



Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

Speaker

The Honourable Ben Hanuschak



Vol. XVI No. 47 10:00 a.m., Friday, September 26th, 1969.

First Session, 29th Legislature.

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
10:00 o'clock, Friday, September 26, 1969

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

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

REPORTS BY STANDING COMMITTEES

HON. AL MACKLING (Attorney-General) (St. James): I beg to present the fifth report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Law Amendments begs leave to present the following as their fifth report:

Your Committee has considered Bill No. 26, an Act to amend The Teachers' Pensions Act. And has agreed to report the same without amendment.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Transportation, that the report of the Committee be received.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

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

MR. WALTER WEIR (Leader of the Opposition) (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, before agreeing to receipt of this report I would like to bring to your attention, Sir, and to the attention of other members of the House what I believe to have been a fairly serious infraction of the Rules of the House, Sir, because the rule that this House has generally gone on up until such time as there has been suspension, has been Rule 288 in Beausiesne which says: "committees are regarded as portions of the House and are governed for the most part in their proceedings by the same rules which prevail in the House." Last evening, and I think co-operation could have been held if the attitude had been correct, but actually I must say that I believe the House Leader to have acted in an insulting fashion; and I really believe that the Chairman of the Committee in ruling some members of the committee out of order was in fact out of order and not operating within the rules that are laid down within the House.

Mr. Speaker, you will find from the record that the House rose about, oh 10:30 - 10:35, something like that, and I don't object to it where there's leave. If there hadn't been an emotional upset my guess is that we could probably have carried on until that time without any problem. We did earlier this week till 11:00 o'clock at night with no problem. But again it's one of those areas where courtesies of the House and the rules and the concurrence of all members becomes very important in terms of the satisfactory operation and I would like to ask you, Sir, to provide this House with a ruling as to whether or not that Rule 288 still holds and that the rules of the House apply equally in the Standing Committees as they do in the House.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN (Minister of Health and Social Services) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. I would like to disagree with what my honourable friend says was an infraction of the rules, first of all; and secondly, I'd like to disagree with the manner in which he seeks to have this infraction remedied.

First of all, I think that it's common practice in the House for committees to meet at the call of the Chair in mornings, for them to go beyond the lunch hour adjournment, not with leave but merely as a matter of practice of committees. I would think that the practice that was followed by my honourable friends when they were the government would indicate that it is normal within the rules of the House for committees not to be bound by the times that are listed for House meetings despite what my honourable friend says with regard to the rules.

But more important than that, Mr. Speaker, and on the same point of order, I do not think that it is appropriate for the Speaker to rule on hypothetical questions. My honourable friends have a perfect way of having that type of ruling dealt with and I suggest that the appropriate way is for them in Committee to challenge the ruling of the Chair if they deem it to be wrong. I think that it's possible that a ruling can be wrong. The ruling of the Speaker can be wrong. But the way of challenging it is in Committee to place a challenge as was done last year, and upon that challenge being placed it then comes before Your Honour. But it can't come before Your Honour on a question of "we would like to know whether Committees can meet at longer hours" because that is not a ruling based on any proceeding presently taking place.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the Committee where a ruling was made by the Chairman I must say that I don't know . . .

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. Is the honourable member closing debate?

MR. MACKLING: No, there's no debate, there's no formal . . .

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. There is a motion before the House.

MR. SPEAKER: This is a debate. I called for the question and this is not the point of order as I understand it. This is on the motion.

MR. MACKLING: I don't intend . . . limit anyone from speaking.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: At this point I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 90 students of Grade 11 standing of the Glenlawn Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. Wheeler and Mrs. Meloschuk. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Riel. On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you here today.

The Honourable Member for River Heights.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C. (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wonder if I could address my question to the Honourable Minister of Health and Welfare. I wonder if he could indicate to this House whether he has the information that was requested in connection with the Medicare premiums.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I regret to say I don't have that information as yet for my honourable friend. I'm trying to get it but I don't have it today.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Surely he is in a position to at least confirm without dealing necessarily with figures if the information is accurate that the figures listed in terms of payment out by the Medical Services Corporation were in fact the total amount of billing received for those months.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, there's no doubt that I can determine that information, but as the honourable member knows we were engaged in the House all day yesterday and all day today - all evening. My practice is that when the Hansard gets to my office, as the honourable member must know, the questions that I take as notice are then directed to the various departments and they come back. In an emergency I would consider getting that type of information but I don't consider the honourable member's question an emergency.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Honourable Minister would indicate while he may not consider it an emergency that it would be germane to the debate that is taking place on both the budget and in the Financial Administration Act, or the Act that was submitted by the Minister of Finance in connection with the budget?

MR. GREEN: No, Mr. Speaker, I don't see any emergency and I would advise my honourable friend that there are bills before the House as well as the estimates of the Minister of Health which will afford my honourable friend the opportunity of fully dealing with this matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Can he indicate whether Mr. Cass-Beggs and Mr. Durnin of the Cass-Beggs-Durnin Report are still both being retained in the further studies with regards to hydro power diversion.

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I thought this same question was asked a few days ago and that we had given you an answer. But I will simply say no, they are not retained in a continuing sense. Mr. Cass-Beggs will be called upon from time to time for advice and information. He is not, as I said before, on a continuing government payroll.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, then is Mr. Cass-Beggs not working on further studies regardless of whether he's retained, or payroll or whatever it is, is he not performing

(MR. CRAIK cont'd.) the work on the further study subsequent to his report.

MR. EVANS: It's the intention of the government to retain the services of consulting engineers and I'm sure it's the intention of Hydro in following out suggestions made by Mr. Cass-Beggs in his report to retain consulting engineers.

MR. CRAIK: . . . whether those two people are presently working on studies subsequent to their initial report. Are they working now in further studies subsequent to their report?

MR. EVANS: I don't know whether I'm really with the member this morning. I think I've answered you in a way to indicate that Mr. Cass-Beggs is not engaged in preparing a further extensive report on the subject. He's available for technical advice to us from time to time. The further studies that we indicate are necessary will be undertaken by consulting firms.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister then indicate to us that -- as he seems to imply -- that the project for which Mr. Cass-Beggs was employed, that aspect of it has been completed, can he indicate the cost to the Province of Manitoba for his services?

MR. EVANS: Because of some noise I wasn't sure that I heard the last part of the question. Was it, can I inform the House of the cost of obtaining his services? I believe a similar question was asked a few days ago and we are on record as saying we will provide this information.

HON. ED. SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, the honourable member should know that he will get that information when it appears in Public Accounts. It's not a matter of great urgency that he must know now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I understand that Alberta has just postponed the upland game hunting season. I wonder if the Minister has any further report to the tests that have been conducted on the upland games in Manitoba, in view of the fact that the season has opened in some parts and will be open at the weekend.

MR. EVANS: Well I haven't got as full a report as I'd like to obtain. I could report on sharp tail grouse with regard to the problem of mercury deposits. My understanding is from information from my officials that the sharp tailed grouse are not likely to be affected by this substance. The hunting season starts today I believe in many areas as the honourable member has indicated and we intend to continue as usual with the season pending the results of current tests. As a matter of fact as of 10:00 a.m. this morning there are no further results available to me.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, what of waterfowl in southern Manitoba, where most of it it's raised on the farm?

MR. EVANS: Well we haven't announced any change in the policy so I would suggest that we would carry on as usual.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to either or both the Minister of Health Services and Education, I suppose. I noticed last night in the Free Press that the Federal Department of Health are looking to universities to assist them to further the health services to the Indian and Eskimos in the north and they mentioned the Manitoba University as being approached or they're going to approach them. I wonder if they have any information on this. This is in connection with both doctor, nurse and dentist assistance for isolated communities.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, for some time the previous administration as well as this one was in communication with the Manitoba Medical College and other various people, including the Federal Government, regarding a scheme for the provision of medical care in northern Manitoba and those talks are being continued.

MR. BEARD: . . . information, this was on Page 11 of last night's Winnipeg Free Press.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

HON. PETER BURTNIAK (Minister of Tourism and Recreation) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, due to the fact that Mr. Speaker didn't have the opportunity to know of the presence of some of the people up in the gallery, I would like to introduce to the House Mayor Hugh Dunlop and several of the Council Members who are presently sitting in the gallery.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD cont'd.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. I understand a daily cattle market information service will be instituted in Alberta next week. Would the Minister arrange for members of the House to get samples of this type of pricing, Mr. Speaker.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): I'll take that as notice, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the wheat deal made with China just during this last day or so and since this wheat will be exported through the British Columbia ports, would he take it on himself to check whether Manitoba will be getting a fair share of the deal in this matter, that they'll be able to deliver their share.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I think my honourable friend knows that the Wheat Board operates a quota system that is at most times equitable across the prairies.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): I'm not sure if I should term this a supplementary question, but due to much criticism having taken place in this House over the past period, perhaps I should ask the question if the Minister is aware that the Wheat Board has sold this wheat -- and of course we're very happy about it.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I'm always aware that the Wheat Board sells the grain on behalf of the farmers of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the First Minister. Yesterday he indicated that the hydro rates would only rise marginally as a result of the government's decision in connection with South Indian Lake. I wonder if he can confirm that the Hydro officials hold the same view?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, some of them do, perhaps, and some of them don't perhaps.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, in view of that answer, I wonder whether the First Minister would submit the Hydro officials before a committee of this House, before the Committee of Public Utilities, so that the House and the Committee and the people would have an opportunity of knowing Hydro's views and not the government's view on this matter?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the sequence of development on the Nelson River will be determined by policy of this government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member . . .

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question. Are you suggesting that the Hydro officials and their views are not to be seriously considered by the government in the determination of their policy?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, on the contrary, it was very seriously considered; but I want to tell my honourable friend that until such time as we ask my honourable friends opposite to make the decision by way of voting on a bill, we see no particular relevance to having a committee convened so that you can ask those questions.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the First Minister . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member asking a supplementary question?

MR. SPIVAK: Well, no, I'll ask another question then, Mr. Speaker. A few days ago in Hansard a question that was put to him, the First Minister refused to answer and I now then therefore ask him again. Were Hydro officials consulted before the policy decisions in connection with the Hydro development were made.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe I need answer that question, but I will. I will say to my honourable friend that of course we had meetings and consultation with officials

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) of Manitoba Hydro.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I'm somewhat puzzled by the reply of the Honourable the First Minister. On several occasions I asked for information as to whether or not this government had met with Hydro officials or the Hydro Board. Could he now indicate to me -- at that time he indicated "no", the answer was "no" -- can he now indicate to me in response to the answer that he just gave the Member for River Heights, when these meetings with the Hydro officials occurred, so we can correct . . .

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I wish my honourable friend would get it straight, the distinction as between Hydro officials of management and the Hydro Board. When you get that straight and ask the question, I'll give you the right answers.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, can the First Minister or the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources indicate whether the new consultants which he referred to are going to be consulting to the Hydro or to the government?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I would refer my honourable member to the recommendations in the Cass-Beggs report which outlines a course of action which should be followed. He'll note in there in one area of the problem it's entirely a matter of Hydro to decide who they shall hire, when they shall hire them, etcetera; and there's another area regarding water control that involves the Department of Mines and Natural Resources. I would refer you to that report, Sir, and you'll see some very valuable information as to how we intend to proceed.

MR. CRAIK: Are you going to give -- a subsequent question. Shall you be giving then, Hydro terms of reference under which they hire their consultants -- subsequent to the Cass-Beggs-Durnin Report?

MR. EVANS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: A supplementary question. Am I to understand the Minister that the Cass-Beggs report is government policy now?

MR. EVANS: The Cass-Beggs report is a report that is of a policy nature, in other words it's a policy guideline. Now it's up to the government to decide which parts of this particular report we wish to implement. As a matter of government policy we're deciding this as we go along and we're implementing the various recommendations which this government believes in and thinks are correct.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the First Minister could help me in the future in asking the right questions if he would identify which Hydro officials the government is prepared to talk with at this time. Obviously it is not the Hydro Board because that is the specific question I asked. Now if we don't deal with the Board -- I'll ask the right questions if you'll identify which of the Hydro officials this government is prepared to talk with.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the question was asked of me earlier today and on some previous day as to whether we had met any time, held any meetings or consultations with officials of Manitoba Hydro - to which the answer is "yes". I believe my honourable friend asked my colleague the Minister of Finance whether we had met with the Manitoba Hydro Board -- that's a different body - separate - and my colleague answer the Member for Lakeside, Sir, to the effect that we had not had any formal meetings with the Manitoba Hydro Board.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. BUD SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the First Minister arising out of a CBC news report in which I believe he was quoted or reference was made to the fact that he expected lower air fares in the near future between Winnipeg and European cities. I didn't hear the whole report and I would like to ask the First Minister whether that was the purport of his statement, and if so does it devolve from any fresh information or is it made largely in the area of wishful thinking?

MR. SCHREYER: A little more than wishful thinking, Mr. Speaker, although there's an element of that, too. I can tell my honourable friend that Air Canada has already on certain of its fares, the group fare, for example, has already gone over to a per mile fare system as opposed to the old gateway system, and that Air Canada is very hopeful that in the course of the next few months it will be able to get its promotion type fare, such as a 21-day excursion fare over to a per mile system which will be a great help, as my honourable friend knows and it is

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) even hoped further by Air Canada that early next year it will be possible to get the standard fare, quite apart from the promotional 21-day excursion and group fare structures to get the standard fare over to a per mile system; and if that happens then of course we'll have the whole gamut of air fares on a per mile basis. One of the reasons why Air Canada is so hopeful is because of the position being taken by the United States Civil Aviation Board and by Alitalia, which I believe my honourable friend has mentioned already.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question, I think it's to the Honourable the Minister of Natural Resources. In view of the Federal Fisheries Minister announcing cuts in his department, will the project that is being planned for Manitoba in connection with the Fish Marketing Corporation in any way be affected?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, not that I'm aware of.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. Has he anything further to report on the negotiations with Ottawa regarding a second national park in Manitoba?

MR. BURTNIAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, this question was asked yesterday, and I'm sorry to say that so far we have no further report from Ottawa as to their policy.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Has the Minister anything further to report on a provincial wilderness park?

MR. BURTNIAK: Not at the moment. As soon as that decision is made we'll notify the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to direct another question to the Minister of Agriculture. The wheat exporting countries of the world I think are meeting at Brussels on the 2nd and 3rd to deal with price stability of wheat. Would the Minister find out who is going on behalf of the Wheat Board and bring the information to the House for us next week possibly.

MR. USKIW: Well, I'm sure my honourable friend can find that information by phoning the Wheat Board.

MR. McKENZIE: I haven't got the same . . . as you have. You're the Minister.

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

MR. EVANS: Yesterday I was asked a question respecting the progress of the Patterson Dam, or just what the government's plans are and what the progress is and I would, for the information of the honourable member concerned inform him that we have applied to the PFRA for the construction of the project under the interim agreement for such community projects. My information is that the proposal is presently being reviewed by the Federal Government and we anticipate, and I would underline the word "anticipate", that approval for this project should be forthcoming in the near future.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for his information on the Patterson Dam, but I must say that my understanding was - probably the Member for Lakeside could make a comment on this -- that the Federal Government had approved as of some date last spring, the construction of the Patterson and the Pleasant Valley Dams and it was up to the Provincial Government to move on these projects, and we had that intention.

MR. EVANS: Are you referring to the Federal Government approval or Manitoba Government approval?

MR. WATT: The Federal Government.

MR. EVANS: Well, I will undertake to examine this further but this is the information that I've received.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources. Yesterday he was giving us the means levels on Lake Winnipeg - September 20th, for the week it was 715.33 and I asked a question about the news service that came out last week. I would like to read what it says: "The Cass-Beggs report says allowing for minimum navigation levels on the lake of 710 feet above sea level, and

(MRS. TRUEMAN cont'd.) providing a draw-down of 2.4 feet for power purposes, it is claimed the maximum recorded flows would not raise the level above 716.4 feet." Is the government considering following the report in this respect and allowing such a height to be reached on the lake?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I thought I explained yesterday to the honourable member that the purpose of the feasibility study which is being undertaken, which is in the early stages, is to determine the proper parameters of lake levels to meet the needs of the varying interests involved, navigation, tourism, recreation, fishing and hydro electric purposes. This is the purpose of this technical study, and I would hope this information would be coming shortly as a result of this study.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: I should also like to reassure the Honourable Lady Member for Fort Rouge that whatever regulation is undertaken by way of control works on Lake Winnipeg, according to the information at hand to date, will be the kind of regulation and controls that will leave the level of Lake Winnipeg well within, well within the levels that have existed in the unregulated natural state of Lake Winnipeg in the past 56 years of recorded levels on the lake; that is to say, since the extreme low and the extreme high of from slightly under 710 feet to somewhat in excess of 718 feet, that whatever regulation is, if and when it is implemented, will be such as to keep the levels well within those two extremes. So I fail to understand, you know, what the concern is that is being expressed by such honourable members as the Honourable Lady and the Honourable Member for Lakeside. I'll take my seat, Mr. Speaker. I can see the honourable member wishes a question.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the First Minister would indicate to us, to the House, on whose advice or on whose suggestions does he make these comments that he just made with respect to the levels of Lake Winnipeg. Is it Manitoba Hydro or the Provincial Water Control and Conservation Branch -- on whose recommendations does he feel . . .

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm just providing information that is derived in large part from the Water Control Commission report.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, the First Minister referred to the Water Control Commission report. I ask once again, could this report be tabled in the House?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, certainly we'll take that question under advisement.

While I'm on my feet, Sir, may I deal with the matter that was raised yesterday by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. He was brandishing in the air a document which he found in the locker room, a copy of which I have now been able to obtain, and I want to advise honourable members that the reference in this document to members, private members feeling free to call on executive assistants to different Ministers, is a document which was circulated among members of the government caucus, admittedly, that the advice and assistance of executive assistants to Ministers can be sought by private members - and I should think this possibly could be something extended to honourable members opposite as well. Theoretically, I understand in Ottawa in the Federal House, executive assistants to Ministers have from time to time, very frequently I might add, provided certain help and service to private members of the government side. We feel that this practice is very much in keeping with the fine tradition and custom of the Federal House of Commons. It's nothing that we should apologize for. But lest my honourable friends feel disappointed, let me assure them that this committee of the House that is being set up at this session to look into the matter of the functioning of committees and the role of private members, could, and I hope will, take under consideration the question of research assistance to private members on both sides of the House, and I would hope that this committee after some study of the matter would recommend some form of research assistance to private members such as has just been started in the Federal House of Commons late last year. Perhaps on a modest scale we can do the same here.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the First Minister sincerely for his statement of today and for giving us the facts as they are. I found one of the replies yesterday from one of his colleagues suggesting that maybe members on this side of the House had prepared a fictitious report, really an improper approach. I thank the Minister for his statement and I appreciate as well his comments regarding the special assistants being available to other

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) members of the House. I recognize that they are in a different capacity insofar as the Ministers, that they are basically a political appointee and this presents some problem.

The Honourable First Minister and myself have discussed the matter of research prior to his ever being in this position at all some years ago and the whole problems of operating in a democracy with assistants for the opposition. I appreciate his comments of today; I think that this is an important structure. I think it would have been preferable if the list had been sent to all Honourable Members of the House. I will certainly make it a point to read notices in the locker room very carefully in the future.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I just want to indicate to my honourable friend that when I say that I would hope that this committee will want to study and possibly recommend the adoption of some system of research assistance to private members, the enthusiasm with which my honourable friend answered would seem to indicate that he thinks that now the government is committed to that course of action. It's up to the committee to recommend this. Personally I hope they will. But I can't help making this observation, that after, personally, after 11 years in opposition where I had to write my own speeches as a private member, I can't help feel that honourable members will be getting soft if they start getting speech writers.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): Mr. Speaker, . . . ask the First Minister if in the 11 years, or the number of years that he was in the House of Commons, would he ever use one of the executive assistants of the government to write speeches for him?

MR. SCHREYER: Not with any degree of comfort, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Leader of the Liberal Party) (Portage la Prairie):
. . . (Not audible)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: On the same issue, Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as both Ministers and Executive Assistants are listed on there, and inasmuch as Mr. Tommy Douglas' name and phone number are also on there, under which category does he fall?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I wonder whether he can confirm that it is a fact that Mr. Durnin disagreed with the findings of Mr. Cass-Beggs in the Cass-Beggs report?

MR. SCHREYER: My honourable friend from River Heights knows that that question was asked before and if he wants to see what the answer was, he can look up Hansard.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, . . . absent at the time, I'm not familiar with the fact that that question has been asked, but I wonder whether the Honourable Minister would answer yes or no. Is it a fact that he disagreed with the findings?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister did answer the question, the Honourable First Minister replied to the honourable member that the question was asked and answered previously . . .

MR. CRAIK: I wanted to ask the First Minister of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, whether he was aware that Mr. Durnin has disassociated himself from any technical contribution that has been made to this report?

MR. SCHREYER: How would the Honourable Member for Riel know that? I would be very interested to find out.

MR. CRAIK: I can certainly tell you how you can find out yourself, Mr. Minister. You have a statute that's passed by this Legislature which registers all professional engineers in Manitoba and if you would like to ask Mr. Durnin himself whether or not he was acting in his capacity of professional engineer, you will find that he wishes to have no technical association with the so-called Cass-Beggs-Durnin report. In addition to that, when the press release was sent out, . . .

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance) (St. John's): Which report is being referred to?

MR. CRAIK: The original statement given by the government in the press release sent out by the Government Information Service, appointed these two gentlemen jointly as the investigators. Well, we can dig up your -- it's probably signed by the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. The government press release states it in the initial instance.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the First Minister. I wonder whether he can indicate whether he has had discussions with the chairman of the TED Commission in connection with the Uranium Enrichment Development proposed for Northern Manitoba.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, would my honourable friend the Member for River Heights indicate clearly whether he believes the TED Commission is still in existence.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, this is rather curious that the First Minister would be asking questions of me. I believe that the chairman of the TED Commission is still living, yes, and I believe that he holds a government position and I believe he can make a contribution. I also believe he is the most knowledgeable civil servant in this province familiar with the Uranium Enrichment Development, and I therefore pose my question again or ask the question again: Has there been a discussion in connection with the Uranium Enrichment Development with the chairman of the TED Commission?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I have held discussions with a gentleman who may very well be the one who was chairman of the TED Commission when the TED Commission was in existence. The TED Commission is no longer in existence and therefore I am wondering whether my honourable friend shouldn't be putting his question in the past tense.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday the Honourable First Minister indicated that the consultants who had been hired by the previous administration were not being retained by the present government. I wonder if he can confirm that arrangement was arrived at after discussion with the chairman of the TED Commission.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for River Heights misinterpreted the answer which I gave him yesterday. I did not in any way indicate that we would not be availing ourselves of the service of that particular consultant firm. All I indicated was that at this present time they are not being retained.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Then the decision of the government in connection with South Indian Lake was made without any consultation with the consultants or the chairman of the TED Commission.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, as acting House Leader, I think we should put a stop to this sort of nonsense that is coming across. There are assumptions, argumentative questions, provocative questions and not questions for information. If there is occasion for debate, then the member should avail himself of it, but to carry on this kind of a debate is absolutely without precedence in the seven years I have been here in my recollection, and I think that we should just stop it by saying: that is enough, honourable members.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I have also been here, not seven years but three years, and I must suggest to the Honourable Minister of Finance that the purpose of the question period is for information to be elicited by the opposition, and I may say that it is unfortunate that we have had to go through this process but it really is because of the manner in which the present government has answered the questions and has tried to cloud and mask the issue, and I suggest that this is the only reason -- (Interjection) -- Well you may object . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please . . . (inaudible).

MR. SPIVAK: . . . Minister of Finance is the one who brought this up and I suggest to him that the argumentative questions and the manner in which the question period is conducted is going to continue until the government is prepared to give us information, and when we get the information, then we can debate the issues. We cannot debate them, we can only make assumptions because, in fact, we are not being given this information.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order. I believe the honourable member did hear me mention a moment ago that the Honourable Minister's point was well taken and the honourable member knows that argumentative questions are not allowed. I must inform the honourable member that they will not be permitted at any time and I would suggest to all honourable members on both sides of the House to adhere to the rules as closely as possible during the question period.

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . for suggesting that you are not conducting this House in the proper fashion, that you are permitting provocative argumentative questions, and I think that the Honourable House Leader should apologize to you and let the running of the House up to you.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, we have just heard the Member for River Heights confirm that he has been asking argumentative and provocative questions by stating that he intends

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) to continue to do so, and that being the case I think, Mr. Speaker, that it was my duty to draw to your attention the nature of the questions that we were being asked, and now that you have an admission, I believe, that that is the nature, then I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that members on this side of the House are not bound to answer the questions anyway and I don't think they should.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I remind the honourable members that a couple of minutes ago I did rule that argumentative questions will not be allowed, and could we return to questions before Orders of the Day, if there are any, and if not I am proceeding with the next order of business.

The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the First Minister. I wonder whether he can indicate whether the consultants that were hired by the previous government in connection with the uranium enrichment development have had any discussions with the Federal Government officials or with the Atomic Energy of Canada.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I told my honourable friend on previous occasions that there are discussions under way at the present time with respect to the proposed uranium enrichment plant for northern Manitoba. Discussions are with the Federal Government, certain officials of the Federal Government, with the Prime Minister, with certain interests in the United Kingdom, in the United States, and I don't think my honourable friend really need know, nor need he expect to know, the details as to which consultant firms we are engaging, etc. I am advising my honourable friend, however, that discussions are very much under way.

MR. SPIVAK: Well a supplementary question. Can the Honourable First Minister confirm that consultants have been involved in these discussions?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, this is a matter of internal operation which the government will disclose in due course as it sees fit.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of Tourism and Recreation announced the appointment of a Mr. Peter Thiessen, I believe it was. I wonder if the Minister could indicate to the House the exact nature of his job, his particular qualifications for the job, and the remuneration to be paid.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance and the proposed motion of the Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition in amendment thereto. The Honourable Minister of Health and Social Services.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand but I understand other members wish to speak, and if they wish to, I don't wish to prevent them from doing so.

MR. G. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Well, Mr. Speaker, is it understood by the House that amendments can still be moved and the member is giving up his right in this regard?

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that by leave the honourable member, or any honourable member be permitted to make an amendment even though the matter is standing in my name. If that leave is not granted, then the only way I would see out of the situation, since I am entitled to have it stand, is by leave I be permitted to remove the motion standing in my name and somebody be permitted to make an amendment. Either course would be satisfactory to me but I would prefer that by leave anybody be permitted to make an amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe that there was a ruling made on that point and was accepted by the House, so we are governed by it.

MR. G. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Well, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Ste. Rose two days ago did a very capable job in stating the position of the Liberal group with respect to the budget speech, and the events that transpired when the member's amendment was ruled out of order by you, Sir, have led me to enter this debate - and very briefly, I might say. It is my purpose to move a further amendment to again state the position of our group with respect to the budget speech, and I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, that the amendment be further amended by deleting all the words after the words "this House" in the first line of the operative section thereof, and substituting therefor the following words: "is concerned about the possible effects of proposed taxation changes on the future development of Manitoba, and in order to ensure that we have a tax system which is fair and equitable for

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd.) . . . the individual and which fosters the greatest development possible for the province, this House requests the government to immediately undertake an over-all review of taxation in Manitoba."

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I'm just wondering whether we are not back into the same problem where we were dealing first with a non-confidence, clear-cut non-confidence amendment, and this one does not take any position really on confidence or otherwise but makes the suggestion as to a study of an over-all review of taxation. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that if the amendment would be in the form of, let us say, non-confidence because the government has not done so, or has refused to do so, then it seems to me it might be acceptable, but in this way it is neither a confidence or non-confidence and therefore it seems to me to be varying from the motion, or the amendment - no, it is a motion - proposed by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, and I don't quite see how the House can deal with it in that way. And not pretending to really know the rules so well and the precedents, I am just again inclined to wonder whether or not it is correct, and I would respectfully request you, Mr. Speaker, to take it under advisement, but hopefully that it will not prevent further debate today.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, if I may on a point of order, there is nothing in the rule that says that a motion dealing with going into Committee of either Supply or Ways and Means, or the Throne Speech, must be a want of confidence motion - in any case, nothing that says there must be a want of confidence motion. That's point No. 1. But having said that, I think it is correct in any case that a motion removing the motion made by the Minister of Finance, in a sense removing it completely -- the Minister of Finance's motion is that we go into a Committee of Ways and Means - in short, the approval in principle of his budget speech. Now, when you remove that by an amendment, by itself it is a want of confidence in that it prevents the motion proposed by the Minister of Finance from taking effect and proposes some other alternative, which is perfectly proper for an amendment. That is what amendments are for - to propose another alternative. The alternative we are proposing is that we don't accept all of my honourable friend's budget speech and that we amend it to call upon the government to do something else -- (Interjection) -- But it does say that, because it removes -- My honourable friend's motion is that this House resolve itself into a Committee of Ways and Means to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty - I haven't got the exact words, something of the sort. Well now, the Leader of the Opposition has removed that section that we go into Committee of Ways and Means and has said that he regrets that the government has done certain things. We go further and say -- oh yes, we go further. -- (Interjection) -- But we don't need to say that we regret anything. There's no rule that says you have got to say that. It's perfectly proper. We are making a positive statement that we don't agree with my honourable friend's complete budget statement but that we want him and the government to do something additional, something extra, which is a perfectly germane amendment.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . is that I believe that this is an amendment which purports to amend a motion, and the amendment does not deal really with the subject matter of the motion which it purports to amend. It may well be, and I won't argue at this stage, that if there was no motion before us other than to go into Ways and Means, that this amendment as a motion may have been acceptable, although I still don't know what would be the result of the passing of such a motion because it seems to me it's not a want of confidence and that we wouldn't be in committee and we wouldn't be anywhere but we would still be in government. But regardless of that, I think that, as it purports to amend a motion of non-confidence, it should be along the lines of that motion.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order I'd just like to add a few comments, that it seems to me that the proposed amendment is merely an attempt to have the same effect as the amendment that was ruled out of order, and in saying so I believe that we should examine what is intended by the budget speech debate. The Minister of Finance proposes that the Government of Manitoba's position with regard to Ways and Means now be dealt with by the House, and the Leader of the Opposition moves a want of confidence. I would suggest that with regard to the Treasury being able to proceed to deal with Ways and Means, that we can't have a motion which merely refers the matter out of this discussion. The budget must either be proceeded with, it must either be passed, rejected or amended, and the suggestion of my honourable friend does none of those things. It merely says we don't -- we think that the government should further consider the kind of budget that they want -- or consider the

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) kind of budget that they want to bring in. Well we've considered it and we've brought in a budget, and the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition quite properly says he doesn't like our budget, and you can say that you like it or you don't like it or you want to change it but I suggest that you can't make a motion which doesn't deal with the budget, and that's what my honourable friend is trying to do. Instead of referring it, he's referring it back to the government, which is the same thing, Mr. Speaker, as a referral.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, if I may on the point of order. My honourable friends obviously do not like motions that propose a specific action. When we propose by amendment an action different than that of the government, that is in this case expressing want of confidence in part of the budget. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition expressed this in a different way. His statement is that he regrets that they've changed the taxation policies and it can spell disaster. We are saying that we regret - while it isn't just stated - that we want the government, prior to making its taxation changes, to reconsider the impact upon Manitoba, and so it has exactly the same effect. And because it proposes a course different from that of the government, which it does, then the government can vote for it or against it as it chooses. If it votes for it, clearly its budget is not accepted. I agree. If it votes against it, then the motion presumably will be defeated because the government have enough members in the House to defeat it, and they carry on in this same way as I expect they will vote against the amendment of the Leader of the Opposition. So the government has the choice to vote for it or against it. If it votes for it, it's voting to hold its budget at this point and to proceed to a study. And it is perfectly proper for the House to do this. It's the question of whether the government wants to support the motion or doesn't.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, it's peculiar that I should be on the side of the government twice in two days. I find it a little hard to take, but really, as far as I can see, what this motion does it says that some of the friends of the Liberal Party are for the budget, some of the friends of the Liberal Party are against the budget and they stand with their friends. And I believe that the reasoning behind the amendment not being in order have been very well put by members on the other side so I won't take any further part in it.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, to add to your confusion, I just want to say to my honourable friend that it may be true that the motion that he proposes could have the effect of attempting to embarrass people by voting one way or another as to whether they're going to consider something, but the fact is that the motion proposes that the government do what it has done. It's considered its tax position and it's brought in a budget, and it proceeds now to proceed to ways and means of obtaining those revenues. And you can be for it or you can be against it or you can change it, but you can't do anything which has the effect of postponing consideration and referring it, and this is exactly what this motion does, and that's what we've done up until now.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on that same point of order. The way I understand the resolution is that it would amend the motion to go into Ways and Means and instead of just considering the budget we would also consider the other aspects of review, that that same committee would take a review of the situation . . .

MR. GREEN: No! It's going to the government, not the Ways and Means.

MR. FROESE: . . . and I don't see that the motion is out of order. The government might well object, but I don't see that it is out of order.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, to come back to the point of order. Yesterday you ruled the original motion out of order on the basis of Beauchesne 202 (6) because you stated that it is not an amendment to a motion to move that the question go to a committee. I'm not going to enter into a debate at this point as to why I disagreed with your ruling, but that was your ruling yesterday. This motion on that basis does not refer this to a committee, it's a statement of principle.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe I can give my ruling on the honourable member's sub-amendment now. Unfortunately, I had hoped that I'd hear some debate on a rule of our own which I feel applies in this case but no one raised it, and I'm referring to Rule No. 57 which states that only one amendment and one sub-amendment may be made to a motion for the Speaker to leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Supply or Committee of Ways and Means. Now, I do believe that . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, . . . with the rules. I would hate to be in a situation where we were challenging a ruling on which nobody has had anything to say because I believe

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) that this may cause us a pitfall. To rule on Rule 57, you would have to have ruled that the sub-amendment which you previously rejected was in fact put, and in view of the fact that no sub-amendment was put, we are in the position now where there has only been one amendment and I don't think that under Rule 57 you can say that a sub-amendment which has been ruled out of order has in fact been put.

MR. SPEAKER: I'll just check very briefly on this point and I think that I'll be able to continue. May I . . .

MR. JORGENSON: . . . on the particular point that you just raised, it is my understanding in reading Rule 57 that it applies only in the event that a sub-amendment has been made to the amendment and had been accepted. In other words, it would not be possible to move a further sub-amendment to the amendment. I quite agree with the Honourable the Minister of Health and Welfare that in this particular instance I do not think that it applies, because you have in fact ruled the sub-amendment out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Well that is the question in my mind at the moment.

With all due respect to the comment on both sides of the House, I find that a motion was made because I ruled on it. True, I ruled it out of order, but there had to have been a motion before the House for me to make a ruling on. So therefore, in accordance with the interpretation of our rules, I do believe that a motion in fact was made. It wasn't accepted, that is quite true, but there was a point in the debate of the motion at which there was a motion made that I ruled on, which was the proposed sub-amendment. So therefore, the motion having been made to the effect of moving the sub-amendment, therefore I feel that Rule 57 applies that no further sub-amendment could be made.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. If that is the nature of your thinking, then again, the House is controlled by its members, and we would have no objection to the sub-amendment that is now being put and ruled on by the Speaker on its merits. We would not want to preclude the putting of the second sub-amendment if you rule that one sub-amendment has already been put.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order I would agree with that position, because all that would be required to make sure that all you could have as an amendment was some honourable member to move a motion that he knew was out of order and he would prohibit any other amendment being made and debate would be limited to his own. In other words, I could, Mr. Speaker, move that motion of non-confidence, one of my people could arbitrarily get up and take over the debate and they could move a motion of amendment to mine, which would prevent any other member of the House making an amendment, and I don't think this would be a good basis for us to get off on.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order. I think it has been our practice to have only an amendment and a sub-amendment - in fact, that is the rule. Then once the sub-amendment is disposed of, I think we have accepted further sub-amendments. Now I must admit that when you read the rule the way it's stated in the book it would appear to preclude that, but it appears, certainly I think in the Throne Speech debate, it's been the practice that we dispose of one sub-amendment and then we are only faced with an amendment, that further sub-amendments have been accepted. Now I would hope that before a final ruling is made, which then becomes a precedent of the House, this be carefully considered. Maybe the Rules Committee could make a final determination.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. I would also take the view that if any sub-amendments are ruled out of order or even dealt with, and a new sub-amendment is being proposed, that that amendment should still be a valid one. Because the rule states that only one sub-amendment can be on the Order Paper at any one time, I think this should not preclude any additional amendments once the sub-amendments have been dealt with.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, perhaps we should avoid a ruling. If everybody is in agreement, the matter could be referred to Rules Committee but in the meantime, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that all parties in the House are willing, by leave if necessary, to let the sub-amendment be put. Having said that, we of course have suggested that the sub-amendment is out of order.

MR. G. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): On the point of order, Mr. Speaker. If it would be of help to you, Sir, by leave of the House I would withdraw the sub-amendment, and just before 12:30, or when everyone else who has wished to speak has spoken, I would then move it and you could take it under advisement over the weekend.

MR. SCHREYER: . . . pertaining comments relative to the point of order in front of us now, I would submit for your consideration, Sir, the following two points: The first being that, if there is any question as to whether a sub-amendment can be received after an earlier attempt was made to move a sub-amendment which was ruled out of order by the Chair, I would suggest to you, Sir, that a sub-amendment is not made until it is accepted by the Chair, so that in this context I do not believe that one can say that any sub-amendment has already been made since it was not accepted by you, Sir. Therefore, on that point, I would think that it would be in order for the Honourable Member from Portage la Prairie to move this sub-amendment. I believe it would be in order.

However, the second point is that the subject matter of this proposed sub-amendment is not in order in my estimation, because I contend that it is really the same, essentially, the same subject matter as was attempted to be moved in sub-amendment just a day or two ago, which you, Sir, ruled out of order. The wording is different but the intent is precisely the same. It calls for a review of taxation which was the whole gist of the sub-amendment that was attempted to be moved by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. So, if you're taking this under advisement, Sir, I simply make these two points, that it is in order for a sub-amendment to be moved now but it all depends on the nature of the subject matter of the proposed sub-amendment.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, if I may, still on the same point of order. I do not have the Hansard yet so I cannot quote directly what you stated, but I listened very carefully at the time and my understanding is that you said that the original motion was out of order because it referred the matter to a committee, and you referred to Beuchesne at that time - I think it was 202 (6). Now this does not refer it to a committee and, based on your own ruling, this is the reason that we have presented this one in this way.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Member from Portage la Prairie is correct that there is no inclination by anyone to speak this morning on this matter, then I would strongly urge that you do take it under advisement, and if that is the case then I would suggest that the name of the Honourable Minister of Health be removed from holding it. It could be held in your name, Mr. Speaker, so it will show the proper sequence of making amendments, providing of course the Honourable Minister of Health will not be barred from speaking on Monday.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, this is just a point of information. One of the honourable members, I believe the Honourable Member for St. Matthews, would like to speak if he is not precluded by the holding of the motion.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I too would like to mention, if there are other speakers I think we should allow them to speak because otherwise we'll be pressed for time on Monday, and I am not prepared today to proceed, otherwise I would be happy to.

MR. CHERNIACK: As long as it's understood they will have to be speaking on the motion of the Honourable the Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: . . . to take the amendment under advisement in the light of all the arguments that have been proposed this morning, and if it is the wish of the House to allow debate to continue on the amendment . . .

MR. WEIR: On the point of order. I would think precedent might be better if we accepted the Member from Portage's suggestion of allowing him leave to withdraw his motion now and allow him to place it again just, well, before the debate adjourns, so that it can be considered in due course and we're not in that area of conflict as to which one you're debating.

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes, I hadn't heard that portion of the suggestion. I think it's a very wise one and one that we could proceed with, and I would then -- but again ask permission of the House to have the name of the Honourable Minister of Health withdrawn as holding it so as to leave it in your name, Mr. Speaker, and be understood that he be permitted to speak on Monday.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, then on the amendment of the House Leader of the Liberal Party the debate will not be extended. The deadline is Monday is it, at a certain hour, I believe. That won't change?

MR. SPEAKER: So is leave given to withdraw the sub-amendment on the understanding that, yes, and it will be reintroduced later today. Agreed? The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. WALLY JOHANNSON (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on a matter of

(MR. JOHANSSON cont'd.) . . . grievance which affects myself, it affects the other teachers in this House and it affects the members of my Party. This arises out of a statement made in this House by the Honourable Member from Fort Rouge, Page 114 Hansard, and an ensuing interview apparently which . . .

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. There's a place where a grievance can be brought up. The honourable gentleman I understand has risen to speak to the budget debate rather than make a grievance at this time. He did say that he rose on a point of grievance.

MR. GREEN: . . . does not mean that a person can't air his grievances and must debate.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman prefixed his remarks by saying he rose on a point of grievance.

MR. GREEN: I hadn't any idea that a non-lawyer could be so picayune. The fact is that the member can speak on the subject matter which he intends to speak on, during the Throne Speech Debate.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, the exhibition of the lawyers a few moments ago doesn't convince me.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member speaking on the motion? -- (Interjection) -- The Honourable Member may proceed.

MR. JOHANSSON: As I said a few moments ago, I'm referring to a statement made on Page 114 in Hansard by the Honourable Member from Fort Rouge, and I'll quote the statement: "Most of us have misgivings about state run nurseries which along with the school systems of socialist and communist countries bear the stigma of being used as instruments for political indoctrination. In fact, many people feel that in this country the school system has been infiltrated at all levels by teachers whose principles don't prevent them from presenting a biased political and ideological picture." This statement was repeated in an article in the Free Press, Friday, September 19th. The statement disturbs me in a number of ways. First of all, there's an implication of a deliberate plot on the part of people who are entering the teaching profession - a plot to insinuate themselves into the profession deliberately in order to subvert the children within the school system. This disturbs me because people who think in this manner usually have a conspiracy theory of history, and the conspiracy theory of history is usually held by the extremist fringe of the political spectrum. So this first statement disturbs me.

Now there's a second statement in this article. Mrs. Trueman was replying apparently to a letter from a Mr. David Robertson, Teachers Association President, that is the Winnipeg Teachers Association President, and she was asked to give examples that might, on investigation, afford some degree of credulity to the charges that she had made. She said: "Mr. Robertson had been the campaign manager for T.W. Johannson the New Democratic Party MLA for St. Matthews". This statement is simply untrue. In fact, before seeing this article I had never even heard of Mr. Robertson. I have plenty of evidence to back up my statement which I can produce. However, the onus of proof in this case is not upon me; it's upon the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

There is a third item here that disturbs me. "Alderman Trueman also cited G.H. Enns, immediate past president of the teachers group and J.H. Lockett vice-president, as examples to prove her charge of infiltration of the school system." This is very interesting. All of these people happen to be members of the NDP, or at least were members. However, some of her facts are wrong. She said that Mr. Enns, for example, is an NDP councillor in West Kildonan. Well he happens to be an Independent councillor in West Kildonan - pardon me North Kildonan.

There's another problem. The Honourable Member from Fort Rouge seems to assume that if some teachers are active in politics, this proves that they are infiltrating the school system or they are indoctrinating students in their own political philosophy. The problem with her point is that she proves too little. I have been teaching for a number of years myself and judging by my experience, the majority of teachers are not active politically. I would say that there are probably more Liberals and Conservatives in the school system than there are NDP members. Are these people infiltrating the school system, the Liberals and Conservatives? My own teaching experience I think proves that it is rather difficult to indoctrinate students. Let me give you just one little example, and I don't go out of my to indoctrinate

(MR. JOHANSSON cont'd.) . . . students.

During the 1968 federal election I polled one of my classes in Canadian history to find out how they would vote if they had the vote at that time. This is a class of 30. Sixteen of them would have voted Conservative, 12 Liberal, 1 NDP - this one student happened to come from an old CCF family - and 1 Social Credit. Now if I was supposed to be infiltrating the school system, I wasn't doing a very good job of it. I'm convinced that most teachers in their teaching are quite honest, are not intent upon indoctrinating their students. For example, one thing that I do when I teach government, and I think probably many teachers do this, one thing I do when I'm teaching government is I tell the students before I start what my political allegiance is and they are to judge what I say, keeping this in mind.

Another statement in this article in the Free Press, the honourable member said her statements in the Legislature are not necessarily her own opinion but she was expressing the concern of some of her constituents; this was entirely proper. I find this statement very odd. Some of my constituents have expressed concern to me, some of them on principle, and I don't repeat these in the Legislature. If some constituent expressed a concern to me with which I didn't agree, I would point this out if I did express it in the Legislature. I'd point out the fact that I didn't share this concern.

The honourable member goes on to try to prove the statement that she made. Now if she was only expressing the concern of her constituents why would she bother to try to prove that there were people infiltrating the system or attempting to indoctrinate students. Why would she try to prove this, if she didn't share this concern or this opinion.

One final item from this article in the Press. "However she continues to maintain too many teachers are involved in politics and it would be better if they spent less time in politics and more in school."

Again the logic of this really escapes me. She's implying that teachers are second-class citizens; they don't possess the civil rights that all other groups in our society possess. I find this very, very strange. Why should a teacher have less civil rights than for example a farmer, or a lawyer. The Athenian democracy, the Athenian democracy, three centuries, more than three centuries before the birth of Christ, held that the highest duty of every citizen was to serve in the public service, was to act as a public representative. Apparently the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge doesn't share this opinion, at least regarding teachers. As far as I'm concerned, not only teachers but all citizens have as their highest duty, the obligation, if the public so desires, to serve the public, to serve as public representatives. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I find the remarks of the Honourable Member for St. Matthews rather intriguing, because he was one of those who through the course of the election campaign went about from door to door and expressed his concern for the people of his constituency, the down trodden, those who were poverty stricken, those who were on low incomes, and we find on his first opportunity to rise in this House to speak on their behalf, he takes the time of the House to defend a group that are pretty capable of defending themselves. In all the time that he could have been using to put forth the problems, and I am sure there are many legitimate problems in his constituency, it seems somewhat strange that he uses this debate to make that point. But I don't intend to deal with that, there are other matters that I would like to deal with during the course of the brief remarks that I intend to make today.

I was interested in the statement made by the Minister of Finance that the government was going to undertake to make it possible for every Manitoban to lead a useful, happy and productive life. It's a very fine statement. But I'm just curious to know, having some knowledge of the different things that make people happy, how they are going to spread themselves around to the point where they are going to attend to the needs of every individual and to insure that every individual is happy. It seems it's a rather broad embracing statement. Perhaps when he replies, or maybe even when the Minister of Health and Welfare replies, he might elaborate on this point a little. I regretted very much, Mr. Speaker, that he adjourned the debate today, or that he had it stand, because I was listening with eager anticipation to hear his contribution and now we are going to have to spend the whole weekend wondering what he would have said had he taken advantage of the opportunity that was his.

I was also interested in the statement that appears on Page 9 of the transcript of the Minister's budget statement and I want to deal with this matter just for a moment. His statement goes on to say "considerable emphasis will be placed upon resource development and the

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd.).... creation of a sound infrastructure. By the latter I mean the provision of the basic services and facilities necessary to support economic development. These are the things which will make economic development a reality and we are satisfied that given sound policies and programs for the development of our basic resources and our infrastructure, capital will flow readily through many channels to realize the opportunities that are here. This aspect of our future we face with great confidence." We have always on this side of the House shared that confidence - up until the night of the budget presentation. Now there are, I think, some serious doubts in the minds of a good many of us as to whether these objectives will be achieved.

My Leader and the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose I think documented fairly well the case insofar as the encouragement of economic development in this country is concerned. I was interested in a statement that the First Minister made, in two separate - I'm reading from the Manitoba Government Information Services Branch News Service: "In two separate addresses to Winnipeg investment dealers and to a visiting Toronto businessman, Premier Ed. Schreyer stressed that the Manitoba Government is dedicated to providing a climate where private capital investment, foreign and domestic, and local is encouraged." Well he said this one day and almost the same week the budget is brought down, and how anyone can suggest that the contents of that budget were in any way calculated to encourage investment in this province is pretty difficult for many of us to understand.

But in creating a climate for economic development - and I referred to this before in this House - I hope that the government are not thinking only in terms of economic development in the city of Winnipeg or in the north, because there are other areas of this province -- (Interjection) -- I'm thinking of Morris and I'm thinking of other areas just like Morris where the climate for industrial development is best achieved by providing some of the basic things that are necessary for economic growth: communications, roads, water supply, proper educational facilities, recreation and the like.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood who dealt with the urban problems in his remarks during the course of yesterday's proceedings mentioned that we have to get rid of an urban psychology, or a rural psychology rather. He thought that the time had now come that the people of the City of Winnipeg were going to throw off the shackles of this, as was described in the House of Commons on one occasion of this rural tyranny. And it was an NDP member who described it as such - the fact that there are going to be more and more members from the urban areas being elected and gradually they'll take over. I don't quite share that view because I don't think it matters too much from whence the members are elected. I think that every member elected to this House comes here with the feeling that he has a responsibility, not primarily to his constituency, not necessarily to his province, but for the country as a whole; and although we in a provincial Legislature may emphasize the needs of our province, we nonetheless in the back of our minds have always the attitude that the needs of the entire country can best be served by promoting the kind of development that will make Canada a better country to live in. But oddly enough the remarks that he made concerning the problems of the urban areas seem to me can be solved to a large extent by encouraging greater development in the rural areas. The problem of providing housing, streets, sewage and water and all of these things for a fast growing urban population is exactly the reverse of the problem that we are confronted with in the rural areas with diminishing population. The fact that the cost of providing the services for those who are left are spread between fewer and fewer people because of the exodus of people from the rural to the urban areas.

I have never been able to quite understand why it is that in a city such as Winnipeg, the planning and the development, the size of a city is not so much determined by those who are supposed to be entrusted with the responsibility of planning, but more by those who belong to the industrial complex. I have never, for example, been able to quite figure out why it is necessary to locate all the factories in the Metro area, when a few miles out you could rid yourself of a good many of the urban problems, of communication, transportation. If, for example, a factory was located 20, 30 miles outside of the city -- Morris again. But it does seem to me that the costs of manufacturing are not going to be that greatly increased as a result of the distances that it is necessary to ship the raw materials and the finished products.

I hope that the suggestion that the honourable member made - and I regret that he's not in the House today - I hope that the suggestion the honourable member made didn't mean or didn't imply that now that they had the bulk of their representation from the urban areas that

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd.),... the rest of the province can look after itself. I couldn't help but be somewhat disturbed about that comment and I hope that I can be reassured.

But it's interesting to watch what has been happening on the other side of the House. We all remember with some interest the comments and the statements that were made by honourable members opposite during the course of the election campaign, and how they were going to make a new heaven on earth in this province once they came to power; and it was rather interesting after all their sound and fury against industry and against business how the Premier fell all over himself in attempting to assure them that they had nothing to fear from the NDP government, nothing to fear whatsoever. But now, now we see things happening that makes us wonder just exactly what is going to happen. Melville Watkins came out with the manifesto a little while ago that's going to be brought before the NDP convention and I know that there are certain members on the opposite side who share his views. One of the honourable members on the other side signed it. I think I must give credit to him for being honest, for indicating precisely where he stands. I wonder where my honourable friend the Minister of Health and Welfare stands on this document? It seems to me that he shares this philosophy to a large extent, but has not got around to the point of where he will endorse it. Maybe it's because of a Cabinet decision, I don't know.

Then what about the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources. He hasn't signed this document, although one is led to the conclusion that this philosophy he supports. I must say again that it's refreshing to see, even though I disagree very violently with it, refreshing to see that there is at least one person on that side of the House who shares the honest opinion and has the integrity to admit it, and we'd like to know just in what direction this government is going because the signs are ominous.

MR. CHERNIACK: Does the honourable member have a copy of the statement to which he is referring?

MR. JORGENSEN: A copy of what statement?

MR. CHERNIACK: Watkins. The Watkins statement to which he is referring.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, all I have, as my honourable friend would probably recognize would be a press report: "NDP Radicals Stress Socialism," and he's read it as well as I do. I'm not going to clutter up the record with a statement of that nature. But if he wants me to table it, I will. However, I haven't extracted anything from it, I've simply referred to it in general terms. But my honourable friend I'm sure knows what it contains.

MR. CHERNIACK: No, I did not. -- (Interjection) --

MR. JORGENSEN: My honourable friend says that he endorses what it contains. I wouldn't go that far, because I don't think that the Minister of Finance does endorse that kind of a statement. -- (Interjection) -- Well, the Attorney-General, I just don't know where he stands. We haven't been able to determine that as yet. And I must confess that prior to his entry into this House I'd never heard of him, so I'm not in a position to know any more about him. But I must say that if his performance as committee chairman is any indication then we have cause to be a little bit concerned because his attitude in running those committees is that he does all the talking and the rest of us are there to endorse the decisions that he makes. It's a small sample of what we can expect, but it's enough to cause us some degree of concern.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health and Welfare used to treat, when he was on this side of the House, used to treat the House to those interesting little homilies every once in a while, and I was looking over, he'll be interested to know, that I was reading over some of his speeches of past years, and I find them -- (Interjection) -- yes, as a matter of fact, as a matter of fact that is true, Mr. Speaker, it's a poor man that can't learn something from somebody every day, and even reading the speeches of the Minister of Health and Welfare are an education in themselves. But there was one little story that he used to tell and it was by Tolstoi I think. I'm going to change the wording of it just slightly because I think the circumstances are different now and it may be a little more applicable if I change that one word. It concerns the story of the rich man and the poor man, and instead of using the term the "rich man", I'm just going to say "the government"; and it reads something like this: "Tolstoi tells the story about the government and the poor man, and he says that the poor man goes through life carrying the government on his back and on his shoulders, but everywhere he goes the government directs the poor man and the poor man follows this direction. And of course the government is very decent, and good to the poor man, and when he sees that the poor man is tired he tells the poor man that he can take a rest, sit down for awhile and if he has to go some place in a hurry he

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd.)... will permit the poor man to trot rather than to run at a full gallop; and when the poor man is obviously weakening the government will see to it that he gets a glass of water or even feed him something to eat, and then the government is completely and at all times trying to do the best he can to make sure that the man is not unduly being hampered by this procedure. When the government sees the poor man is perspiring he will even go to the great length of taking a white handkerchief, a white silk handkerchief, out of his pocket and wiping the brow of the poor man. Tolstoi says that the government will do anything for the poor man except to get off his back." I kind of think that,...

MR. GREEN: Will the honourable member not agree that when the government was controlled by the other part, the part that you've struck out, the rich man, that the story is applicable both ways?

MR. JORGENSEN: The point that I'm attempting to make is that from the indications that we see -- and I see that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface is occupying the seat of the mighty over there now -- the indications that we see from that side of the House is that there is a great likelihood that this is going to be precisely the situation, that the poor man -- and we'll all be poor because that seems to be philosophy over there, the government will be riding on our backs pretty heavily. I have been again distracted by my honourable friends opposite. But I think that the one point that must be stressed in the presentation made by the Minister of Finance the other day -- it has been raised by my Leader, it was raised by the Member for Ste. Rose on two occasions, a sub-amendment before this and the sub-amendment before this House -- the direction that we could possibly be heading by discouraging investment in this province.

I don't think anyone can deny that in the past ten years great efforts have been made to encourage the kind of investment that will assist in the development of this province so that the jobs that are needed to ensure people that we're spending money sending them through the schools and universities, are insofar as it is possible, able to find employment in this province. It doesn't seem to me that it makes much difference if you cannot keep them here, if there are no jobs for them here, if there's nobody going to invest money in this province, then all of the good that you believe that you're doing in redistributing wealth is going to be to no avail if there are going to be nobody to pay the cost and to pay the taxes. So it is very important in my view, and I share the concern that was expressed by the two gentlemen I mentioned earlier, that this may be, unless -- and there's a big "if" there -- unless other provinces decide that their share of the income tax will go up as well, and if that's the case why then we're at least on an even keel with them; but that's an awful funny thing to have to hope for in order to ensure economic development in this province.

But I hope that the government has given the kind of consideration that this matter really deserves before they made that decision. They claimed they have. All I suggest is that it remains to be seen. I hope also that the atmosphere of endeavour, of initiative, will not be discouraged by actions of this government. This concerns me.

I have a little, as I say, I have a little story that I think pretty well indicates what could happen if government continue to pursue this course. The story concerns, and perhaps some Honourable Members will remember it from school days. It's a story of the Little Red Hen. It's been changed around now, I've changed it around a little bit to suit the present circumstances. Once upon a time there was a little red hen who scratched about and uncovered some grains of wheat. She called her barnyard neighbours and said, "If we work together and plant this wheat we'll have some fine bread to eat. Now who will help me plant this wheat?" "Not I," said the cow. "Not I," said the duck. "Not I," said the goose. "Then I'll do it myself," said the little red hen, and she did. After the wheat started growing the ground turned dry and there was no rain in sight. "Well, who'll help me water the wheat?" said the little red hen. "Not I," said the cow. "Not I," said the pig. "Not I," said the duck. "Equal rights," said the goose. "Then I'll do it myself," said the little red hen and she did. The wheat grew tall and ripened to golden grain. "Now, who will help me reap the wheat?" said the little red hen. "Not I," said the cow. "Not I," said the duck. "Out of my classification," said the pig. "I'd lose my welfare," said the goose. "Then I'll do it myself," said the little red hen, and she did. When it came to grind the grain to flour again, the little red hen asked for help. "Not I," said the cow. "I'd lose my unemployment insurance," said the duck. "When it comes time to bake the bread, that's overtime for me," said the cow. "I'm a dropout. I never learned how to do it," said the duck. "I'd lose," said the pig. "Well, if I'm the only one helping, that's

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd.)... discrimination," said the goose. "Then I'll do it myself," said the little red hen, and she did.

She baked five loaves of fine bread and then held them up for her neighbours to see. "I want some," said the cow. "I want some," said the duck. "I want some too," said the pig. "I demand my share," said the goose. "No," said the little red hen, "I can rest for awhile and eat the five loaves myself." "Excess profits," cried the cow. "Capitalistic leech," screamed the duck. "Company fink," cried the pig. "Equal rights," screamed the goose, and they hurriedly painted picket signs and they marched around the little red hen singing, "We shall overcome," and they did. For when the farmer came to investigate the commotion, he said, "You mustn't be greedy, little red hen. Look at the oppressed cow, look at the disadvantaged duck, look at the underprivileged pig, look at the less fortunate goose. Why, you're guilty of making second-class citizens out of them." "But I earned this bread," said the little red hen. "Exactly," said the wise farmer, "That is the wonderful free enterprise system we are living under. Everybody in the barnyard can earn as much as he wants. You should be happy to have this freedom. In other barnyards you would have to give all five loaves to the farmer. Here you give four loaves to your suffering neighbours and keep one for yourself." And they all lived happily ever after, including the little red hen who smiled and smiled and thought, "I am grateful. I am grateful." But her neighbours wondered why she never baked any more bread.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I do wish to take part in the debate at this time and make my contribution. Our group, on the past couple of occasions, has tried to bring it quite strongly to the government by amendment, or by sub-amendment to the amendment of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, and pointing our concern about an increase to corporation tax and the effect it will have on development in this Province of Manitoba. I think it may have some serious effects because if there ever was a time that Winnipeg had a great opportunity to attract development, I don't think any other city in Canada today has as great and as good an opportunity as Winnipeg has, because if one would be prepared to do some research, many cities have developed to the point where they're realizing some vacancy experience in their office and commercial buildings in their downtown redevelopment. This is the case in some of the other western cities, and as well in eastern Canada. On the other hand, Winnipeg in its downtown area has a great opportunity because this is what most of your real estate reports are pointing out, the land is available; we have not an over-supply of new office space, and I feel any move that the government will do in respect to taxation and any other incentives that it can offer in the way of tax freeze is most important at this time. So I would like to see the government really take this point into consideration.

I think the basic decision to locate in any particular area depends on many factors, and these may be quality of growth, marketing areas and availability of cost of supplies and labour and so on, but I think the most important one that we have to concern ourselves with is usually a tax climate. I think it is important. So, despite what other factors are concerned, the first thing that a developer is going to concern himself with is the tax factor.

Now the point that I'd like to raise in Winnipeg, at the present time our analysis of real estate taxes per square foot is much higher than most other cities in Canada. For instance, I would like to relate on the same type of building and I'll try to use some differences between different cities - Edmonton, Victoria, Vancouver, Calgary and Winnipeg. On the same type of building, which I will call (a), the tax per square foot is 29.76 cents in Edmonton, Victoria it's 33.36, Vancouver 35.16, Calgary 22.44, Winnipeg is 48 cents, which is a substantial difference than what we have in -- this is on apartment buildings, which is a substantial difference in respect to realty tax what some of the other jurisdictions have to pay. So this is one of the points that I wish to raise.

I can use a building (b); probably the building (b) is not as great a building as No. (a). It's maybe less attractive in the respect that it may not have underground parking and so on, and the tax per square foot in Edmonton would be 24.48, Victoria 33.96, Calgary 22, and Winnipeg would be 45, so there still is a substantial difference in that respect, Mr. Speaker. So this is the reason that I would like to point out at this time, that we've tried by two sub-amendments to try to convince the government that perhaps they should have a complete review as far as the 18 percent corporation tax is concerned and what effect it will have on industrial and commercial development in Manitoba, and Winnipeg particularly, because really, I don't feel the government has made any assessment or has made any studies at this particular time.

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.)

I know the Member for Elmwood the other day has concerned himself with -- most remarks pertained to Metropolitan Winnipeg, and this is what I wish to do because I'm not familiar with the rural parts of Manitoba, but I believe that the people of Metropolitan Winnipeg have many problems and concerns which have probably gone unattended for probably too long. Metropolitan Winnipegers suffer from high taxation, divided local government, shortage of low cost housing, increasing difficulties in public transportation, and existence of serious poverty amongst many of our people. Now I know that I could relate, for instance, an area in the middle of Winnipeg along the tracks, there's an area that probably over a million dollars goes in there in the way of welfare payments and has gone in there for the last 30 years perhaps, and there was no physical change in that area at all. I think that this is the type of reassessment and revaluation that the government must do. I am not saying that these people should not be getting welfare but, of all the welfare payments, the family allowances, the other welfare money that's gone into there, there's been no change in that area and I think that there must be change in those respects.

I think that Winnipeg itself is the key to prosperity of Manitoba and for this reason I feel that the government must attend to the urban problems. We must appreciate that over half a million of the people of this province are concentrated in the City of Winnipeg. I think that it's time that the government should consider probably setting up under one department such things as housing and urban affairs, and probably problems that affect social, economic and legal aspects of urban living, and I think that the Minister should be a person that would have the initiative and the energy and interest to deal with these problems in a very prompt manner because I think in the last two years we've had many studies in this area but we've had little progress and, Mr. Speaker, I would like to see this government take an active part in this area.

I think reform is also necessary in Greater Winnipeg. Metropolitan government to some extent has been quite successful in working. On the other hand, it's been receiving unnecessary criticism from many sectors and areas of Winnipeg, but I still feel there is too much duplication and probably not enough planning. There are still unequal tax burdens and uneven development in different parts of the city. I think it's the responsibility of this government in solving many of these problems. There must be reorganization in Winnipeg in your whole Metropolitan Government. I would not wish to state -- or if I can, that I am one of those that I'm not in agreement that there should be a one-city concept. I feel that we should move perhaps to a three or four-city concept and perhaps review this in five years or ten years and see if there's any necessity in maintaining. But I think that change for a one city would be too great in one and I don't think it would receive much approval from the majority of Winnipeg residents and would not receive -- when I say Winnipeg I mean Metropolitan Winnipeg -- I don't think it would receive approval from many of your municipal people but I think we must move in a direction to eliminate the 13 or 14 cities or municipalities and move into three or four -- (Interjection) -- Yes.

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Could you tell me if it's the government or . . . change in the policy of the Liberal Party as far as total amalgamation? Or is that just his own personal opinion that he's ?

MR. PATRICK: This is my own personal opinion. I have stated this before in this House and I'm saying the same thing now. So if this is a change, then I'm sure the Honourable Member for St. Boniface must be aware of it as he was . . .

MR. DESJARDINS:

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, if the solution would be a simple one and, say, one government, I think it's worthwhile looking at it but I think it's not that simple and I think it's much more difficult and will not come about in the near future if this is the course that we want to follow, but I think if we say that we must decrease the present 14 or 13 municipalities to three or four and review that in a short time, then I think it's much easier to accomplish it in this manner.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the honourable member whether or not he thinks it would be a problem that by creating four cities involving roughly 125,000 people on the average per city, wouldn't it make it more difficult to rationalize the government completely at a later date than it is now with 13 relatively smaller municipal units?

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, it may be. I can't say at this time. I think that it may be just as difficult dealing with 14 or 13 municipal governments as it is with four -- let's assume

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.) . . . there's four or three - and you'll have to look at the economics at that time, many factors. I'm sure that most politicians are reasonable and if they see there's no sense in carrying on, I'm sure they'd agree to an amalgamation, but I think that it would be wrong to try to go to one city concept at the present time. I think it could be much easier accomplished if we try and reduce to a minimum and review the whole thing to see if there's any sense in maintaining a three or four-city concept. I think it would be easier accomplished, because we have spent some eight years on this problem; there has been no progress made in this respect; and if we say it should be one city we'll probably spend another eight or ten years and who knows if there would be any progress. So I think if we move in this way I think there will be progress, Mr. Speaker.

The other point, I think that we must deal with the problem of tax. Of course the major point here is with the education tax or the tax of the property owner. I think that there must be followed a more equitable redistribution of tax. I have taken the time of the House before about talking on municipal services and the mill rate and the tax how it applies to many areas. I have a resolution on the Order Paper in respect to the taxes for old age and pensioners, which I think is too high, and I think it's time that we have taken such as education and remove some of the hospital costs from the property owner because, as I pointed out, we are becoming more renters instead of homeowners in this city and one of the big reasons is because of the high tax on the homes.

Mr. Speaker, I think the record of the province in using federal funds for low-income housing has been poor, and the records show. I feel we still have a shortage of some 14,000 low cost housing in this province and I would like to see what the plans of this government are and are going to be. I have mentioned to the Minister that in the Throne Speech I was very disappointed that we had no mention, nothing was mentioned, but I do expect when the next Session comes around that there will be a program, and see what the government intends to do to provide clean, warm and decent accommodation for the people that require it. I think that we have not in the past used funds that were available from Ottawa while most of the other provinces, not that they utilized their own share, but as well utilized some of the money that was given to Manitoba, and some of the other prairie provinces did not avail themselves to use the funds.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about the Metropolitan area of Winnipeg. I think that the city must become a place where everyone has an equal opportunity to share in what one may call the good things of life, such as living accommodations, job opportunities and so on. I have pointed out and I am greatly concerned about the tax and how it's going to affect development, and as far as commercial and industrial development in this city. I have pointed out that some few years ago when at that time one of the developers probably developed some of the finest buildings that we have in this city such as the I. B. M. Building, the Imperial House, Britannia House, the Royal Trust Building, and then this same developer stopped because at that time when the Foundation Program came into effect most developers felt that the tax at that time was much too high on commercial buildings, much higher than some of the other cities as I pointed out by statistics just a minute ago, the tax structure per square foot as it is in Winnipeg and as it is in Edmonton and some of the other Western cities. I did not use, for instance, the city of Toronto because their tax structure is almost similar to ours per square foot basis, but on the other hand, the income in the city of Toronto I understand is at least 15 to 20 percent higher per square foot than it is in Winnipeg. But, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about this tax area and I hope that the government will have another look before it increases the 18 percent on corporations. I'm concerned how it is going to affect the development of this province and the city.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, be known we are making an allowance for the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party to put an amendment. It's just that the honourable member's speech will be limited if he wants to speak now.

MR. MCKENZIE: I thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, I have already been over and spoke with the Leader of the Liberal Party and agreed that at a certain time you call me to order, Mr. Speaker, and I will turn the floor over to the Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

I at this time would like to congratulate my friend the Minister of Finance for the position he now occupies in government. He's been one of the Socialist members of the House that I have always had a great deal of respect for and nothing has changed. I still respect the man and I'm sure that he will do his government and the province justice in that department. I don't agree

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd.)... with a lot of his political ideologies from time to time, but I have always respected him in this House and I am sure his contribution will be much to Manitoba and to the government.

I also thank him, Mr. Speaker, for his kind remarks relating to Manitoba's present economic position. I think this province has enjoyed the full share of the economic boom that this country has experienced since the post-war period. Just drive around and take a look; come out in my constituency - we've had some good days in the post-war period, some excellent days. We find that the road system is pretty adequate; we have a park there now, the Asessippi Provincial Park is under way. I'm sure the new Minister is going to help us get that thing developed. It's very slow; money is scarce I agree. The Shellmouth Dam is completed and water is being held at the present time. I'm sure that the Duck Mountains are going to be developed and if we could find some way to get the agricultural economy moving I think that Manitoba has a great future.

I am concerned in another aspect, Mr. Speaker, in the debates that went on in the House that government members continually keep advising me and the House that the estimates of these various departments that are being debated, are not theirs. This concerns me, for many reasons. It concerns me due to the number of new members that we have in the House. It concerns me because we that were out on the hustings during the election campaign have heard and read at great length the wonderful things that the New Democratic Party had in store for Manitoba: "Just vote for us and we've got it." But how they can continually stand up in this House day after day and say, "Look, this is not ours, we didn't say it? Newspapers are misquoting them. They say they don't like these estimates. I am concerned. I know there's a lot of ability over there, but why don't they come forth and say, "We are ready to go and we will lead Manitoba," This concerns me and concerns many of my constituents. It concerns me in many ways. I was over talking to the Chairman of the Municipal Board the other day and I find some \$18 million of unsold debentures there. It's not an alarming thing but nevertheless, I understood that this government had the answer for that problem - municipal taxes in the country; the money is not coming in. I don't know whether, maybe I won't be able to pay my taxes in my municipality this year, because I'm in business there, my accounts receivable are alarmingly high and the whole economy rurally is bogged down.

But I was reviewing Hansard the other day and I came across a statement that was made by the Minister of Agriculture, the present Minister of Agriculture, and he at that time, as I read Hansard here, I thought had all the answers. If he would only come forth with his policy we would solve a lot of the problems in my constituency. He's debating agriculture on Page 1409 of Hansard wherein he said: "And largely, Mr. Speaker, the reasons are that both the federal and the provincial governments have never adopted an agricultural policy, a planned program for the development of our rural people so that they too may share in the better standards of living that other sectors of society are able to share in and that their standards move in accordance with the rest of society; that there be some process of upgrading and levelling so that we would insure a rural community would have the same affluence as do most of our urban centres." And he went on further and he said, "We have had a number of conferences recently on the whole question." So I immediately anticipated when he took office that he would be coming forth with some answers, but unfortunately he says no, these estimates are not his and he is not in a position to offer us any answers. But I humbly submit to you this morning, Mr. Speaker, that the public, the public in my constituency, want government to provide us with a policy that will be laid on the line for the future development of Roblin constituency and the other rural constituencies of the province.

What is going to happen in my constituency in the next 12 months? I don't know and I can't tell my people what's going to happen because nothing is being said. Nothing - nothing that's going to help the people of my constituency. I'm concerned. The farmers want the answers about their agricultural policy. The farmer wants to know how can he pay his taxes, how can he pay his taxes with this government administering the affairs of this province. Maybe the Minister of Finance has got the answer for it, but he hasn't told us in this budget that I can see. I think rural Manitoba wants the policy of this government laid on the line, Mr. Speaker, laid on the line. Has anybody, have any of the members here heard any policy statements coming across during the course of the debate? The Honourable Member for Swan River shakes his head. He's like me, he hasn't heard anything over here. It's unfortunate. I humbly submit to the Minister of Finance when he gets around to the time of closing the debate on the budget that he will give us a position where the rural people will know where they're at with relation to this

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd.),... government; and where our future is and what is at stake as far as this government and the people of my constituency are concerned.

In the budget speech it was very encouraging for me to see it wrote again into the record Mr. Speaker, that Manitoba's unemployment is the lowest in Canada - lowest in Canada. Nice to see the Minister of Transportation shaking his head, or highways -- oh yes only highways, he's not transportation that's right - shaking his head -- and try and tell me that the government of the past didn't do a good job. We did, I agree and I thank the honourable minister for associating himself with me in those remarks. Well below the national average - well below the national average. Very encouraging. It makes it difficult in the country with this low unemployment; we can't find help in the country today. The farmer this fall, like in trying to find somebody to help him take his crop off, he couldn't find anybody, no - couldn't find anybody because they're all working in this province.

There are some problems though that I would like to draw to the attention of the Minister of Health and Social Services, that some of those people that are getting social assistance in our province were offered jobs and in some cases -- and I think that we should try and firm up a policy some way -- they say why if I go out and earn X numbers of dollars it's deducted from my social allowance, so they would just as soon not go. There are some cases in my constituency where - well the housewife went out and drove the truck or something, where people could have gone that were living in the town and given them a hand.

MR. GREEN: I wonder if the honourable member would agree that where it is known that a person on social allowance should probably not be in that capacity that it would be wise to notify the Minister, so that we can deal with the problem. I happen to think the situation is very rare.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, is the honourable member making a speech or....

MR. GREEN: No, I just asked a question of the member who was speaking, as to whether it would be wise for him to notify us when he sees that happening.

MR. McKENZIE: Well possibly that would be the answer. It's very difficult though because a lot of people don't want to raise the question to me being the MLA. They'll tell somebody else; I get it secondhand. But it has been brought to my attention from time to time. Some of the farm people feel that the welfare policy or the social law has deprived them of what was a labour force at one time, casual labour force where they could go to town and hire somebody for 4 days or 5 days, pay him X number of dollars. Possibly we can solve this problem in the not too distant future, because I think the Minister recognizes that there is a problem there.

MR. GREEN: lest there be no misunderstanding. I happen to think that the situation is very rare, so I don't recognize a big problem in that area.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, the Minister's statistics in his budget speech mentioned that 43 percent of all Manitobans filing income tax have indicated an income of less than \$3,000 per annum, and I wonder if there isn't some way of analyzing the fact that we are not that bad off in this province. Is he trying to indicate that we are depressed, by that figure or -- (Interjection) -- Yes. I just wonder, that statistics rather, you know, it confused me. His remarks on Page 3 where he said government, or Page 4 was it? Page 3 of Hansard: "that government must play a much more active role in making it possible for every Manitoban to lead a happy and useful life." Now some say to me that we are being over-governed. The president of the urban and municipal people who are meeting out in West Kildonan today or in his speech yesterday, said that we got too many bureaucrats, we got too much government, that we in fact are over-governed.

A MEMBER: When did that start? When did this happen?

MR. McKENZIE: Long before my time, long before my time -- (Interjection) -- could be. I'm just humbly submitting to the Minister of Finance that this is a serious situation where you can't basically move out in rural Manitoba today -where there's a bureaucrat telling you, you know; "do this or do that." I very humbly submit that we are over-governed and this possibly could be reflected in his reply when he closes the budget speech. I guess, Mr. Speaker, maybe I should yield to the Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia that the amendment be further amended by deleting all the words after the words "this House" in the first line of the operative section thereof and substituting therefor the

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd.)... following words: "Is concerned about the possible effects of proposed taxation changes on the future development of Manitoba, and in order to ensure that we have a tax system which is fair and equitable for the individual and which fosters the greatest development possible for the province, this House requests the government to immediately undertake an overall review of taxation in Manitoba."

MR. SPEAKER: It is my intention to take the sub-amendment of the Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party under advisement and give my ruling thereon on Monday.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, before we close, on the point of order. May we have it understood that your ruling on the validity of the sub-amendment, that with leave the sub-amendment is being presented to you and that we are ruling on the validity of the content and not on the propriety of putting the amendment?

MR. SPEAKER: What question of leave?...

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, we dealt with it rather extensively this morning, that all parties in the House, by leave, agreed that we would allow the sub-amendment to proceed despite what appears to be a difference of opinion on Rule 57. On that basis, what we are hoping the Speaker would rule on is the question of whether the sub-amendment now proposed is in order, without reference to Rule No. 57.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker. I believe my honourable friend the Minister of Health and Social Services is suggesting that you have accepted the amendment; is that correct? Not the content, but you've accepted it to make the ruling. We haven't rejected the amendment on the grounds of an earlier argument?

MR. CHERNIACK: 12:30, Mr. Speaker.

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