation, it's a step, no matter what it says in the legislation actually, in the right direction, and once it's on the statute books of the Province of Manitoba, if necessary, we can use our persuasive powers upon government or as the government itself ourselves, make such improvements as from time to time will become necessary.

Again, in this legislation Mr. Chairman, sufficient for me to say we're looking forward in anticipation to reading the legislation which will be produced.

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL, (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister if in his opinion the entering into a collective agreement with the association will by inference or implication suggest that the Civil Service has the right to strike?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I welcome the expressions of support that I've received from two honourable gentlemen opposite in connection with the principle of the Bill. It may be that when the details are put before you, you will find points which you may wish to consider further, but I believe that basically it should commend itself to the House. I think most of the points that are raised could better be dealt with at second reading. I will say, however, though that a system of mediation is provided so that the right to strike does not arise in connection with this and also that provision is made for negotiations with whoever happens to represent the employees from time to time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution passed. The Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

Madam Speaker the committee has adopted certain resolutions and has instructed me to report the same.

IN SESSION

MR. JAMES COWAN, (Winnipeg Centre): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. BAIZLEY introduced Bill No. 49, an Act respecting the Safety of Employees in their Employment.

MR. ROBLIN introduced Bill No. 64, an Act to amend The Civil Service Act.

MADAM SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the Day I would like to attract your attention to the Gallery where there are some 35 grade 11 students from Nelson McIntyre School under the direction of their tacher, Miss Pistawka. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for St. Boniface. There are some 75, Grade 8 students from Lord Kitchener and Maple Leaf Schools under the direction of Messrs. Leberdeff, Reimer, Martens and Malenchak. These two schools are situated in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Kildonan and the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead. In the Speaker's gallery there are nine ladies from the Women's Institute of Myrtle. Myrtle is situated in the constituency of

(MADAM SPEAKER, cont'd). the Honourable the Member for Dufferin. On behalf of all members of this Legislative Assembly, I welcome you.

Orders of the Day.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, before you call the Orders of the Day, I rise to bring to the notice of the House a tragic and untimely event in the passing of Ronald David Turner who was a member of this Legislature and a personal friend of many who sit in this House. Ron Turner had a spectacular political career. He joined this Legislature in the first instance in 1945 as the air force member, and he continued for some eleven years to take part in proceedings of this House. It was not long before his abilities were recognized by the government of the day and after serving a period as Deputy Speaker, he was appointed Provincial Treasurer, the portfolio that I now carry myself, and afterwards was the first Minister of Industry and Commerce when that function was erected as a separate department, and he served in those capacities with the most considerable distinction, as I think those who are familiar with the recent history of Manitoba will have occasion to note.

He not only was active in the political field, but he served in almost every aspect of regular community service that one may mention. He was a businessman and a leader in the business community; he was apprenticed to the law and for some time was an outstanding lecturer at the Manitoba Law School; he served on the Manitoba Arts Council; the Greater Winnipeg Community Clubs; the Y. M. C. A. ; Royal Canadian Geographic Society; Canadian Corps of Commissionaires; Industrial Development Board and so many different organizations that concern themselves with the welfare of the community. After he left the service of this House he distinguished himself greatly in the economic structure of Manitoba being the presiding officer of one of the leading regional air lines in the nation and in that capacity he and I had many occasions to consult together on the future of the transportation industry in Western Canada and the nation as a whole, and his wise counsel and generous advice was something that was always appreciated by the government.

Of course I think my feelings about the passing of Ron Turner are tinged with the complexity of my personal association with him. We not only sat in this House at the same time; we sat on opposite sides. I remember so many occasions on which we were engaged in debate together on the standpoint of different principles, different views. I can say with complete candour that he not only gave as good as he got in the exchange of ideas in the Chamber, but I think demonstrated his superior talent on many an occasion as a public servant in this House. I had the honour of serving under Ron Turner in the Royal Canadian Air Force. He was my Group Captain at the time. This was during the same period incidentally, when we were competing, one might say, in the political arena, we were working together in the Royal Canadian Air Force activities in which he took such great interest, and his leadership and drive in that capacity is something that is very well worth appreciation and note at the present time.

All during this whole association of mine with Ron Turner, we remained the warmest of personal friends which indicates the climate of political activity that I think we should all like to see encouraged and grow in this province of ours. So the news of his untimely tragic death is one which, I am sure, we all feel in a personal way, as the loss of a companion in the battles and struggles of life in this community, and I think that on this occasion the House would wish me to bring this matter to their attention and to present for their consideration the motion that is appropriate to the occasion. And I am very pleased indeed that I have the privilege of associating the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition with me in the presentation of this motion.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, that this House convey to the family of the late Ronald David Turner, who served as a member of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, its sincere sympathy in their bereavement and its appreciation of his devotion to duty in a useful life of active community and public service, and that Madam Speaker be requested to forward a copy of this resolution to the family.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT, (Leader of the Opposition), (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, it is with deep regret that I accept the honour to second this resolution. Ron Turner did, indeed, have a distinguished career. He served his country well during the war in the Air Force; before that was even completed he took on responsibilities here in the Province of Manitoba representing the Air Force group in this House. He continued for many years serving here as a private member and later as a Cabinet Minister. He held one of the most important posts in this House as Provincial Treasurer and had a guiding hand in the development of our province.

(MR. MOLGAT, cont'd).....

Mr. Turner was a man of very wide interests. In addition to the work that he did here, he was extremely interested in many other fields and saw challenge come in the development of air transportation in this province. He left what the Premier described as a spectacular political career here, to engage in private industry. His capacity, his intelligence, his hard work showed out there as well, where he developed, I would say, the leading air line in Canada outside of the two international carriers. He formed there a company that has served Manitoba extremely well. He brought to this province a great deal of additional economic activity. But it is more in the personal sense, Madam Speaker, that I speak today, because I have lost a very close personal friend. When my colleague, the Member for Lakeside, decided that he wished to cease being the Leader of our party, I could think of no man who could succeed him better than Ron Turner. I did all I could to convince him to accept that responsibility. He declined to do so, but encouraged me to proceed along that line and subsequently put my name in nomination at our leadership convention. All through the years, Mr. Turner was a very close friend of mine. I cannot express fully the loss that I feel personally in this regard. I have lost a very close friend and the province has lost a distinguished public servant.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, this is one of those occasions when one joins with political foes in this House to pay a tribute to a former member who had made a substantial contribution to the welfare of his province, and I do that at this time, Madam Speaker, in respect of the memory of Ron Turner. I had the opportunity of sitting in this House with Ron for about five years. Madam Speaker, I can picture him now as I pay tribute to him, when he became the Provincial Treasurer, I can picture him now opposite me with a dark blue suit and a red carnation when he introduced the budget for the forthcoming year. Ron was one of those types of individuals that you cannot erase from your memory, Madam Speaker, because he had the happy faculty of being able to stand up to say his piece and even penetrate into your own thoughts and ideas, and throughout it all remain a true gentleman and give us as he spoke of his scholarly knowledge. As the First Minister and the Leader of the Opposition have said, truly Ron Turner has made a tremendous contribution as a member of the Air Force, possessor of the Air Force cross, a member in this House as an independent for the Air Force, as a Cabinet Minister. I join with my two friends in this House in paying a sincere tribute to the honour and memory of Ron Turner and express on behalf of the group I have the honour to lead, our sincere sympathy to those that Ron has left behind. We shall not forget him in a hurry.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I too, had a casual acquaintance with Mr. Ron Turner, I watched his career with interest over the years that he was a member of this House and also as a member of the cabinet. It is unfortunate to have him pass at such an early age, and I too, want to join with other members in extending sympathy to the bereaved family.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I find it very difficult to express my feeling with regard to Ron Turner. I think one of the things that would indicate the capacity that all of us realize that Ron Turner possessed was the fact that when he came in here as a private member, he was representing a constituency that already had a member in the cabinet. Those were the days when Winnipeg city was divided into three constituencies of four members each. Ron first came in of course as a member for the Air Force at the conclusion of world war two, but then in the next election ran in the Winnipeg South seat and was elected as a regular member of this House. Those who know how representation is chosen in the Cabinet will realize that a man had to be of particularly outstanding qualities in order to be chosen for a cabinet position in the seat that already had a cabinet minister in the person of the former Lieutenant-Governor of this province, John S. McDiarmid. I'm sure I can agree with everything that's been said about the service that Ron Turner always gave. I was only one of a legion of friends that he had and I know that all of us regret most deeply his passing, but our regret is as nothing compared to the tragedy that has been suffered by his family and the community.

HONOURABLE GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, I cannot let this occasion pass without a brief and I am sure quite inadequate word of sympathy to Ron Turner's family, perhaps heightened as it will be by the fact that he was such a fine family man and had such a lovely family. This is a great tragedy, a tragedy perhaps sharper than occurs in some cases when a man has served his full span of life. But Ron Turner had accomplished much and the tragedy arises in the fact that he had much yet to accomplish and I can only add my word of sympathy then to the family. I came to know him well and cordially and with great admiration, both from the opposition benches when I had some occasions to discuss matters concerned with the Department of Industry and Commerce and took

(MR. EVANS, cont'd).the occasion many times to continue the discussions outside the chamber, and had many fine and if I may say so confidential and warmly mutually respectful discussions with him. And on no occasion did he take advantage of any discussions we had outside the Chamber to improve his position within the House and I think that that was characteristic of him. I know him now of course as the inheritor of his very fine work in establishing the Department of Industry and Commerce and I think it can be truly said that a great deal of the strength of the department itself derives from his mind and his very fair spirit and his broad vision which he brought to the development of the Department of Industry and Commerce. I have had the occasion to continue this association since because the development of the air business in Canada is the richer for the work that he has done in connection with his own corporation Trans-Air. So for his qualities of heart and mind he will be greatly missed, and I add my sympathy to the family, to his political associates, to his business associates, and voice my belief that Manitoba is much the poorer for this very untimely and tragic death.

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders. . .

MR. JOHNSON: Madam Speaker before the Orders of the Day I would like to mention to the House, I would like to record my warm congratulations to the seven University of Manitoba students who last week were awarded the Woodrow Wilson fellowships. I think I express the pride of all Manitobans in the feat of scholarship accomplished by these young people and wish them well as they carry on their studies under the aegis of these coveted fellowships. I think we all extend our congratulations to the administrators and faculty members of the University of Manitoba, University College, United College in Brandon from whom these students came, who have created the intellectual climate in which this kind of achievement is nourished. It is always a source of pride to see further proof of what we already know to be a fact that the calibre of university training in Manitoba is eminently capable of producing such a high degree of accomplishment. Last year we had 15 Woodrow Wilson fellowships; this year the university with seven, stands fourth among Canadian universities in the number of fellows it produced. I should point out to the House that these scholarships are recognized as next to the Rhodes scholarship in order of importance and one of the students who was chosen here has also won a Rhodes scholarship. I just thought Madam Speaker I would mention this and extend warmest wishes I'm sure on behalf of the members of the House to the winners of these coveted awards.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY, (Inkster): Madam Speaker, while we regret very much the untimely death of our member Mr. Turner, the world must go on and I wish to hand a bouquet to a gentleman, he's alive and I hope to see him alive until 120 years of age, that's.the Hebrew prayer. And I want to give a bouquet to the Honourable Minister of Trade and Commerce for his wonderful exhibit that he has arranged the other day which most of us, if not all of us, have attended at the Royal Alexandra Hotel. I have lived in Winnipeg all my life and I did not know, I confess, there are so many industries and so many products being manufactured in Manitoba for home consumption and for export. It was a revelation to me; it was appreciated I am sure by everyone who have seen those exhibits. I want to pay my respect --I have a bad habit and this is, I always give the devil its due-- I want to pay my respects to the Minister for the educational hours that he has given us the other day by the invitation of visiting the industrial exhibition. More power to him, whether in the government or outside the government; as a person, as an individual, I wish him long life, good health and continued good work.

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON, (St. George): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I asked him last week whether or not Metro had the authority to give a grant or contribution to the Pan-Am games and at that time he said it required a legal opinion and that at the moment he wasn't prepared to give me an answer. Could he give me an answer at this time please?

HONOURABLE ROBERT G. SMELLIE, Q. C. (Minister of Municipal Affairs), (Birtle-Russell): No.

MR. GUTTORMSON: What is the answer? No, that you can't give a legal opinion; no they can't give the grant?

MR. SMELLIE: No, I can't give a legal opinion.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Labour. It concerns the establishment last year of the, I believe it is called the Rural Building Construction Wages Board. I would like to ask my honourable friend if such a board has met as yet in the vicinity of Brandon. The reason for my question is there's considerable consternation at the present time in Brandon that the wage level

(MR. PAULLEY, cont'd). rates of the journeymen and those in the construction industry in Brandon will be lowered to those prevailing in the rural areas. I wonder if the Minister can tell me if the board has met; when it will meet, and is it possible that such a condition may arise where there is a reduction in the rate presently being paid to the construction worker in the City of Brandon, and also the Cities of Dauphin, Flin Flon and The Pas.

MR. BAIZLEY: Madam Speaker, the Rural Building Construction Wages Board are to hold their first meeting in Brandon tomorrow evening. This board is composed of representatives of employers and employees from the rural area with an impartial chairman. They are to hold those hearings that are necessary to make recommendations as to what wage rates will be determined in that part of the province.

MR. PAULLEY: ask the Honourable Minister whether the Minister himself has to approve of the recommendations of the Board or does the Board have sole jurisdiction over what the wage rate shall be.

MR. BAIZLEY: Madam Speaker, the Board makes recommendations to the Minister.

MR. PAULLEY: A supplemental question then. May I have the assurance of the Honourable the Minister that if there is an endeavour to reduce the rates presently paid in the construction industry in these large centres he will reject them.

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders. . . .

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, I have a supplementary question I would like to direct to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Would he undertake to give the House an answer to my question later on this week?

MR. SMELLIE: Madam Speaker, my honourable friend is asking for a legal opinion and I am not prepared to give a legal opinion on this question in the House.

MR. GUTTORMSON: tell us where we can get this legal opinion then.

MR. SMELLIE: There are lots of good lawyers down town. They'd all be glad to give my friend this advice.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside that the House do now adjourn to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the government's admission that persons on welfare require further relief from the tax on utilities and heat as described by the Minister of Welfare outside of this House, and the fact that this relief is being limited to those persons on welfare and is not being extended to all people of low income.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, before you rule on the admissibility of this resolution I would just observe that there are a number of occasions on which it can be discussed, certainly in the estimates, certainly before going to Supply, and certainly also on the resolution that is before the Chamber now.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I believe you have ruled in that you have read the motion. Is that not correct? Madam Speaker, my reason for bringing the matter up at this time in this manner is that this is the only opportunity that I will likely. . . .

MR. ROBLIN: the resolution before my honourable friend starts to discuss.

MR. MOLGAT: only the one. It is in the hands of the Clerk. Madam Speaker, my reason for bringing up the matter at this time to that on Friday night there was a very passing comment made in this House by the Minister of Welfare when he said in the course of the debate that it's in process, it's in the process Madam Speaker at the present time and is going through. That's page 563 of Hansard. Subsequently on page 564 he made another comment regarding the fact there had been some changes made in the regulations under The Social Allowances Act, and then again, page 564, he stated "on a question of privilege again I said it was in the process of going through at the present time." Those were the complete statements that he made in the House, Madam Speaker, at that time, but subsequently the Minister proceeded outside of the House to give a good deal more information than he gave the members of this House. I believe that there is here a matter of privilege for one thing, and secondly, the overall question of the relief to the people of Manitoba. But outside of this House as reported in both newspapers, the Minister indicated some specifics, as for example, and I'm quoting from the Tribune here "Mr. Carroll disclosed later that the fuel grant of \$19 a month for social allowance certificates is being increased to \$20.00. The grant for utilities is upped to \$7.50 from \$7.00." He proceeded to say that the \$1.50 increase should easily cover the new taxes. Madam Speaker, those statements I submit should have been made in this House and not outside this House.

(MR. MOLGAT, cont'd).....

The First Minister the other day when speaking on matters of privilege said that the Cabinet has the right to make decisions. I don't question the Cabinet's right to make decisions, Madam Speaker, but I say that when this House is in session, when the members of this House have been called here to transact public business, that decisions, that announcements of that type should be made in this House, not outside of this House. If we are not here in session there would be reason, but not certainly when we're here. So Madam Speaker, the government has admitted and accepted that the tax on heat and utilities is a tax that the low income groups cannot cover. It has admitted this in increasing its social welfare payments to those on social welfare so that they can meet the tax. These are the statements of the Minister himself.

Well Madam Speaker, there are many other people in this province on low income who are not on welfare. Here for example are the figures insofar as the Province of Manitoba, for incomes: Taxpayers by income: The total number of taxpayers in the province according to this, this is a Survey of Markets, 1964/65 produced by the Financial Post. The total number of taxpayers in the province, according to them are 158,846. In 1962, 20,000 of those taxpayers were under \$2,000; 34,000 more were in the \$2,000 to \$3,000 bracket. In other words, under \$3,000 income over a third of the total number of taxpayers; an additional 34,000 were in the bracket of \$3,000 to \$4,000; which means that over half of the taxpayers of this province were in the bracket under \$4,000.00. Madam Speaker, there has been no statement whatever from the government that they will extend any relief to these people. And these are the ones who require relief for this type of tax because it's quite obvious that they cannot in any way -- there's nothing that they can do to reduce their expenditures in this field. They have no control over the climate in the Province of Manitoba; they have no control over the price of the fuel that they purchase and you certainly cannot live in Manitoba without it.

So Madam Speaker, we are saying to the government that this tax on the low income groups in particular is completely unrealistic, it just does not fit in with any conception of life in the Province of Manitoba. The government has admitted this in its treatment of the people on welfare. But this is only one group. There are many other people in this province, Madam Speaker, who are not on welfare, but who are having a tough time getting along. Who are having a very difficult time meeting their daily obligations, let alone these new taxes. I suggest Madam Speaker, the government should make an immediate statement in this regard and cancel its tax on heat.

HONOURABLE J. B. CARROLL, (Minister of Welfare), (The Pas): Madam Speaker, the other night there were some suggestions during the course of the debate which took place, which created an impression, I thought, that the government had really little concern for people who were on, living on social allowances and that the government were certainly not doing anything and had done nothing in fact in recent years to try to improve their situation in the light of increasing costs of various kinds and I think that was the suggestion which prompted me to interject at that time, and suggest that the government had on several occasions taken into account the fact that there had been increased costs since The Social Allowances Act was first proclaimed and that we were in fact recognizing the effects of the tax changes which took place last fall. I think it is true that imposing new taxes does have an impact on people. I think we do tend however, to overlook the fact that this is a shift of taxation rather than a new imposition because there will be reductions in the area of local taxes which one way or another will reflect with respect to most taxpayers in the Province of Manitoba. Will reflect in either rebates, some of which will be going to welfare recipients. It can result too in changes in rentals and things of that kind.

I would also like to point out that of course the tax increases which took place are very substantially less on the low income groups than the impact would have been had we gone to a sales tax which bears most heavily on those who can least afford to pay it. With respect to the actual amounts of the tax increases, I certainly will apologize to the House for any error which I may have made in disclosing any facts with respect to this change, although at that point changes had been made. I just point out however, that this is a mathematical calculation. If one wants to take the figure of \$19 and add to that five percent which is the amount of the fuel tax for those who do pay full fuel tax, then they will come out to a figure of \$19.95 and the fuel allowance will in fact be going to \$20 for people who live in homes, unheated homes during the period of the year when the fuel allowance applies. I believe that's all I really have to say Madam Speaker, in this connection. The announcement of the change had taken place in this House during the course of a debate; the actual figures may not have been mentioned but certainly the change had been indicated and indicated very clearly at that particular stage.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam Speaker as I understand my Leader's contention I think it is twofold. First, he challenges the Minister or the government for making an announcement regarding an increase outside of this House which should have been made inside of this House; and secondly, he challenges the inadequacy of the provision made by the government to overcome the effects of this particular tax. Now as far as I can see, the government's position is simply this, that they are giving an increase in social allowances to overcome the effects of the fuel tax. But my Leader also raises the point that one-third of the people of Manitoba are in the \$3,000 or under income tax bracket and my leader's contention is this, which I heartily support, that it is not sufficient for the government to give relief to people on social allowance from the fuel tax, but that relief should be given to all people in the low income tax bracket. Now the government has this session impliedly admitted that a married person is entitled to an exemption of \$250 a month from a garnishing order, or \$3,000 a year, so I submit Madam that the government has not gone far enough in the exemption from this fuel tax and that should be extended to all people in the low income tax bracket.

MR. CARROLL: point of order here. I'm just wondering if we're getting into the details of the fuel tax debate, if this isn't adequately covered by the resolution that's already before the House. If it's a question of making an improper statement outside the House I think that's one thing but if we're getting into the other debate, I seriously suggest that you take that into consideration as to whether this debate is in order.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, on the point of order, I believe that the motion was clear, that it covered the fact that the fuel tax was not being extended to other people of low income.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, in this debate I think that some of the remarks made this afternoon by the Honourable Minister are misleading again. I don't think it is quite clear. He did mention a few things, but I don't think that he stood up in this House to mention anything on Friday. It was something that while the Honourable Leader of the NDP was speaking that he answered back, and all of a sudden there's a big announcement made here. I think that he's wrong when he said that this should have been clear.

Another thing that comes to my mind, this amendment that was brought in on this day by a member of the government was that --and everything that was said on that day was why did we single out, why was this tax singled out, this particular tax. This tax was singled out because we felt that although we did not agree with all the others we felt that this one was definitely a wrong and an unfair tax.

Now my honourable friend I think is indicating that the members of the government also recognize this, because they have singled that out--this tax-- singled it out for a rebate. This seems odd because they haven't mentioned anything about the telephone tax and the electricity tax. Now this is not good enough. This is a shifting tax, a tax that is shifted. There is no doubt that we know that the government will return a certain amount --a certain amount. It's not just a shifting tax, it's an added tax, and a lot more money will be collected in Manitoba with these taxes. If the point that he's trying to make --that my honourable friend is trying to make is that this is a better way, to take it away from the people that own houses because they're the only ones that are going to get anything back-- they're going to get \$50 if they pay at least \$100 on the education tax-- and he's going to take it and put it on people who don't own a home at all because they can't afford it. They're renting, and they have to pay for the tax on this heat. I think that this is definitely wrong. I don't think that he can get away with this.

Yesterday, another Minister who is famous for these statements, for trying to muddle everything on a television program, came out and stated that this wasn't important, and that if we wanted to do away with these taxes we should find out a way to get more money. Well I think that it was clear that we said --I said, anyway, that as far as I'm concerned if we were that low, if we had to stoop that low to get money, to tax money, we should do away with certain things. I think that this is just not critical, I think that this is a way out, an alternative.

As I said, we would like to see the Pan-Am Games here; we would like to see certain things in the Arts Centre and so on; but if we're stooping that low to try and collect a tax from poor people that are trying to heat a place, and this is not something that you can do without, not in this country, and this is why in all sincerity this motion was brought up by the members of our party. We don't think that this is right.

Again the Minister made another false erroneous statement right today. He said that this tax is five percent and it is not true in all cases, Madam Speaker. This has never been

(MR. DESJARDINS, cont'd).clarified. I made a charge in this House that it was anywhere from a cent on sixteen cents, and this is probably the most expensive way of heating, on propane gas and oil, to a cent on twenty-four cents in the case of the bunker oil.

And this tax --again there's another thing that was wrong, and that is this tax was on certain people collected from October 19th and from other people from December 28th or 29th. I think that this government should not try to muddle up this thing with a useless and meaningless amendment of patting themselves on the back. What does the amendment say? That it be resolved that while recognizing the incidence of the tax on heat, this House regards it as preferable to the institution of a general provincial sales tax. We haven't got a sales tax here. What has that got to do? You can say that it's preferable to put this tax than to send somebody with a gun and just get the purse away from the people. That's preferable too. We haven't got a sales tax in this province and the thing is that we are asking --we have made a motion asking that this tax be discontinued immediately because it is an unfair tax.

So, Madam Speaker, if this Minister is going to make any statements at all, he should be clear. He should not try to mislead the people, he and his colleagues should not try to mislead the people here in Manitoba. He should tell us that it's not necessarily a five percent tax, because that is not the case, and I think that he should tell us why he has singled out this tax which is not any worse --we were told all the taxes have to be taken together. Why is that tax been singled out for a rebate instead of the telephone or the electricity tax. I think these questions should be answered, Madam Speaker.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, on several occasions during this session an argument has developed such as is presently going on over one or two or several matters, and to me it seems to stem from the fact that the government has not yet told the House what it intends to do about a lot of things that are mentioned in the Throne Speech. The Throne Speech was four or five pages in length and refers to a great number of items, benefits, and so on, but most of them have yet to be told to the people. We know nothing at all about them. There's mention there about reducing a cent a gallon I think on gasoline, extending the time to pay your taxes, and a whole numerous number of items there. If the government would get up --we've now been sitting three weeks-- if the government would get up and tell us what they plan on a lot of these things, then we would know where to proceed and how to plan our attack accordingly, and save a lot of time incidentally.

Now, Madam Speaker, the Honourable Member for St. Vital, and indeed my honourable friend the Minister of Education, the other day they both suggested that --well, let's fact it they said, if it wasn't for putting on this heat tax we wouldn't be able to pay back the \$10 million to the people, the rebate on their taxes; we wouldn't be able to implement all of the education programs; we would have to do away with all the social allowances; we'd have to call back all the medicare cards; and they went on and on and on and on for about two hours the other day, inferring that if they rescinded the fuel tax they would immediately have to cut out every bit of social legislation that had been put on the books for the last --since '58. Now that, we know, is not a fact, because I think the government only expects to collect about \$1 million on this heating tax, something in that neighbourhood, and even the First Minister himself attempted to point up that it only amounted to 60 cents a month so it was pretty small peanuts, on the one hand; but on the other hand, if they rescinded it, it would mean cancelling all social legislation.

Now the Honourable the Attorney General said there was no special reason for putting it on in the first place. Either that or he was misquoted. I have before me the what the papers report that he said. "Attorney-General Stewart McLean said Friday," --this is November 14-- "there had been 'a good deal of criticism' of the government's recently imposed tax on heating fuel." And then he was asked, well why did you put it on? He said again, " 'There was no special reason,' he replied. The government needed a certain amount of additional revenue and it had been 'a matter of judgment' which items would be taxed and how much. "

HONOURABLE STEWART E. McLEAN, (Attorney-General), (Dauphin): Madam Speaker, on a point of privilege, I did not make the latter statement referred to by the Honourable Member --or quoted by the member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well, Madam Speaker, if he says he didn't make any of these quotes --these are all in quotation marks -- then he should lay charges against the Free Press because they are all in quotation marks here, and --(Interjection)-- Pardon? Well, when they put it in quotes, when the paper puts it in quotes, generally you accept it as being the gospel.

MADAM SPEAKER: The honourable member should accept the statement of the Minister.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well I will accept it but I question whether the Free Press will be- cause they are using quotation marks in what he says --(Interjection)-- No, I am not going to accept it for the Free Press, they can do what they like about it.

Now, Madam Speaker, you will recall about a year ago now, maybe two years ago now, we had one of the longest debates in this House. It went on for days and days and weeks, I think, over the \$10.00 increase in old age pension and then this government taking it all back from them. You remember that? The papers were full of it for weeks. It was the Honourable Leader of the NDP said the other day that he was quoting part of the Bible in suggesting that this government was similar to the quotation that "the Lord gives and the Lord takes away," and so does this government. And away back there, "Province May Cut the Aged Allowances"; "Pension Rob Angers Aldermen"; "Province Won't Pay the Pension Hikes". They said their needs were all filled and so on and so forth.

Now with the increase --my honourable friend the Minister of Welfare the other night said that they had recognized that these utility taxes would increase their cost of living, that is understandable. He says that he is going to up the fuel tax by \$1.00 a month, I think. That's what the paper suggests, from 19 to 20, so he's recognized this. Then there's the two or three other taxes, their telephone tax and their light tax and so on.

Now there is no question about it but that a whole new group of people will now qualify for social allowance. There's no doubt about it. A whole new family will be taken in, be- cause I have before me, and I don't intend to read any of them today, because I have the reso- lution on this particular subject adjourned in my name and that will give me opportunity to speak then, but I have before me a letter right here where the social worker went out and as- sessed the needs, as they do, and he said in a letter, you've got \$2.00 too much now, there- fore you don't need social allowance --two dollars exactly, he says. Because you understand what they do, when they go out and assess their needs they figure out your income; they figure out your needs-- that is they do, I am referring to the government -- they apply their schedule of needs here and then they take the one away from the other, and they say well lo and behold you've got \$1.97 left so you don't need social allowance. So now with this increase in their cost of living they will automatically have a whole new family to take in.

So I think, Madam Speaker, it would have been much better for the government to have got up and said, "here is the new schedule of payments," and laid them on all the members' desks, and say, "there they are; look at them; we know that the cost of living has gone up and here's one reason, the new taxes is one reason, there's lots of other reasons --the cost of living has gone up. Here's the new schedule," and laid it on the desk. There would be none of this argument today if this had been done. I suggest they do this with a lot of other proposed legislation that is mentioned in the Throne Speech.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER, (Brokenhead): Madam Speaker, last special session I had oc- casion to refer to the changes made in taxation by this government as the kind of changes that would produce a treadmill effect, and by treadmill effect I meant that this government would be on the one hand reducing taxes on property, and on the other hand it would be increasing taxes on consumption, some cases on basic necessities consumption, and that therefore the tax burden as such would not be substantially alleviated and so therefore this whole change that was proposed would in fact have no real basic substantive effect and that is indeed a treadmill effect.

Now the admission of the Honourable the Minister of Welfare certainly does reveal just what the problem is, since basic necessities are in some instances here being taxed, it will necessitate an increase in the social allowances schedule and regulations. I think that we should be a little more rational about our taxation policies. There isn't much point in in- creasing taxation if you are going to have to increase social allowances to make up some of the newly imposed burdens on those unable to pay for it.

I would like to point to a chart which is derived from the US Treasury Department in which it makes a comparison of the modes of taxation in the United States and in other major industrial countries. When I saw this I was at first interested, and later very interested, almost astounded, because I find, according to this US Treasury Department data, that in the United States government revenue is 78 percent dependent on taxes on income and wealth and only 22 percent dependent on consumption taxes, sales taxes, excise taxes, etcetera. I think that is a something to aim at Madam Speaker.

(MR. SCHREYER, cont'd).....

How does Canada compare with this? Canada stands somewhere around eighth or ninth on the list because Canada, and this would be indicative more or less of the provinces, derives its revenue 61 percent from taxes on income and wealth and 39 percent on consumption taxes. In the case of the United States, 78 percent of the revenue derived from tax on income and wealth and only 22 percent derived from taxes on consumption. I consider this to be a goal in taxation policy which Canada and which provinces in Canada should aim towards. What is the point in taxing consumption of essentials when it necessitates action by the welfare department to try and close a self-created gap.

Madam Speaker, I still have hope that this government will see fit to do something about this tax on heating fuel and on other sources of heat and that they will see fit to rescind it before too long.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, last week you heard the member for St. Vital chastise me for introducing this resolution as a privileged one, and he had other names for it. It would appear now that even his own colleagues have recognized that this is an unfair tax and, if nothing else, this resolution of mine has achieved getting the government to at least increase the payments to the people on welfare as a result of this unfair tax. The Premier has indicated that the tax only means about 60 to 90 cents per month. I have to disagree very strongly with him on that statement. I know that the average home in Winnipeg, and many in the rural areas, are paying at least \$10.00 to \$12.00 a year in tax as a result of this levy last year.

I would like to point out to the members that we frequently see discussions and news stories about how the municipal men are attempting to pare down the taxes and keep the mill rate down. Does the government realize that a home with an assessment of only \$5,000, that this fuel tax means an increase which is the equivalent of an increase in the mill rate of two to three mills. I think this is very important. The member for St. Vital said, oh well if people don't want to burn fuel they can go and pick up wood and twigs. Well this is a ridiculous statement.

MR. FRED GROVES, (St. Vital): I didn't say that, Madam Speaker.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Oh, yes you did. You said a lot of people in northern Manitoba could burn wood, but I would like to remind him that some of the people in northern Manitoba such as Thompson, Flin Flon, Churchill, are paying as much as \$35.00 a year in tax as a result of this.

MR. GROVES: If the honourable member had been listening, I specifically excluded the larger centres in northern Manitoba.

MR. GUTTORMSON: As I heard the honourable member speaking, he indicated the people in the north. If he said he excluded them, well I will take his word for it.

Why is the government only making it retroactive or making it effective April 1. Now that the temperatures are easing off, the weather is easing up, the tax isn't going to have the same impact. I suggest that the government should make this retroactive to last October so the people will get a benefit from this new change of legislation. Why make it effective April 1 when the temperatures are warming up, the snow is disappearing? I think that the government should reconsider their position on this. It was a bungle on their part to tax heat and I don't regret bringing in this resolution, even though he calls it frivolous. He said that if people --he talks of a tax on food, and I would like him to tell us what food is taxed in this province. If it is taxed, I would like to know about it.

MR. GROVES:.....honourable member, Madam Speaker, that I did not refer to his resolution as frivolous.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, I think the government should give immediate consideration to eliminating this tax and make it retroactive to last October so that the people who have suffered the hardship will not endure it any longer.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I might add a few words to what has already been said. I haven't got the text of the resolution that we are discussing but certainly I think it is well known that the poorer people in this province naturally have poorer housing conditions, and as a result they have higher fuel costs, so that those very people that should not be paying any tax on fuel are the highest taxpayers in this case. Therefore, I think it is so very wrong that this tax was imposed on heating oil. I take exception to this tax. I think I did so when the matter came up at the fall session and I am still of the same opinion.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, in closing the debate --if no one else wishes to speak-- the main point, Madam Speaker in this is that when this legislation was introduced by the government last summer, when they proposed their new tax bill, the First Minister at that time --and I regret that he is not in his seat, in fact he does not like to discuss these things-- the First Minister at that time specifically stated that these taxes were not going to be on necessities and that they were taxes that people would not have to pay if they didn't want to. They were going to be taxes that were mainly on luxuries and that they could simply, if they didn't want to use the services, for example gasoline or liquor or cigarettes, they didn't need to.

But here is one, Madam Speaker, that no one in Manitoba can escape. There is just absolutely no escape for it whatever. That's point number one. Now the Minister has accepted that. The government has accepted that principle because they are proceeding now to make changes themselves in their social security structure, specifically because of this tax. There may be other factors that increase the cost of living, but in this particular case, according to the Minister's own statement, this increase is to cover the new taxes. So the government accepts now, belatedly, that the tax is unfair on low incomes.

But it is singling out here only one section of the low income people, those who are on welfare, and they represent only a very small proportion of the taxpayers of this province. There is a very large group of people, and I gave the figures earlier, who simply cannot afford to pay this type of tax. It is an unfair tax on them. They're fighting, in many cases, to stay off welfare. I can speak on this, in my own constituency, there are a large number of people there who don't want to be on welfare. They want to be able to carry on on their own and here we are loading extra burdens on them. For the Minister to say, oh well they will get it back because there will be a decrease in their mill rate and so on --Madam Speaker, the decrease that's going to come will not come anywhere near the amount of new taxes the people have to pay, because the tax rebate at the best is going to amount to some \$10 million and the new taxes amount to \$25 million, so it's obvious that the taxpayers are not going to get back the amount that they are forced to pay out.

And in terms of the average individual, a man who say has a house assessed at some five or six thousand dollars, this heat tax alone amounts to some two or three mills. Now to say that the municipalities are going to turn around and reduce by two or three mills will not improve the position of this individual. But more than that, Madam Speaker, a large number of people on low incomes are living in rented accommodations. The very reason of their low income --or rather the fact that they are on low income means that they can't afford to buy a home in many cases, so they're living in rented premises and they are not going to get the benefit of either the tax rebate or a reduction in municipal taxation. They are going to be strictly paying out and not getting back. This is the situation of these people.

Now the Minister has accepted the principle that the low income groups need further assistance. He has accepted that for the welfare people. I say to the government, cancel your heat tax; it's a wrong tax to begin with. You made a decision as a result of a lot of pressure to do away with the land purchase tax; the heat tax is a much worse tax. Let's tackle it first, let's get rid of it, and you'll put the people of Manitoba, and particularly the low income people, in a position where --at least you'll improve the position that they now find themselves under as a result of this tax.

Madam Speaker, I think that the proper procedure on this type of a debate is for me now to ask that the motion be withdrawn, so I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that the motion be withdrawn.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker it's only a technicality and we have one motion before the House now. I think the honourable member merely requests unanimous consent of the House to withdraw the motion.

MADAM SPEAKER: That's right. Agreed that the motion be withdrawn? --Agreed.

MR. MOLGAT: If I may, Madam Speaker, that doesn't mean I've changed my view, but merely that this is the form of the debate.

.....Continued on next page

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, I adjourned the debate on this motion last Friday. I was prompted to do this by some of the statements made by the Honourable Member of Mines and Natural Resources who unfortunately is not in his seat today. Now as he usually does, he tried to give the impression to the members of this House that he was the only one who knew anything about law, the only one that was right in this, in that this was a thing that was decided by statute and there's nothing that could be done about it. Now, Madam Speaker, the Act, No. 26, states that "notwithstanding The Legislative Assembly Act or any other act or law, the corporation shall not be required to produce to the Assembly or to any committee thereof." So we are not asking anything here -- there's nothing being asked from the corporation but rather from the members of the government. We do respect that a lot of these things should not be made public, we realize this, but we feel that it is not fair to have one party in the "know" and not the other party.

Now my honourable friend the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources said at the time that we hadn't said anything about this and all of a sudden -- he was talking about the Liberals then -- and all of a sudden we were questioning this. This again, Madam Speaker, is false, like so many of his statements. We did approve the principle of the Bill -- it was approved in 1958. It was something that we felt should go through, Understanding Section 26 as we do, we felt that there was a safeguard, and after -- from 1958 to 1962 we saw very clearly that this was something to play politics with; that the members of government were going around making speeches on different platforms telling the people of Manitoba how wonderful they were; that they were great friends of the people because they had this fund and they were making these loans.

Now, Madam Speaker, in 1962, there was an amendment to this Act, an amendment that asked for a blank cheque of \$10,000 for this corporation -- \$10 million, excuse me. Well, Madam Speaker, we refused to go along with this. We refused to go along with this because, as my leader said at the time, private funds are private matters but public funds are public matters. We felt that this was not only a right of the members of this House but a duty to find out how this money was used, to find out certain things about this and we had no idea of giving this blank cheque. Now I think that if we are asked, if it's proper to ask the members of this legislature to vote on a certain thing, to approve \$10 million, I think that at least we should have an idea as to how this fund operates. My leader at the time, I think, informed the members of this House that he felt that this was indeed a black day for democracy if the government would use its superior number and send this thing through, and this is what was done.

Now if I had followed the example of the Leader of the NDP, I would say, well our friends also join the government in this vote. But I think that it would be a little unfair because the members of the NDP on this occasion did vote for the government but they did back us on this demand that the names should be known. They did back this and they felt that at the time they should vote for the amendment because this Development Fund was needed. Well the Fund was already in. We had no reason to give a blank cheque to the government. As I said, we felt that we should know more about this before we blindly say "yes, you can have another \$10 million", and therefore I think that my honourable friend the Leader of the NDP, and his colleagues, I think that they should see now why we insisted on voting against this amendment in 1962. I think that they could see their error now in voting for it because they could see that this government in matters such as this is not to be trusted too much because we have not been given any more information at all.

Now, Madam Speaker, we feel we will certainly back our friends of the NDP on this debate. We feel that this is certainly "legit" to ask these questions and we certainly aim to vote on this motion with them.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I submitted this Order for Return

MR. SMELLIE: Is the honourable member closing the debate?

MR. SCHREYER: That's right, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. SMELLIE: Madam Speaker, I think that it is imperative that we should understand that any credit information has to be private information. Even the fact that a loan has been applied for is information that a business concern may not wish their competitors to know about, and certainly the fact as to whether or not a loan has been made is something that I think is privileged information. The fact that a business concern has applied for a loan tells not only

(MR. SMELLIE cont'd) something about the financial resources of that concern, but it also indicates that that same concern has plans under consideration for, in most cases, expansion of some kind. Even these little bits of information can be very valuable to a competitor in a highly competitive business. If information such as the information that the Honourable Member for Brokenhead has asked for is made available to the public, merely because the fund from which these people may have applied to borrow, if this information is made public, Madam Speaker, it would discourage many applications to the fund and would make impossible many proposed developments.

Let's just take a look, for a moment, at what might happen if this information were made public. In many cases it could be misinterpreted. A business enterprise makes an application for a loan. If my honourable friend had his way this would become public information. Then if the loan is not granted, or if the loan is not used by the applicant even though it was approved, what is this going to mean to other people? To some it's going to mean that their credit was no good. To others it may mean that the business proposal they had was not satisfactory. But I suggest that credit may not be the reason for the refusal of the loan. The loan may be refused for a variety of reasons. Perhaps the information that was submitted with the application was insufficient. Perhaps the fund wanted some other proposal to be made and it asked to have it withdrawn for that reason. Perhaps the proprietors of the business have changed their minds themselves in the interim and decided to withdraw it.

I suggest, Madam Speaker, that no -- no lending body, either private or public, can possibly give out information as to the names of the applicants for loans or as to the amounts of loans or even the fact that loans are granted if they wish to have the confidence of the people who will use the lending service. Borrowers who have approached the Manitoba Development Fund from time to time have been assured over and over again that their dealings with that fund would be confidential. There have been explicit assurances by the fund to applicants, reinforced by the fact that this was debated in this House some three years ago, and on that occasion the government assured the people of Manitoba that their dealings with the Manitoba Development Fund would be confidential. I suggest, Madam Speaker, that the government cannot break faith with those who have used the fund now. If honourable members want information; if they believe that a certain company has borrowed from the fund; and if they believe that real property was security for that fund, certainly they can obtain some information. They can make searches of the property in the Land Titles Office to determine whether or not there was a mortgage registered. This is public information, this cannot be avoided. But I suggest that it would be improper for us at this time to change the policy as to the confidential nature of dealings with a fund like the Manitoba Development Fund.

In my view, Madam Speaker, the Act forbids the disclosure even of the names of the applicants. This opinion has been confirmed by the law officers of the Crown. I remember well the debates that took place in this House previously and I believe that this was the intention of the government when the fund was begun and certainly it was reinforced by the debates that took place while I was in the House in 1962. Madam Speaker, I believe that the government policy to decline this information is right. Madam Speaker, I would go farther than this, I would say that members of the government do themselves not have this information. This is confidential information and neither I nor any other member of the treasury benches of this House know who the applicants are to the Manitoba Development Fund and we certainly have no knowledge of anything contained in those applications.

The Honourable Member for St. Boniface, says, "surely it's reasonable for us to know how this fund operates," and that is true. In general terms, Madam Speaker, but not in specifics dealing with one applicant or one application. I suggest, Madam Speaker, that there is no desire on the part of government to limit information to the members of this House as to how the fund operates, but I submit that as long as I have anything to do with the policy of this government there will never be any disclosure without the consent of the person applying, or the corporation applying, and prior consent to the release of that information.

Suggestions have been made that members of the government have used such information for political purposes. Madam Speaker, I categorically deny that statement. The only time where a loan has ever been referred to by members of the government, has been after the borrower himself has made public that information and I hope and trust that the situation will never change.

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK, Q. C. (Ethelbert Plains): Madam Speaker, I notice that the Honourable Minister was quite careful in stating that the contents of applications should not be

(MR. HRYHORCZUK cont'd) disclosed and should be kept secret and he was basing his argument on the statute itself. But this question is not asking any information on applications. This question asks for information on loans that have been granted, and insofar as particulars of these loans are concerned as to the amount of the loan that was granted, I think this is public information in every case, because you could find that either in the Land Titles Office or the court in which the bill of sale or the chattel mortgage has been registered. We're not asking for any information that's contained in the applications of these people. We're asking for information that is already open to the public. The only difference is that instead of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead going to the Land Titles Office and spending money in order to obtain that information, he asks it from the source here in the Legislature, and I think it's the proper place to ask it for. As a representative of the people, the people's money is being used in making these loans, I think he's entitled to information that is public information anyhow. Why should he be asked to go to the expense of paying for that information, the government should supply it. And you won't be breaking any secrecy or anything else because it's no longer a secret once that loan is made.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I think that while it's already been stated that whenever securities are taken for a loan, and which would apply in this case, that this is a matter of public record. We have firms like Dun and Bradstreet who publish reports on this so that this is not restricted in any way. However, I feel that there are certain matters that have to be confidential. I know this and this is true in business especially and even in the credit union field there's a certain amount of this that has to be kept confidential. But I think when it comes to a matter that where a firm goes into receivership or is in trouble, I think at that time, at that point, we should know about this, and I think some information should be given at that point. I don't know whether the fund has acted in any of these cases under the trusteeship. I know of other cases where they have acted and where firms where they made loans to were in trouble and have been wound up since. Certainly at some time during the sessions, whether it be done under the estimates, we should be entitled to some information on matters of that type.

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I think a point has been missed out completely here in that the Member for Brokenhead is asking for information, not for a reason to -- personal information or trying to embarrass the government. I am sure he has heard like some of us in this party have heard, that there has been a loan perhaps made that should not have been made. I'm talking now about if it has been or has not been made, the Friendly Family Farms Limited. Now if this firm has received a loan and they're in the farming business, surely this doesn't seem to be the field for the Manitoba Development Fund. And I quote from a paragraph in the Manitoba Development Fund Annual Report for their first year March 31st, 1959, and I quote: "The function of the Manitoba Development Fund is to provide financial assistance to new and existing manufacturing industries, tourists and recreational facilities, and community development corporations in the province, when it is the opinion of the fund that credit would not otherwise be available on reasonable terms and conditions and where the amount of capital invested by the owners is such as to afford the Fund reasonable protection."

Now I am the first to agree that loan information should be treated with great discretion by personnel in the department of the Manitoba Development Fund, and certain of this information should not be bruited around, that it can do harm. We all realize that and we concede the point, but the Honourable Member from Brokenhead is asking for information that -- it is old, it is out of date; it's certainly not going to do anyone any use to have it.

It's a fact I'm sure that he and other members of this House are interested in as to whether or not one or perhaps more of these loans have not been made in strict accordance of the principles of the loan fund and I'm sure that this question is so important that it can't go unanswered. I'm rather disappointed, I thought the Minister of Agriculture would give a clarifying statement on this one point that I've raised. If the reports that I have heard are true, a farming firm has received more money in one year for a farming operation from the Development Fund, which is under industry and commerce, than all loans put out, various loans put out under the Act for the Department of Agriculture. And if this is correct, or incorrect, one or the other, I feel it should be answered and a clear statement made on this so that people who are in either the farming business or other businesses that require loans, would like to have these cleared up. I think this is a very important point, and the information asked for in the Order of Return by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead is all reasonable. He has conceded the fact that Item No. 3 could be of some value to a competitor and probably is not important

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . to the information he is seeking and he concedes that, but I for one can certainly see no reason why the first two questions in this order cannot be answered.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Madam Speaker, in my area there were some businesses that have benefitted through the corporation I believe -- we didn't get official word from the government that that is true but otherwise we have found out that it is quite true. The government benches, the ministers try to tell us that the government is not using this fund -- not exactly the fund I should say, but the idea of the fund as political propaganda, or don't intend to use it. I will disagree with them because I think, in my opinion, that on every occasion whenever possible, the members of the front benches here take that advantage and they do use it politically so as to enhance their own party, and I disagree with that. Here in the House they tell us that we cannot get the information; we can't even get the information in what area the money has been borrowed by the fund. But when they get out among the people they make a lot of noise about it and boast about it. I have several clippings here. I've got one clipping before me and this is the Free Press, February 10th, 1962. And here's what the headline is: "Flakeboard Plant opened at Sprague", now I'll read this and I'll read it all -- (Interjection) -- And you tell me when I'm through whether this isn't used for propaganda purposes. "Three busloads of business men from Winnipeg, Brandon and other Manitoba points, Friday accompanied Premier Duff Roblin and Minister of Industry and Commerce, Gurney Evans, on a tour of south-eastern Manitoba during which they attended a public banquet held for them by the Steinbach Chamber of Commerce; visited the C. T. Loewen & Sons Ltd. millwork plant; officially opened an addition to the Barkman Concrete Products Plant, also in Steinbach; and then went on to officially open a new Flakeboard Plant at Sprague." Now here, "speaking to the businessmen of Steinbach and their visitors Premier Roblin said that both the millwork and concrete products plant had been assisted by the Manitoba Industrial Development Fund." Isn't that used for propaganda? It is true of course. You accept it . . .

MR. ROBLIN: If I may rise here, seeing my name has been mentioned, Madam Speaker, I would like to inform my honourable friend that I was not the source of that information, that information was in the public domain before I gave it.

MR. TANCHAK: I'm just wondering if the people interested, or the businessmen did ask for that information to be made public and this is supposed to be the words of the Premier. Now he continues, and this is in quotations, "These people were unable to get the necessary capital from any other source and were loaned the money they required to bring these plants into production by this fund."

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, my honourable friend misses the whole point. Of course we say what the Manitoba Development Fund does and the advantage to the province, but we don't say individual names unless that's in the public domain.

MR. CAMPBELL: On a point of order, Madam Speaker, is it in order for a member of this House to get up and interrupt someone who has the floor?

MR. TANCHAK: . . . specific names mentioned, of at least two of these firms. He said, "This money, much of it came from the people of Manitoba who purchased savings bonds. Some people call this going into debt but I call it productive investment." Speaking of the problem of raising the industrial level of such regions of south-eastern Manitoba, Mr. Roblin said, "that funds and planning could only go so far. Businessmen must work hard and show enterprise, initiative and use the tools the government provides. Many sound businesses in this province are being held back by the lack of a supply of capital," he said, "and revealed that since its inception the Development Fund had made available a total of \$8 million, two and a half million dollars of this money to businessmen in Winnipeg area and the remainder to business in communities all over the province as far north as you want to go. The 50,000 square foot flakeboard plant of Columbia Forest Products Limited officially opened by Mr. Roblin at Sprague a few miles north of the Minnesota border and south-east corner of the province was erected at a cost of \$2½ million." It didn't say how much money was spent there. Now here's another one. "Roblin Opens Big Plant to make Wood Products." I don't think I have a similar to this one except one paragraph and here's, "The Manitoba Development Fund which was helping establish many smaller industries throughout the province was financed partly with money borrowed from citizens in the form of Manitoba Government bonds," Mr. Roblin said "and a portion of the money also came from the Provincial Treasury." And here, "Since the Development Fund was established in 1958 it had contributed over \$17 million -- there's a little smear here -- on investment in new industry," the Premier told the businessmen, "approximately one million new jobs have been created." -- (Interjection) -- "The cavalcade, which

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd) included members of the Committee on Manitoba's Economic Future, travelled to the official opening of the Canadian Forest Products Flakeboard at Sprague, Manitoba. " Now after reading this I would say that definitely that is using that for political propaganda. -- (Interjection) -- . . .

Now the Honourable Member from Brokenhead asks one specific question here that I'm quite interested in and it is: Was a loan extended by the Manitoba Development Fund to the Friendly Family Farms Limited? And I think it is in the interest of all farm communities to know that because it seems that if the fund advanced money to this organization it sets this organization, it sets them up in competition to a producers' co-op which is only about four miles from that area.

A MEMBER: It's more than that.

MR. TANCHAK: About four miles -- (Interjection) -- And there's quite a bit more to that as the honourable says. And what I can't swallow is this, that if a farmer wishes to borrow some money from the Farm Credit he can go as high as \$25,000 but if a group of farmers get together and they form some kind of corporation for the same purpose, they go to the Development Fund and they can borrow hundreds of thousands of dollars, and I don't think that is promoting the family farm in this case, and the worst of it is that it does set itself up in competition. There are other factors that could be discussed but this one I thought should be brought up because it definitely proves that the Ministers are taking advantage of this. They do not wish to tell us in the House, give us any information, but outside it's supposed to be secret here but once it comes out in the public arena it is not secret.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, what is at issue on this Order for Return? It seems to me that there are two issues here. One is having to do with policy that this government must take responsibility for, and secondly, there is at issue a question of what is constitutionally right and proper.

The member for Selkirk has dealt with the statutory authority, or lack of authority that this government has to answer questions of this kind pertaining to the Business Development Fund. Now the Manitoba Business Development Fund is, as members know, one of those so-called semi-autonomous boards, agencies or commissions that have proliferated in the past decade, or two or three. And I don't know whether I find myself in agreement with the members of the Liberal Party here or not, but I take the view and the position that the Cabinet does not take responsibility for matters of administrative detail that these boards and commissions undertake, and because Cabinet does not take responsibility and does not intercede in matters of detail and administration therefore parliament or the legislature cannot question Cabinet in that connection. And I don't want to be misunderstood on that because the Member for St. Boniface has drawn up a sort of a side issue here, but, Madam Speaker, the reason why I asked these questions in this Order for Return is because of the matter of policy and I want to quote for the edification of the Ministers opposite, that from the British Constitution by Harvey and Bather, "that the full purpose of creating boards in the first place, and commissions and agencies, etcetera, was to free them from restrictive treasury or cabinet control and therefore, and also, from nagging interference and hectoring by Parliament." But on the other side of the coin, Madam Speaker, is something that members opposite should not forget either, and that is that matters of policy, of basic policy, Cabinet can never escape responsibility for, and because Cabinet must take responsibility for matters of policy, Parliament therefore has the right, the constitutional right and duty to question Cabinet for the policy of these boards, agencies, and commissions. Now I don't know who the Minister of Municipal Affairs was trying to kid, but he didn't kid me when he was trying to say that this information was a matter of public trust and confidence, and so on, because any member of this Assembly, and for that matter any member of the public can go to the Land Titles Office, and not only to the Land Titles Office, he can go to the Registrar of Companies upstairs and look up the incumbrances that are registered and he can find exactly how much was loaned by the Development Fund to the . . .

MR. SMELLIE: This is exactly what I said to the House. -- (Interjection) -- This is exactly what I said to the House.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, therefore what is being denied to us here on this side is something that is not a matter of secrecy or confidence. It is openly available. -- (Interjection) -- It is public information.

Now then, I already admitted and conceded to the Minister opposite that perhaps with respect to Question 3, I had overstepped the bounds of constitutional propriety when I asked for the precise amounts, etcetera. I think perhaps the precise amount does impinge on matter of

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . detail and administration. But the question as to whether the Development Fund has extended any loan whatsoever to a vertically integrated commercial farm operation is not a matter of detail, it's a broad question asking for a declaration as to what the policy is, and the honourable members cannot try to escape from answering that.

Furthermore, Madam Speaker, there is precedent. In 1962, I believe the Member for Gladstone, the Honourable Member for Gladstone submitted an Order for Return having to do with the Development Fund and in response the Minister opposite submitted sessional paper 93, so that apparently the government does acknowledge some responsibility in that it did submit and file a sessional paper on a question having to do with the development fund. Madam Speaker, I submit that there is in fact a matter of policy, important policy involved in this Order for Return.

I would make the offer to honourable friends opposite to withdraw the Order and that I would re-submit it at a later date asking not whether this government had extended a loan to any particular company -- I am not so much interested whether it's extended a loan to any particular company but what I do want to find out is whether the fund has extended a loan to any commercial vertically integrated farm operation. That's really what I am getting at and that is not a matter of detail, it's a matter of policy, and let them try to escape that because if they do, if they deny that they must file that information then I charge them with trying to ignore and avoid their constitutional responsibility.

I have here, Madam Speaker, or at least I did have, a memorandum indicating what has been set up in the area that my honourable friend from Emerson speaks about, where it is alleged, and I must say alleged because I don't have the official reply from this government, where it is alleged that the Manitoba Business Development Fund has loaned \$750,000 to a commercial vertically integrated farm operation that is capable of producing 1,300,000 poultry birds per year, and I have here the description of the size of the producing units and so on, which if they went into operation, which they might do thanks to public funds, will do more than scuttle the small family farm operator in this province than what can be done by two or three years of effort by the Minister of Agriculture. Now if I ever saw anything -- a government allowing basic and major policy to be arranged in different bureaus and departments that are so clearly at cross purposes to another, I would be surprised. Here we have the Manitoba Business Development Fund allegedly giving financial stimulation to a vertically integrated farm operation that is the worst enemy of the family farmer in Manitoba today. It's vertical integration that is at the heart of the whole problem of agriculture in Manitoba and I am surprised that this sort of decision was undertaken and that it escaped members of the Treasury benches opposite. I certainly can see that they are not responsible for matters of detail but this, Madam Speaker, is a matter of the most urgent, the most grave public policy and I demand that they file information on that score.

Now then the Minister of Industry and Commerce who likes to arrange things neatly suggests to us that under statute and under constitutional practice he and the Cabinet are not really responsible for the day to day administration of this particular board or agency. This is fine. No one disputes that, but I would suggest to him, that it is not a good arrangement to have a deputy minister of a department act also as director of a bureau or agency even though the man may be and is most competent, because there you have a crisscrossing of these lines that you are trying to draw. You are trying to -- the government certainly is trying to draw the line -- I go along with them on that score -- a line of differentiation between the organization of a department of government and a board, bureau or agency which is supposed to be semi-autonomous for the most part. Then after trying to do this it has a deputy minister of a department -- the Minister of Industry and Commerce's department -- also acting as director of one of these so-called unanswerable, unaccountable boards, agencies and commissions.

To summarize, Madam Speaker, I think it is, or it should be if it isn't, obvious and clear to members of this Assembly that the line to be drawn is as between matters of detail and matters of policy, and my friends surely can't be serious if they are going to insist and intimate that whether or not three quarters of a million dollars was loaned to a vertically integrated farm operation is not a matter of policy. Most obviously it is.

I would before I sit down, Madam Speaker, repeat my offer and that is to withdraw. I would ask for leave to withdraw this Order with the understanding that I will submit it in general terms so as not to pinpoint any organization, and I would hope then that it would be accepted without question.

MR. ROBLIN: May I ask my honourable friend a question? I think he's just made a

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd) . . . reasonable offer to withdraw the motion provided he has a chance to debate the policy. Well that's a different -- that's a horse of another colour, and would he be content to withdraw the motion if he debates the policy on the estimate for the Industrial Development Fund?

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, there is one question I want to submit and that is whether any monies have been loaned to a commercial vertically integrated farm operation. Now you notice I'm not specifying, and I would think that there can be no argument then about public trust. -- (Interjection) -- Well I'll ask for leave to withdraw, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Has the honourable member leave to withdraw his motion? -- Agreed. Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: What was the patient population in each of the mental hospitals in the last two calendar or fiscal years, whichever is the easiest to get.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Seven Oaks, that an Order of the House do issue for the Return standing in my name.

MADAM SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable the Member for Elmwood, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: (1) The number of medicare cards in effect each month in 1964 where Medicare was the sole social Allowance benefit, (2) The number of Medicare cards in effect each month in 1964, (3) The payments made by the province in 1964 to Manitoba Medical Services for Medicare cards, (4) The payments made by the province in 1964 for other health costs for Medicare card holders; (a) dental, (b) drugs, (c) optical.

MR. CARROLL: I would like to suggest that it be rephrased to indicate the number of persons covered by Medicare rather than the number of cards, because in some cases the cards may include a husband and wife and in other cases it may include a mother and several children, and we pay on the basis of the number of persons involved rather than by the number of cards that we have out, and this is a much easier way for us to provide the information. The other would be much more complicated, much more difficult to get. So I would ask my honourable friend to allow his order to go through in that form rather than the one that's on the Order Paper.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, on this motion, of course I'm sure that the Minister could make an amendment or have an amendment made to the order that would be within the rules of the House, but I respectfully suggest that the information being sought is two-fold. We have no objections -- or at least I think that maybe the Minister could supply the information as to the number of people that this would make it look better, but surely the number of cards issued is no hardship either, and we want this information for specific purposes and I think that it can be done.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: (1) The location, description and size of each land purchase and price paid under authority of the ARDA agreement, in the years 1962, 1963 and 1964, with breakdown showing Federal and Provincial share of cost. (2) The project number of area in which above land was purchased. (3) The purpose for which the land was acquired.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: Copy of certificates to be used in applying to the Provincial Treasurer for school tax rebate to property owners.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SMELLIE: Madam Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would clarify what he means by certificate. Is he referring to the certificate that is to be completed by the Municipal Secretary-Treasurer?

MR. JOHNSTON: This is the taxpayer. Does he get an application form to apply for his rebate school tax?

MR. SMELLIE: Do I understand from the honourable member that he means the whole application form. Is that what he wants to see?

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for a Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for La Verendrye.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Burrows, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: (1) The number of members on the joint land purchase committee of the Province of Manitoba and the Government of Canada under ARDA. (2) The number of provincial representatives on the above committee, and the number of representatives of the Government of Canada on this committee. (3) The names of the provincial representatives on the above committee. (4) The date on which this committee was formed. (5) The number of times this committee met since formation, showing dates.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. TANCHAK: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: (1) The date the Government of Manitoba purchased the Macdonald airport. (2) The description and amount of property purchased. (3) The price paid for the property. (4) The use presently being made of the property. (5) Whether this property is available for purchase by private individuals. (6) Details of offers made to the Manitoba Government by other parties for any or all of this property. (7) The policy of the Government of Manitoba for the disposal of this property.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

HON. WALTER WEIR (Minister of Public Works) (Minnedosa): Madam Speaker, I'm prepared to accept the questions on this order with the exception of No. 6 and 7. No. 6, until some negotiations are completed, I don't think it would be wise to make public any of the offers that there have been. And No. 7, the policy of the government, I don't think it would be wise to provide this answer in this way. And I think probably the answer to No. 5 will suffice along this line pretty well probably anyway. With those reservations, Madam Speaker, I'm prepared to accept the order.

MR. TANCHAK: accept No. 7 if it was changed to the Plan of the Government of Manitoba for the disposal of this property?

MR. WEIR: No, Madam Speaker, not at this time.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for St. George.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: (1) The schedule of hourly rental rates established by the Government of Manitoba for the various types of construction equipment. (2) The same information for each of the government Boards and Commissions. (3) When these rates were originally established in each case. (4) Whether these are the actual rates which are always paid.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 41, and the amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for St. Boniface. The Honourable the Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I don't believe in taking up the time of this House unnecessarily and so my remarks relative to Bill 41 are very brief. I want to say at the beginning that I sympathize with this government in the problem it's having with the official time designation and so on. I don't know that any other government could in this respect do any better. It's a case of one group of people preferring Standard Time and other people preferring

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) Daylight Saving Time, and yet a third group wanting uniform time. The question is then much the same as the old question, "who is to bell the cat?" Everyone agrees that the cat should be belled, but who is to bell it? Similarly in connection with official time, most people would agree that it should be uniform throughout the province, but on what basis?

So therefore I think it is not surprising that this government is seeking ways and means of compromising so as to suit the largest possible number of people. It was really in response to mounting pressures and representations throughout the province that the official time act was changed only recently to make it uniform. But apparently it was changed in such a way that left many people in Metropolitan Winnipeg dissatisfied in that they felt they were being robbed of many hours of sunlight in the early fall months. So representations undoubtedly have been made and now this government is seeking to compromise further. This compromise is in the nature of a step away from uniform time, there can be no question about that, but still I would think that the bill is an attempt to do the right thing and I will support it.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon): Madam Speaker, I do not quite feel the same about this Bill as the Honourable Member of Brokenhead and I'd like to bring up a few points. And speaking on Bill No. 41, I am very surprised that this government wishes to mingle with such a controversial topic all over again after just a short interval of acception of the present set-up concerning daylight saving time.

I wonder if this government is aware of what might, or is more than likely to happen in the rural areas if this Bill is passed. I believe this Bill is much more controversial than it ought to be, but the facts have to be faced. The country folks are just now getting used to this present daylight saving time and here, bingo, we start playing or thinking of a new bill again.

Madam Speaker, to me the splitting up of rural areas because of differences of opinion in establishing different times in different areas is very serious and should be avoided if at all possible. I can so well remember a few years ago when some of the merchants of the town of Steinbach decided to establish different, so to speak, store hours than they normally had established, and this situation just plainly backfired. The stores were practically boycotted because of this change of the so-called store hours. People went out of their way for many miles to avoid these merchants. Thank goodness these merchants wisened up and reverted back to their original schedules.

But, Madam Speaker, it took a long time to heal this rift. These are the type of differences that will occur between municipalities, Chambers of Commerce, organizations, communities, and even individuals. If we, as an elected body of 57 members, or 57 constituencies, having one goal in mind -- I think by now that is correct, namely that of keeping Manitoba prosperous and united -- cannot agree in this Legislature here, how can we expect these communities to agree where competition and jealousy and varied ambition are already gnawing at the very roots of their success and existence. I may be accused of causing dissension -- no Madam Speaker, I accuse this government of irregularity, of not enough leadership, and controversy due to the lack of accepting first and then not abiding with uniform time. I do not care what has been said about daylight saving time or standard time before. It is still not too late to rescind this bill and help keep Manitoba united.

As one partly responsible for our community, I have asked our local Chamber of Commerce to try and get together and at least establish a uniform time in that certain area or community if this bill should pass. While I do not want to be unduly pessimistic, I know that it will be no easy matter to come to an agreed time. People have accused different parts of Canada of wanting to split this nation. In my reasoning, are we any better in this province if we give a difference of opinion on a matter of uniform time a chance to split Manitoba? This may sound serious, but I really do believe it is a serious matter.

Surely we must be aware of some of the difficulties that will arise between the people involved in all of Manitoba, some of the villages, some of the towns, the larger towns and the cities. The people I have talked to are tired of discussing time, and I thought two years ago that it was time we took time to discuss time, and this time settle the problem of time for all times -- at least for a long time. But apparently all this time has been used to aggravate the situation anew.

I for one am not of the belief or opinion that only rural people want slow time or a reasonable amount of daylight saving time, or all of the city people want fast time for a long period. I would be willing to go on record that there are a number of people in the country who would be willing to share this God-given sun for an hour longer each day for a reasonable

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd) . . . length of time with their city cousins, but I also feel that the city mothers have the same problems as anybody in the country has when it comes to putting their young children to bed in broad daylight. But whatever the millions of people in Manitoba may be thinking along the lines of what kind of time each and everyone would like to have, I for one have enough confidence in all the people of Manitoba that if given a decent chance to voice their opinion they would stick to the time that the majority of people in this province would choose.

Therefore, I ask this government to show leadership and guidance in this matter. Let us leave the time problem to the next election, then provide for a referendum, and possibly even have a choice of three different times as the Honourable Member from Brokenhead was mentioning. Would this not be true democracy? Would this not settle this problem of time for a long time? I repeat, we need leadership and some very thoughtful planning before we start pulling our own province apart by letting communities argue or discuss this matter with such bitterness just for the sake of a difference of opinion on time.

MR. D. M. STANES (St. James): Madam Speaker, I must oppose the amendment and support the bill. Many words and much time has been spent on this subject and I don't propose to take any more time because it would only be repeating the old arguments. However, there is something new brought into this argument and that is the increase of communication through teletypes and so on. There are many many people in Winnipeg serving the economics of our province and they are tied to cities such as Montreal, Toronto and Vancouver. It is true there is a time lag at all times, but to switch from one time to another is creating a great deal of inconvenience; it's hurting our businessmen and hurting our economy. Consequently, I opposed at the time of the bill being introduced that there should be no change between the City of Winnipeg or Greater Winnipeg and the other large cities, and for this reason I again support the return to the time for the urban area to the time of Montreal, Toronto and Vancouver.

In addition to this, and it was a very serious matter in the last fall, we have a number of people who were denied extra hours. In particular, I would mention the sports clubs. Our sports clubs were denied a great deal of revenue because people who normally came after supper to a sports club did not go there and play golf and then join in the activities of the club because of that lack of an hour of daylight. It is interesting to note that most cities in the world do use the extra daylight of daylight time. So on behalf of the people of Greater Winnipeg, I do urge the members to defeat this amendment and to support the bill.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I too, rise to support the amendment that has been placed before us. I am really surprised that the government came out with the bill as is before us today. I thought last year when this matter was decided that we had adopted a principle and that the principle was uniform time. I opposed the bill last year because I felt that we should stick with standard time, that the people back home would like to stay with central standard time, and why change? But since the change was made, I feel that we're going too far now in extending daylight time from the Sunday following Labour Day in September to the last Sunday in October. I think this is extending it too far and the people in the province and the rural parts certainly would not support this. Too, this will cause a great deal of confusion again because of the schools, and especially so if some of the municipalities decided to establish daylight saving time as well on that basis. So I for one cannot support the bill, but I will support the amendment.

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Madam Speaker, in rising to speak against the amendment, I do it with a certain amount of sympathy for the amendment. I come from the old-fashioned school, I believe, because I am for uniform time, that really I see no reason to tamper with the clock. I believe the Province of Alberta have the right idea, that it's against the law in that province to have any kind of daylight saving. I see no reason why people can't start work a little earlier in the morning. I remember in our municipality when we started our public works men off at seven o'clock in the morning and let them finish at four in order to get the benefit of the cooler morning. This seems to me to be intelligent and I am at a loss to understand why we can't adjust our way of life so that we will abide by this sensible principle. But failing all this, as I said before, this is the way I would like to see it but I realize that I stand pretty much alone on this question, and although I voted last session for the bill on uniform time, I believe I made a mistake. In fact I'm sure that I did. I believe that half the population of Manitoba being in the urban areas really want to have daylight saving time, and if we can't accomplish it by the co-operation of industry and by other people who can't see the wisdom of simply leaving the clock alone and starting earlier in the morning, then I am afraid that I will have to go along and take things as they are and vote for the bill.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. TANCHAK: Madam Speaker, I don't think I have spoken on this as yet. I'll be very brief.

A MEMBER: You're about the only one that hasn't.

MR. TANCHAK: I'll be very very short. I just don't seem to be able to swallow this that you have to -- you get something that is very difficult to decide, slough it off and let somebody else do it. The government is stumbling in the dark in this case. It seems to me that the government is like a chicken without a head. It did not know what to do with the time changes in the past, the last time, so what did they do? The government asked other governmental bodies to tell them or suggest to them or tell them and say what shall we do? There just doesn't seem to be any leadership.

Now what does it ask in the bill here? It asks about 200 other local governments to decide for the government what they should do, what kind of a bill -- in other words, leave it up to the different municipalities or regions. They can decide what kind of a time they will have. I would say that this would create simply chaos all over the Province of Manitoba. Different areas would have different times. Some areas probably will have daylight saving time for six months; some would have it maybe for four months; and some might have no daylight saving time at all except the first three or four months established. You'd have chaos all over. I would say the government should have the courage of its convictions and simply -- if they think that they are convinced that daylight saving time of six months or so, daylight saving time is good for the people of Manitoba -- if they are convinced then they should have the courage to come up and say this is it, after so many years. If not, then I'll endorse the suggestion of the Honourable Member for Carillon that it be left to the people of the whole province. I'm not so sure that even in the City of Winnipeg, if all were given the vote now after they have tried, that the City of Winnipeg would even accept six months of daylight saving time.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, in order that the press will say that M. A. Gray also spoke, I have to express my opinion. I am opposed to daylight saving, but once we have daylight saving I think we should be uniform with the other cities in Canada. It interferes with reservations, with transportation, and with business, so we want -- if once we have it, and we cannot do away with it like it says here because no one here suggested that we oppose daylight saving time, so once we have it we might as well have uniform all over Canada.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): Madam Speaker, the way I see it now with this daylight saving time, we have all these various provinces and all our transportation going through. Each one is hodge podge. We get into our own province and you go out of the area of Greater Winnipeg and it is still the same way -- hodge podge. I would say either start in our own province, we don't seem to know what we want or where we are going. Now I was raised in an area, and ever since I knew, come in the Spring it was daylight saving. That was clear across country and everything was in order, but not here. As I said, in our own province it's not so, and I see it pretty hard to do anything in this way because you are bucking the other fellow, Ontario, Saskatchewan and Alberta. You are bucking them all. Nobody seems to know what to do on these various times so our own province, to my mind, whether it is standard time or daylight saving, it matters not, but I like the idea of this longer daylight saving because it gives the city folks a chance to have a little bit more daylight. So that is all I have to say, Madam.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Madam Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 39. The Honourable the Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, I adjourned the debate on this second reading of this bill because I felt that the Honourable Minister would give us some answer, the answers to my friend the Honourable Member from St. George. I think that this is something that we should have. The Minister should tell the people of this province if Metro has the right to raise money for both the Pan Am Games and also for this hospital tax as requested by the Chairman of the Hospital Commission. Now seeing that the Minister has refused to answer this, I guess he would sooner that this should go in court I guess. Probably this is what will happen if the Metro tries to raise this. I think that there is no use pursuing this any further, certainly let

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) this go through committee but we'll probably have many questions to ask the Honourable Minister at that time.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, I think it is inconceivable that the Minister should tell me that he doesn't know whether the Pan American games can get a contribution or not from Metro. Metro has been debating this issue frequently for some weeks now, and when I asked the Minister whether Metro had the right or the authority to issue a grant to Pan Am he said, "I don't know, this is a legal question." But surely the Minister in charge should be able to give this answer to us rather than to say, "well go and find out from a lawyer down town."

How are the people, the members of this House to understand what the policy is or what right the Metro has without the Minister knowing himself? He's responsible for the administration of The Municipal Act, and yet he tells us, "I don't know, this is a legal matter." And when we ask him to get us a legal opinion on this subject, he says, "go down town and see a lawyer." This is shirking his responsibility and I suggest he change his attitude and let members of this House know whether or not Pan Am -- whether the Metro Corporation has the authority to issue a grant to the Pan American games.

MR. PATRICK: Madam Speaker, I don't rise to oppose the bill but I would like to get some clarifications. In Section 2, under 4 (a), it says the corporation, the by-law may guarantee the payment of principal or interest, or both principal and interest that may become payable under any bonds, debentures, notes or other securities issued by the Red River Exhibition. Now my point is that Metro may undertake certain endeavours and would collect from certain municipalities, which the municipalities might not want to be included in, and I would like to know what guarantee is given to the Brandon Fair or the Portage Fair? Is it a provincial or what it is, and why shouldn't the province guarantee the Red River Exhibition bonds? Under section (a) -- section 622 (a), it seems to be some internal matter changed for better efficiency. It's not too clear what it means. Section 19, which I don't agree with this part, it says "all monies levied against an area municipality shall be deemed to be taxes and a debt of an area municipality the corporation." I presume this is business taxes. Whether or not the area municipality has collected the taxes imposed in respect of the amount levied against by the corporation. Now I don't think that municipalities should be responsible for the 100 percent of the taxes if it hasn't collected the whole amount. What if they don't collect?

MADAM SPEAKER: I call it 5:30 and leave the Chair until 8:00 o'clock.