

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, April 7, 1970.

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

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

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 with us 60 students of Grade 5 standing, of the Lincoln School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Copland, Mrs. Graham and Mrs. Thimm. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you here this afternoon.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debated. The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Osborne. The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable Member for Emerson, I wonder if the House would give leave to this matter standing. (Agreed.)

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. Matthews. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, the report that is before us is the Report of the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders which sat in between sessions and reviewed certain Acts, and had representation made to the committee by a large number of people and groups in connection with the Tenants' Act, and apparently the committee then went to work and set up certain guidelines, or made certain recommendations as to what changes should be made in the way of legislation. I was not a member of the committee and therefore did not witness these meetings. It seems to me that in order to be speaking intelligently on the report, a member or any person should really have made a study of the Act so that one was conversant with all the details that the committee apparently went into.

While I do not quarrel in general with the report, I think there's some valuable recommendations made and contained in the report. There's also provision in the report for a new office, that of a Rentalsman. It seems to me that we're getting more and more of these one-man offices into being. We've just appointed an Ombudsman and he is now in office; now we have a second recommendation here of a Rentalsman, and while there are certain things that I'm sure such an office and such a man could do, and certainly could do valuable work in certain respects, I'm just wondering whether this would apply to all the various ideas and provisions that the committee is recommending that this Rentalsman should look after. I think so much is dependent upon the type of man that will occupy that office and to which group he might lean towards. I certainly am not one that would deny that there is wrongdoing at the present time, probably by either of the parties, the tenants or landlords, in this province from time to time. One has only to listen to some of these people and you hear a good deal of this.

There are certain provisions which I do question. For one, I feel that the recommendation 4 is rather a paradox, the way I understand it. It says here: "The landlord should be allowed to hold a maximum of one-half months' rent as security for rental arrears." Well, how can he hold money for arrears when he's already got them? How can there be arrears if he already has the money? Maybe the mover or the chairman of the committee could explain just what is really meant in this case.

Then, the next section deals with the right of the tenant to sublet with the consent of the landlord. I would not want to dispute this. Surely these things happen, that persons for some reason have to leave, vacate, and if there is a lengthy period to the lease, that there should be some provision for subletting. In my opinion, it revolves so much around the new tenant, whether he's acceptable to the landlord or not. We know that one tenant can live in a premise for years and there will be very little deterioration, whereas another tenant can abuse the premises so badly that within a short time there is a large depreciation to a certain premise.

I would like a little more information on Item 7 in connection with the tradesmen making payments in exchange for exclusive access. I was not on the committee and I'm therefore not really conversant just what is behind this particular section.

(MR. FROESE Cont'd).

The next one deals with the landlords should not restrict canvassing during elections, be it municipal, federal or provincial, and it refers to orderly distribution of election literature. I think so much will depend on distribution. Just how is "distribution" interpreted? Can walls be splattered with election material? Is this part of distribution? I think these are probably some of the matters that landlords might object to. No doubt the committee has heard from these people and I don't know whether they did take exception to some of these recommendations or whether they are aware of the final recommendations that were adopted by the committee.

Under 12, it seems to me that under this provision two or three tenants could get together and certainly abuse what is recommended in Item 12 where it requires the landlord to repair, provide heat and give quiet enjoyment. I certainly would not object on the part of the tenants to have this, but if two or three tenants got together and one of them was abusive as far as making a lot of noise - and this could happen vice versa - and in this way they could certainly really make it troublesome for a landlord to comply with this particular section.

Under 15, a written notice is to be given in connection with privacy. Was the matter of telephoning considered? Would telephoning not be sufficient? Does there have to be written evidence in this case?

It seems to me that in general terms the report is, I think, favouring the tenant. I'm not quite sure whether we're, in some of the provisions not going a little overboard on the side of the tenant, because the landlord is there; he has to provide the facilities. If he wants to keep them in order and make a profit and a reasonable one, which he should not be denied, I feel that we should also make sure that we will not be discouraging these people from providing good facilities for the tenants and that we should not lean too much on the side of the tenant, because we know that there can be very nagging tenants as well. You can have good ones but there can also be those that are nagging about every little incident, and certainly if this is the type of people that a certain landlord gets in, he might want to have rights that are not presently or will not be available to him.

Then also, in Section 20, he is required to state the cause in case of quitting tenure. Is this really necessary, to give cause? Surely the committee in arriving on this recommendation must have discussed it and I would appreciate getting some of the reasoning behind some of the items that I have been bringing forward.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion. Introduction of Bills. Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

ANNOUNCEMENT

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I beg to ask the indulgence of the House to have leave to make a brief announcement.

MR. SPEAKER: Has the honourable member leave? The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that it was my honour and privilege to have spent a portion of last Sunday afternoon honouring one of Canada's, and indeed Manitoba's, most distinguished citizens. Held in Baldur in the fine constituency of Rock Lake, citizens gathered to pay tribute to Mr. Jon Petur Sigvaldason, who holds the distinction of being the first Canadian of Icelandic extraction to have been appointed to the high office of Ambassador. He served in this capacity in Indonesia, Norway and Iceland, and previous to this was posted as Assistant Secretary to Canada House in London, England. He served six years in Ottawa and later was sent to Pakistan in the consular service. In 1958 he was recalled to Ottawa to become Director of the Inspector Service of the Department of External Affairs. Mr. Sigvaldason was born and received his early education in the Baldur district and is a graduate of the University of Manitoba.

Among those present to honour Mr. Sigvaldason was Mr. Ivan Schultz, Manitoba's 1940 Minister of Education and another citizen who spent his formative years in the Argyle district.

Mr. Sigvaldason's portrait now holds a place of prominence and importance in the elementary school in Baldur where all children will be prompted to remember a truly great Canadian.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a few more words and, if I may, ask the page to deliver

Á Sunnudagin þann fimta April hafði eg þá anogu og hefur að vera stoddur við afhjupun og skemtis samsoti, að Baldur, í minnu kjördomi.

Samsoti var haldið til þess að heiðra Jon Petur Sigvaldason, vinur of Íslenskum otum, sem var fyrverandi sendiherra Kanada til Indónesía, Ísland of Noregs; og sem þar á undan þjónaði hann í Kanada House í London, á Englandi of í Pakistan.

Við staddur var Herra Ivan Schultz, fyrverandi fylkis þingmaður fyrir mitt kjördomi og síðar domsmalar ráðherra og er nú yfir - rittar domari.

Mindin sem var afhjupið var nýlegga tikin of Joni Sigvaldasini og verður latin hauga á heiðra stað í Baldur Mentaskolanum.

Það gaf mér anogu að hugsa til þess að Herra Sigvaldason, Herra Schultz of jig sjalfur, hafa aldir verið aldir up í Argylehygg.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

sjalfur, hafa odlið verið aldir up í Argylehygg.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): May I have permission to make this presentation in English? I would like to pass this question on to the Minister of Health. I have just received a letter, and I'm not sure he has, of one who has a complaint in respect to the Rehab Centre in Winnipeg withdrawing the services for neck exercises for those who have broken their neck, and he points out that now there is no place to have this done under Medicare. While they can have it done in other hospitals, they would have to pay, but he does point out that this would be quite a cost if you had to come in and pay your own bills in the hospital. Could the Minister like to answer this? If he hasn't got the letter, I'd be glad to pass it on to him.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Services) (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, there's very little to add to the comments made by the Honourable Member for Churchill but to say that this is something that is being looked upon by the officials of not only the Manitoba Hospital Commission but the staff in my office, and I do hope that we'll find a better solution for the near future.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Honourable the Attorney-General and ask him, in the light of the fact that the Minister of Justice in Ottawa has referred the breathalyzer legislation to the Supreme Court, could he advise the House as to what course of action will be taken in the Province of Manitoba with those people who are now before the courts on charges resulting from the use of the breathalyzer?

HON. AL. MACKLING, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (St. James): My department is studying the legislation; insofar as making any change, we don't think that any change is warranted at this time until a final decision is made on that case.

MR. JORGENSEN: What I was asking the Minister was: what will happen to those cases that are before the courts now? Are these people going to be -- will action be proceeded or will they be deferred until the decision is taken by the Supreme Court?

MR. MACKLING: I'm not aware of there being any cases strictly on this point before the courts presently, but I will enquire. If there are, then some decision will have to be made in respect to either allowing them to continue or deferring them.

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . then has not made a decision as to what the disposition of these cases will be at the present time?

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Speaker, as I've indicated, I don't know any specific cases that deal specifically with this point or not; and if there are, then some decision will have to be made.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Attorney-General. Can he tell me if the Liquor Commission, or the Board, has any standard requirements before they grant a licence to a new establishment or a restaurant for liquor?

MR. MACKLING: Yes, I'm certain they have, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Have you any changes in the liquor regulations been made in the last short while?

MR. MACKLING: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the honourable minister is aware that just recently a licence has been taken away from one establishment in my constituency which they were given a permit -- I'll have to just say these remarks -- so he'd know what happened; they've been given a permit to operate with all approval of the Board and the Commission in respect to furniture and fixtures. Two years later they come back and say you have to change your furniture and fixtures before you can continue your licence. I don't think this is correct. Can the honourable minister look into this situation?

MR. MACKLING: Well I certainly can't accept responsibility for the operation two years ago, but I am aware of the fact that licences from time to time are reconsidered, particularly if there's been any difficulty in the operation, and if the honourable member will give me specifics, I will certainly look into the matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the fact that he's made his trip to Ottawa, I'm wondering if he presented a brief to the Minister while there. If so, is there a possibility of a copy being submitted to members in this House?

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac Du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, I think I answered that question on more than one occasion.

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 Health and Social Services. I note that a grant from the Winnipeg Foundation has now placed the Stella Avenue Day Nursery closer to the goal, the financial goal, that would enable them to replace this facility. Could they anticipate a favourable response from the Provincial Government soon so that they could go ahead with this project?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I thought that there -- well there was definitely something in today's paper regarding Stella Day Nursery. There was a grant made by the province of \$40,000. There was equally a grant from the Foundation, the Winnipeg Foundation for \$40,000. They anticipate to sell the existing building at \$10,000; they have to raise the other \$10,000 themselves.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Conservation and/or the Minister of Agriculture. My question: is it the intention of either or both ministers to meet with the Turtle Mountain Resources Conservation Corporation to discuss the reasoning that prompted the withdrawal of the government support to that corporation?

MR. USKIW: I presume, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable member is referring to a request for a meeting. I haven't had time to reply at this stage.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I want to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. Can he indicate whether the consultants' report with respect to Southern Indian Lake or the Churchill River is now in the government's possession, and if we can receive it?

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK Q. C. (Minister of Finance) (St. Johns): I have not yet received it; when I do, I intend to inform the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Agriculture. I may have been out of the House the day that he answered in reply to the Member for Rock Lake. Are we going to get a copy of his submission to the Federal Minister of Agriculture, or are we not?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to repeat what I said any more than I have to. I indicated during the estimates the position that the Government of Manitoba took at Ottawa with respect to their program, and I don't see any point in accommodating my honourable friend.

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

MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. The House Leader may wish to rule this out of order but I assure you that there

(MR. ENNS Cont'd) . . . is some interest expressed on the part of the farmer. Has the Minister any firsthand information as to whether or not the government of Canada is referring a recent provincial magistrate's decision with respect to the Wheat Board to the Supreme Court? I'm referring to the decision of several months ago that Magistrate Enns brought down with regard to the Wheat Board. Is the department aware of any action on the part of the Federal Government to refer this to the Supreme Court?

MR. USKIW: Well, I'm as much aware, Mr. Speaker, as my honourable friends opposite are. It has been indicated by federal authority that they are going to appeal that ruling.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I agree that that was what the press stated at that time, but you have no further information that this step is being taken at this time?

MR. USKIW: No.

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 Attorney-General and ask him whether he has been petitioned by a Winnipeg couple, Mr. and Mrs. William Adams, with respect to the circumstances surrounding a fatal shooting that took place in Winnipeg last May 21st involving one of Mrs. Adams' relatives.

MR. MACKLING: Such a petition has not come to my attention.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could I ask the Attorney-General if he recalls whether the case as such has been disposed of. Has there been any disposition of the case? It's my understanding that an individual was taken into custody at the time and subsequent to the shooting.

MR. MACKLING: It's my understanding that the case involved a juvenile and that the case was heard by the Juvenile Court. I understand there was representation by the Crown for transfer of the juvenile to Adult Court, but the Juvenile Court judge rejected that and the juvenile was tried in Juvenile Court.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I may be out of order in asking this question - I ask your direction, Sir. Can the Attorney-General advise this House as to the charge that was laid against the juvenile and the sentence that was imposed on him?

MR. MACKLING: I'm not so sure whether I can answer that. I think if it's a matter of public record, I can and will do. I'll take that as notice and if I'm at liberty to give that sort of information in the House, I will.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to ask a question of the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder -- some time ago a question was asked whether the government was supporting Frontier Airlines trans-border crossing application. I wonder if he is in a position to inform the House as to the government's position in connection with this application.

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I regret that I'm not in a position to give the information at this time but I will undertake to do so in the near future.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, another question directed to the Minister. Approximately a year ago, negotiations were commenced with Northwest Airlines for a terminal attachment to the Winnipeg terminal between their aircraft and the terminal, sometimes referred to as an airwall. I wonder if he could indicate to the House - I beg your pardon? Wind tunnel, I'm sorry, also -- I wonder if he could indicate to the House whether those negotiations have been completed and whether Northwest is going to comply in this respect.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, we have been working on this matter but I'm unable to give a definitive answer at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RON McBRYDE (The Pas): In light of the announcement by the federal Minister yesterday in regards to compensating fishermen in Ontario, I wonder if the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources could let us know if the Province of Manitoba is presently negotiating with the Federal Government to continue compensating the fishermen in the Cedar Lake-Easterville area.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, we're presently involved with the entire problem and I hope to be able to make a statement on

April 7, 1970.

(MR. GREEN Cont'd) . . . the question either tomorrow or the next day.

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

MR. GORDON JOHNSTON (Portage La Prairie): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Now that the government has announced the purchase of the Winnipeg Auditorium, is it the government's intention still to go ahead and make a financial input into the proposed convention centre?

HON. ED. SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I can advise the Honourable Member for Portage that acquisition of the Auditorium does not directly affect any decision that we may take with respect to a provincial cost-sharing of a convention centre. It will not change the decision.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the Honourable Member for Lakeside? --(Interjection) -- the Honourable Member for The Pas asked a question of his Minister --(Interjection) --how is your mother-in-law?

MR. SPEAKER: If the Honourable Member for Lakeside is a minister, than the honourable member may. The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is a supplementary question to the Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party. I wonder if the Premier -- For the benefit of the House Leader, my question is directed and is a supplementary question to the question that was already asked by the House Leader of the Liberal Party. In connection with the Winnipeg Auditorium, could the First Minister or the Finance Minister indicate whether the Land Appraisal Board did any evaluation for the government before negotiations were finalized in connection with the purchase of the Auditorium?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, that is the advice I received that the Land Acquisition Branch did give such an opinion to the Minister of Labour, who was Minister in charge of the negotiation.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question. Then I can take it, Mr. Speaker, that the procedures followed were the procedures outlined in the Act. Is that correct?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I repeat to my honourable friend that the Minister did receive the views and opinion and advice of officials within his department relative to the acquisition.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health and Social Services.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to table the report, the annual report of the Manitoba Hospital Commission for the year 1969, and to bring to the attention of the honourable members of this House the correction on the last page of the financial statement where we give the results of the operating deficit at the end of December 1969. Net operating deficit from January 1, 1959 to December 31, 1968, and in the report it's indicated to December 31, 1958. There's only two copies here now. We should get additional copies within an hour.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD (Cont'd.)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I realize, of course, it's not in order for someone on this side to ask a question of someone sitting opposite so I will not ask the question but simply request that my honourable friend the Member for River Heights, if he really wants an answer to his question as to whether or not this government is supporting the application of Frontier for trans-border rights that he should be a little more specific, whether he wishes to know if this government is supporting the application as part of a reciprocal agreement whereby a Manitoba-based regional carrier receives trans-border rights in return, or whether we are purely and simply supporting Frontier's application without any consideration of other matters.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I assume that the question was asked of me and I'm entitled to answer. I know this is a rather unusual case. Frankly, I'm --(Interjection)--No, no. I'm not asking a specific question. I'm answering the question that was posed to me by the First Minister. . .

MR. SCHREYER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I know full well that it's not possible to ask a question of someone opposite. I simply took advantage of the opportunity to advise my honourable friend that if he wishes a specific reply to the question of Frontier's application for trans-border rights, that he should take advantage of an opportunity either today or

(MR. SCHREYER Cont'd). . . tomorrow to give more specific, more specification in his question to the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, then, may I pose the question to the First Minister or the Minister of Industry and Commerce? In a rather decisive manner, I would like the government to tell us what they intend to do in connection with Frontier's application for trans-border crossing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: While the First Minister is considering this last question, I'd ask him to move a little further north to the 60th parallel and perhaps he could advise me what has taken place in respect to the resolution last year calling for a Tourist Information Bureau, and Port Authority at Churchill on a year-round basis. He undertook to look into it some time ago. I don't need the answer today.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the reason there some hesitation is because the question asked by the Honourable Member for Churchill relates to two departments, the Department of Tourism and the Department of Industry and Commerce, and I would undertake to take the question as notice on behalf of the two ministers and the reply will be forthcoming.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I wish to pursue the matter of the appraisal of the Auditorium with a supplementary question. Could the First Minister advise the House, either from memory or could he undertake to do so later of the amount of money that the Land Appraisal Commission set as value to the Auditorium?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I prefer to take that as notice and refer the question to my colleague the Minister of Labour. I simply take the moment now to say that all advice that I have received is that it was a good deal for both parties.

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

MR. JACK HARDY (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable Minister of Government Services, I direct this question to the Honourable the First Minister. Can the First Minister advise this House if in fact the Auditorium is to be utilized to house personnel to administer a proposed Auto Insurance program?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, policy with respect to the use of the Auditorium will be determined by events, as they eventuate.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: A supplementary question to the one just posed by the previous speaker. Has the National Farmers Union requested the Provincial Government to retain the Auditorium in its present state so that it could be used for public meetings? This is the statement that was made at that particular Farmers Union meeting last Saturday.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the idea sounds as though it's a good one, and will be considered. If the Honourable Member for Rhineland is suggesting that his constituents may wish to rally at the Auditorium from time to time in his support it would be available.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce and ask him if he is aware of the fairly rapid transfer of Air Canada Overhaul Base personnel at this time from Winnipeg to Montreal, and ask him if he can confirm to this Chamber that Air Canada is living up to its commitment to keep that base in operation till 1971.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take this question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Youth and Education. Can he indicate, verify or otherwise, that the bursary program for the universities is no longer in the hands of the University but has been taken over by the provincial government?

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Youth and Education) (Seven Oaks): No, Mr. Speaker, that statement isn't entirely correct.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, a subsequent question. Could the Minister indicate what portion of it is correct?

MR. MILLER: To the extent that three bodies are involved whereas in the past there was only two. To that extent it's not correct.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the speakers aren't on here and we can't hear.

MR. MILLER: Oh I'm sorry. There are changes in the bursary program. Some were referred to by my colleague the Minister of Health and Social Development, when he announced

(MR. MILLER Cont'd) . . . that his department be involved in student aid, but the bursary program of the Province of Manitoba is going forward as it has in the past and you will hear about it in a few days. The university is still involved in the bursary program.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: . . . Mr. Speaker, should direct the question to the Minister of Youth and Education. Should questions of student aid be directed to the Minister of Education or the Minister of Health and Social Services as of today?

MR. MILLER: Take your choice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder if he can inform the House whether it's the government's intention to introduce legislation compelling industry to comply with new anti-pollution devices.

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is asking me to state government policy and I don't think that this is the appropriate time to make such statements.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Transportation. Will he be tabling any legislation to licensing and operation of snowmobiles this session?

HON. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Minister of Transportation) (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, did he ask are we going to be bringing in legislation to license snowmobiles? Well I think we should know that in about two weeks' time.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to reply to a question that was asked by the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party relative to the cutting of trees up to road allowances by Churchill Forest Industries. My advice is that cutting regulations generally would not permit the Churchill Forest Industries to engage in this type of operations, either close to a road allowance or to a lake that is used for recreational purposes or may be used for recreational purposes. The provisions don't apply to winter roads, logging roads and others not normally used by the public. My honourable friend says that he knows of such cutting having taken place and I would ask my honourable friend to bring this to my attention so that if there is anything we can do about it we will do so.

I also want to reply to a question that was raised by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia some time ago relative to recent convictions of hunters using automobiles. I'm advised that there have been no convictions this year for any such violations although there have been warnings given out on several occasions. There have been some snowmobile convictions, I believe, but not for hunters using automobiles.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address this to the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs. There are two questions. Has the advisory council of Churchill the right to pass resolutions to spend the \$100,000 that are in trust for them? And secondly, rather than spend \$20,000-odd for a house for the administrator, can they apply to CMHC for the usual type housing under that program?

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Selkirk): Well first, Mr. Speaker, as I'm sure the honourable member knows, the advisory council is simply that - an advisory council, with no powers insofar as passing resolutions to authorize expenditure. Insofar as the advisory council as such applying to Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation for funds to build a home for the administrator, this too, of course, would be out of the area of ability of an advisory council. I have been made aware in my trip, as the honourable member knows, last Thursday and Friday, of the feelings of the advisory council in respect to the use of any of the monies on hand for the residential home, and I am now taking this entire matter under review.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I'm advised by several constituents today that the department of propaganda has issued a story of a new variety of rapeseed, and I think the question maybe should be directed to the Minister of Agriculture. A new variety of rapeseed has been introduced; can I ask the Minister does this propaganda go to the Parkland Development Corporation, to their office?

MR. USKIW: If my honourable friend was listening some weeks ago, the propaganda

(MR. USKIW Cont'd) . . . would have hit his ears in this House, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Graham): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct this question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Could the Minister inform this House if it is true that West Germany is negotiating for the use of the facilities at Churchill?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would elaborate on his question. Specifically, what facilities?

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, this was a report that was in a newspaper today. If the Minister does not have a chance to read the newspaper, I would be glad to provide him with the copy.

MR. EVANS: That's fine. I should take a leaf out of my honourable colleague the Minister of Labour and tell you that we've been so busy engaged in carrying out the province's business that we have simply not had the time to read the newspaper this morning.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, late last week the Honourable Member from Rhineland enquired as to the provision of legal aid for certain persons and I gave him some information which I find is substantially correct with some slight variation. He asked in respect to whether or not legal aid had been granted to those persons who had been charged with an offence involving a police constable who was fatally injured, Constable Shakespeare. I indicated that as far as I knew some of them had received legal aid. My understanding is that initially two of the accused persons did not require legal aid and two did, but during the course of representation on their behalf, all four of them were handled by legal aid. In respect to the information I gave him in connection with Mr. Hart, the information I gave him was correct.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, a supplementary question. How many lawyers were engaged in the prosecution and how much was spent in total?

MR. MACKLING: I'd have to take that as notice, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps I can take that as notice, or if you want to file an Order for Return -- it's a detailed question.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I would prefer if he took this as notice so that it would speed up . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, and this deals with the Fish Marketing Board who would come under his ministry but with which he indicated he was not that familiar or not in a position to answer. But I wonder, because representation has been made to me and I think to other members of our caucus, whether he can confirm the fact that Manitoba fishermen, as a result of the operations of the Board, are in fact subsidizing out of their earnings the fishermen in Saskatchewan and Alberta.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I don't care to answer that question. The honourable member knows how a fish marketing board works.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question. I wonder if the Honourable Minister could indicate to the House whether he has had an opportunity to review the operations of the Board recently, and to determine whether the statement I made is correct or not.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I don't care to do that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of Health tabled the Manitoba Hospital Commission Report just a little while ago. When can we expect copies for all members? Will they be distributed today?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, when I tabled the report I mentioned that I was hoping to have the other copies of the report tabled in the House in about an hour.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I would like clarification from the Honourable Member from Rhineland as to the nature of his question because, as he is probably aware, there's an automatic appeal provision in respect to those sentenced in the case and perhaps he wants this information after all the legal proceedings have been completed, I don't know. Perhaps he'd like to defer his question and make it when everything has been completed.

MR. FROESE: Well, if the Honourable the Attorney-General can provide the cost figures for the first case that will be all right for the present and I can put questions later on for the

(MR. FROESE Cont'd) . . . appeal case.

MR. MACKLING: I understand you want the cost to the Crown of the prosecution. All right.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may direct a question to the Honourable the First Minister. I wonder if he could tell the House as to whether or not a deed has been signed with the City of Winnipeg for the Civic Auditorium, a deed of sale?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, there's been an exchange of letters of intent.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Private Members' Resolutions. Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this resolution for the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Orders for Return, Mr. Speaker.

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

MR. SPEAKER: My apologies. Orders for Return. On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Roblin and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was most concerned when I heard your remarks because, first of all, I didn't anticipate that I would get a second amendment to my resolution. I've already had one from the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, and of course I voice the sentiments of the Honourable Member from Morris who spoke the other day briefly on a similar type of Order, in that it's not fair to stand up and debate in the House when the member who adjourned or amended my resolution is not in his chair today, and it's unfortunate that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface is not in his chair. I would think, if the Speaker would permit me, that I would like to get the information as quickly as possible. I would refer back to the speech which the Honourable Minister of Finance spoke in the House the other day, and I think it reiterated loud and clear that if we delay this type of resolution much longer we may not get the information that is required. Every day is most important to me and those that I represent, and if in fact the Honourable Member for St. Boniface can't be here he knew my resolution was on the Order Paper; he knew that I would likely speak on it today, and it's most unfortunate that he's not in his chair. I'm here every day so I can't apologize for him in his absence.

I think this is a fair resolution, Mr. Speaker, and I have no concerns about the fact that I put it on the Order Paper. I wasn't here in 1966, the date that the Honourable Minister of Finance referred to that a similar resolution was on the Order Paper, and I'm not one of those that are willing to go back and deal with the past. I'm looking to the future and I always will. I think the past, let it be where it may. If he wants to drag the past history of government in Manitoba into this Chamber, let that be his day and his debate, but I'm not one of those. I'm looking forward for the direction I'm going to get from this new, this open type of government, who said that they're going to give us all the information that we require, so I just ask, Mr. Speaker, that they don't give this Order for Return a six-months hoist, which I think they're trying to do. I don't know why, but in the back of my mind I think I'm getting the heave-ho on behalf of those that I represent.

I don't know why this Liberal Democrat over here wants to amend my resolution. He may have had a --(Interjection) -- An opportunist, or maybe he can't speak with this government or on behalf of them, so he has to attack our private members' resolutions. So, with great reservation, I ask the Minister to take a good hard look and I'm willing to wait as long as it takes for him to get me this information, but I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that I shall get all that I asked of this resolution from this new, this open type government that Manitoba has got today.

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

MR. SPEAKER put the question on the motion as amended, and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders for Return. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rock Lake, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing:

1. The number of applications received each month from doctors and dentists for professional loans pertaining to their possible location in rural Manitoba.
2. The number of approved loans each month.
3. The gross amount loaned to date.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, we have no objection to fulfilling the requests of this Order.

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

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 La Verendrye, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the following information with respect to land purchased by the Government for the Portage By-Pass and the Portage Diversion:

1. Names and addresses of owners.
2. Names and addresses of previous owners.
3. Date land changed hands prior to this date.
4. Amount paid per acre.
5. Original offer per acre and any subsequent offers per acre.
6. Number of acres in each case.
7. Amount paid for buildings in each case.
8. The original offer for buildings and any subsequent offers in each case.
9. Amount paid for damages in each case.
10. The original offer for damages and any subsequent offers in each case.
11. To whom the money was paid in each case.
12. Whether the purchase was achieved by negotiation or expropriation in each case.
13. When was the approval given by the Land Value Appraisal Commission in each case.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I was prompted to re-submit this resolution with a few more questions. I had submitted a similar resolution in 1964 and again in 1968, but because of many complaints I've had from affected parties, I felt that further information should be extracted from the Land Appraisal Commission by way of a motion in this House. Some minutes ago, during the question period, the Premier assured the members of this House that the government had made a good deal for the City of Winnipeg and the people of Manitoba with respect to the proposed purchase of the Auditorium by the province. I'd like to remind him - although he's not in the House, I see - I'd like to remind him of a supposedly good deal that went through government back in 1964 when a firm by the name of Octave Enterprises had quickly acquired the former Bain estate and then proceeded to sell it to government for land needed for the Portage Diversion, and at that time I believe the Minister of Agriculture, who was responsible, in whose department it was, assured this House of what a good deal the people of Manitoba had made when they acquired this land, and to perhaps tell the story to the newer members. I would like to relate some of that deal that Manitoba paid for.

There were 219 acres of land in the purchase. Campbell Soup Company in 1964 had appraised and made an offer for the land of \$29,000 and I believe the land was listed with a real estate firm for \$32,000.00.

A MEMBER: How much per acre?

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, this was 219 acres. The land consisted of about 80 acres of sandy soil that was not conducive to growing very good crops; it had about 30 or 40 acres of swamp that wouldn't grow anything - it was full of water most of the year; and the remainder of the land was average farm land. Well, Mr. Speaker, by the time the Land Appraisal Commission gave their approval to this purchase, on September 24th, 1964, the government paid in the neighbourhood of \$70,000.00. So that was called a "good deal".

I would like now to refer members to the position that two farmers find themselves in at the present time. One, Mr. McClary, has 230 acres, roughly, to sell to the government and

April 7, 1970.

(MR. G. JOHNSTON Cont'd) . . . his land is presently under expropriation. This land is prime root crop or market garden land next to the Assiniboine River; the land on either side of it is being used for root crops and is yielding a very high return. It's a type of farming that we are trying to encourage those who have this sort of land to go into, and land of this quality is presently selling or being offered for \$1,000 an acre, it's such high yield and such good soil, as well as available to irrigation from the river. Mr. McClary has been offered \$88,500 for 230 acres of this land. Now, to someone who is used to grain farming, I suppose this seems like a lot of money. In fact, when you work it out to a price per acre it is a considerable sum of money - I think it's up around \$400.00 an acre.

A MEMBER: What's the assessment?

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I don't have the assessment; I would like to give it to you. Another gentleman, Mr. Steve Chuckry has 192 acres of land which is being acquired by the government although negotiations are still going on. This land is the same type of land exactly, the finest land in the Assiniboine Valley, that will grow all types of root crops and yield abundantly. His offer is for \$97,000 for 192 acres, but when they take the 192 acres they've put him out of business as a registered potato farmer. He has a building, a storage building that is used for year-round storage, valued at \$29,000.00. This building will be useless when the land is taken, yet our friends in the Land Appraisal Commission don't seem to think that they should offer anything for disturbance or damages, indeed they make no offer whatsoever to buy the building. So, while it appears again upon the face of it that a good price is being offered, I say again that the same type of land is selling and is for sale for \$1,000 an acre within a half a mile or a mile of this property.

I would like now to refer members to a deal that has been completed by the Land Appraisal Commission and this was land that belonged to A. A. Kroeker and Sons Limited of Winkler. The approval was given by the Land Appraisal Commission on March 15, 1967. There's 558 acres involved and the government's board paid an average price of \$390.68 per acre for the land. Now, if one works this out, I think it's around -- well, it is \$390.00 an acre, but on top of that, Mr. Speaker, and here is a disparity that I wish to draw to the attention of members: in the case of Mr. Chuckry who was going to have a useless storage building on his hands when his land was taken from him, and he received nothing whatsoever for the disturbance or for the damage, in the case of Kroeker and Sons they received \$56,000 for reduction in value of buildings and the buildings still belong to them.

Now I think that this is very unfair. There has been two types of treatment meted out to individuals and I think something should be done by the Minister who is responsible for the Land Appraisal Commission's actions. The two farmers that I have spoken to have told me time and again that they don't want any more than anyone else is receiving; they do not wish to unduly hold up the taxpayers by way of asking more than they're entitled to; but these men are in the middle age of life; they have many productive years ahead of them, and they want to re-establish; they want to stay in the line that they're in and they want to re-establish on similar types of soil, similar types of land, and with the offers that they are being forced to take there's no way that they can re-establish with that type of soil. Mr. Chuckry, the registered potato grower, has presently shelter, isolation, which is required when one is growing a certain a registered crop seed so that contamination will not come in either by wind or by other carrier. He originally pioneered this type of growing in the area. He was one of the ones that showed the way for others to come, and he was one of the ones that has helped to increase the land values in that area. I might note, Mr. Chuckry has been in that district for about 15 years and has pioneered that type of work whereas the Kroekers came in after the industry was well-established; they came in 1962 and had their land for approximately five years. So I think that not only should the public be aware of the methods of government to expropriate, but I think the Minister concerned should take a look at this and should examine the methods and means and the quality of personnel on the Land Appraisal Commission. As I understand, some of the gentlemen on that commission, they are used to grain farming only. They have no idea of other methods of farming in the province, and I think that people who are making judgments which most people feel are almost quasi-judicial judgments, and who are hesitant to challenge these judgments in the higher courts, I think the quality of personnel on the Land Appraisal Commission should be re-examined.

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

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I was not at my desk during the full course of the Honourable the House Leader of the Liberal Party's statements on this matter, but I did get his latter comments and I feel impelled to say a few words on the general subject of land purchase by government; and again, I may be ruled out of order, Sir, but then I would take it that you would be the first one to correct me, if not the House Leader opposite.

I feel that the remarks of the Honourable the House Leader of the Liberal Party cannot be left to stand completely as they are insofar as this would appear to cast some degree of insinuation of the capability of the personnel on the Land Appraisal Board. I would not particularly take challenge with him on his statement that perhaps they do not have the full range of experience in the various forms of agriculture that he referred to, but I would like to point out and take this opportunity to suggest to you, Sir, and to the government, that far more important - it would be for a consolidation of all lands purchased by government or their agencies under one Crown agency or under one department, and that this in itself would greatly improve the manner and the way in which private lands are purchased from time to time by government or their agencies.

I have had a great deal of concern in this particular area, particularly as it affected my constituency in the last few years. My constituency is dissected with transmission lines, with highways and with drainage, as is every other constituency but perhaps a bit more concentrated in the constituency of Lakeside, and it's always been a concern to me that we have different arms of government approaching the private individual all too often on a different set of terms, even though the being of the Land Appraisal Board should prevent this. Just the mere personnel involved in the various different departments and agencies, such as Hydro or Telephones, brings this about, so that in attaching my general comments to those made by the House Leader, I would like to say and suggest, and had some very active discussions under way during the time that I was still a member of the Treasury Bench, to see that this would come about. My understanding is that this was the intention at the time some changes were made in this general area, but that at that time two agencies, or one agency in particular, namely Manitoba Hydro, felt that they wished to continue with the right to acquire property on their own.

So it's my judgment, it's my contribution to this debate, to recommend most highly to the House and to the government opposite to make it a more understandable approach with respect to the private citizen, who regards all agencies as government whether it's Hydro or Telephone or whether it's the Department of Water Control for drainage projects, or for projects such as this under discussion, the major project of the Portage Diversion, or any other such project as might be undertaken, construction of dams, conservation projects. The government is always on the hook. There is no getting away from the responsibility of the fact that perhaps from a technical point of view, it could be a person from Manitoba Hydro that's purchasing the land or it could be a person from Manitoba Telephones purchasing the land - the general understanding as far as the individual is concerned, it's government. And I feel very strongly that it's time that all purchases of land on behalf of government and their various agencies should be under the jurisdiction of a single board or commission directly under the further jurisdiction of an individual Minister or responsible person in government duly elected, and in that way the individuals have a clear source of access to those who are in fact responsible for expropriating or purchasing or making the arrangements to buy this land.

These, Mr. Speaker, are just a few comments that I add to the general tenor of this debate. I think it's an opportunity that should not go by without expressing a general concern about the manner and way in which land is being purchased. I quite frankly was not happy with the way it was being purchased during the time that I was in government. I felt that one of the major reasons for that was this diversion - pardon me, Mr. Speaker, I keep stumbling on that word - this multi-approach on the part of so many agencies involved that added to some of the confusion in the pricing of the land, some of the confusion as to who exactly the personnel was that should be contacted if legitimate grievances arose, and it's a move that I would strongly recommend to the present government to consider, to bring into one area and one board the purchasing powers of land that may be required for any future government purposes.

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

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I had originally not intended to speak on this Order for Return but I recall when a similar order was made, and I have a copy of that return here, on land acquired for the Portage Diversion as of April 8, 1969, and if you go through this report the variations in the amount that is being paid per acre are astonishing, and I would like to

April 7, 1970

(MR. FROESE cont'd) quote a few from this report. There's one here for \$275.00 an acre and the number of acres - 95 acres. Another one for \$173.27 an acre - approximately 28 acres. About \$100.00 difference. Then you come to the next one here, at \$15.00 an acre - 11 acres involved. But mind you, \$15.00 an acre! A large variance. Then there's another one for \$239.00 an acre and a further one for \$31.00 an acre; the amount involved in that one is 13 acres. So that you have such a large variance. No doubt there would be different types of land, as has been pointed out by the Member for Portage; some of it is for special crops, for root crops such as potatoes, and others, as the Member for Lakeside just mentioned, might be swamp land, so there can be great variance, but to me it seems really too wide a variance because if you then go on to the ones that were mentioned by the Member for Portage of \$390.00 an acre and involving 558 acres, on top of that the amount for damage is \$56,000 which means another \$100.00 an acre, so it comes to \$490.00 an acre, and some of it was sold for \$15.00, so you have such a great variance in the amount being paid and evidently negotiated.

But just how do these negotiations take place? Are they fair and just in all occasions or are certain people scared . . . when it comes to these negotiations? I think it has a lot to do with the people employed by the department or representing the department and who are acquiring this land. I know some of them can be -- well, maybe I should not use the word "nasty" but some of them can be pretty direct, and I've heard some of these people. Others are very good and I would have nothing to say against them. Maybe making a statement of this type in the House is making a broad accusation but I think there is too much variance in the way these negotiations take place, and I am wondering whether we should not be using the courts more than we have up until the present time for this very matter so that more of these negotiations could be judged and be done in public.

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

PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: Private Members' Resolutions. The adjourned debate -- for the information of members, there was a sheet distributed, a loose sheet which honourable members will find on their desks, correcting some errors which, I must apologize for, appear in the Orders of the Day as to order in which some resolutions appear. So the order would be as shown on the loose sheet.

Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Assinibola. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: I'm sorry to disappoint all of you. I'm just indicating I wanted to -- I reserved this question for the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the motion before us is certainly an admirable one, full of generous and humane intention, and in principle is one that is certainly very difficult, if not nigh impossible, to debate. However, unfortunately, the tendency that is addressed throughout the motion is one which suggests that certain problems and difficulties can be best dealt with my means of patchwork policies. and I'm sure this is not the intention of the honourable member. But before a policy is formulated it must be insured that that policy is one which is geared towards the removal of need wherever that need in fact exists. The type of policy that is advanced in the motion could very well create more inequity than the inequity which it with good intention is attempting to remove.

The fact is obvious to all, and I'm certain to my honourable friend, particularly when he makes reference in paragraph 1 that the present Property Tax is imposing great financial hardship on many of our citizens, that in fact this Property Tax is a burden in many different areas, and as my honourable friend knows, the young married people within our society who are attempting to begin a life of some social success, economic success, are burdened, and in fact in some respects, because of financial difficulty, are deterred from further progress throughout their lives. He is certainly aware of the fact that the resolution does not deal with many of the age that in fact requires most assistance. There is no reference to the tenants within the motion, to roomers, and I think if analysis was attempted - and I'm sure it will be done - that it will be seen that many of those in most need among the aged are in fact those that are attempting to make a go of it in a rooming house or in some other senior citizen home. So the criticism that can be directed to this motion is not that the motion in itself is too extravagant, too radical, but that in fact the motion is one that is too restrictive, too patchwork,

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd) and in fact I must admit, Mr. Speaker, takes me back to the days of 1957 when the Federal Government of that day - which I believe, Mr. Speaker, was Liberal, if I recall correctly - was challenged effectively as being the party of six bucks, a patchwork party. And therefore, Mr. Speaker, that before any policy is enunciated, it must be insured that the policy is going to be universal, a policy that is going to have social and economic effects that will uplift all those within society that in fact are in need.

Now, accepting that principle and directing that important area of consideration to the matter at hand, that of Property Tax, first it is generally recognized that something must be done at an early date in order to remove this hardship, as the honourable member makes reference to, to all those on low and fixed incomes and people who are receiving Old Age Security pensions. I would have been much happier if the honourable member, after making reference to such people in his preamble as "all those on low and fixed incomes" went on to suggest that there should be some form of Property Tax alleviation for all those on fixed income or low income variety, but instead he leaves that grouping aside, though mentioning it and recognizing it as a real need, and isolates a particular group within the Manitoba community. However, I think that it would be unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, if what in fact is a sensible and a worthwhile resolution, a resolution that certainly points to one isolated problem within a general pool of difficulty, if we were to reject such a resolution out of hand, and as the honourable member knows, the entire area of assessment and taxation is being dealt with at the present time. It will be dealt with hopefully this session, before the conclusion of this session; there'll be reviews, there'll be representations, there'll be hearings from the public. I think it's important that we do consider the very worthwhile suggestions made by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia in this resolution, and it is in that light, Mr. Speaker, not with enthusiasm because of the restrictiveness of the motion, but with support because it does point to an area of certain and very grave need, that I suggest that we are prepared to accept this motion and we'll be considering -- in reference to the consideration of the advisability, and the motion will be dealt with, the thought, theme of it will be dealt with within the committee dealing with assessment and taxation, the Municipal Affairs Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I'm not closing the debate. I wish to have a question posed to the Honourable Minister. Would the Minister agree or not that at the present time some of our senior citizens are forced out of their homes because they cannot pay the tax?

MR. PAWLEY: Some of all our citizens in Manitoba are being forced -- could be -- but included in many factors - high costs - are being compelled to undergo changes in their standards that they should not be required to undergo. It's not a matter, however - and this is the theme - it's not a matter restricted to the aged; it's a problem of our young people, the middle-aged and others in need, and certainly in looking at this entire question of assessment we must not restrict ourselves but must be prepared to look at the entire problem of need in relationship to assessment.

MR. PATRICK: One more question. Would he not agree, would the Minister not agree then that the tax review would probably take somewhere in the neighbourhood of a couple of years while this requires immediate attention, and I mean it - immediate attention? Would the Minister agree with that?

MR. PAWLEY: No, I would be most disappointed, Mr. Speaker, if tax assessment review took two years. I rest confident and certain that with the usual splendid cooperation from the Honourable Member from Assiniboia and the other members in the opposition that we'll be able to certainly do much better than that.

MR. SPEAKER: May I remind honourable members that the Chair is rather reluctant to accept questions of the type just posed to the Honourable Minister because it's not really a question for clarification, for the purpose of seeking clarification of a point made by a previous speaker, but rather it's an attempt, an indirect attempt to extend one's participation in debate, and the Honourable Member for Assiniboia will have ample opportunity to present his views at a later time.

Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): I wonder if the Minister would accept another question. I just wonder if it would be fair to expect that possibly at a fall session legislation could be introduced with the idea of changing the taxation by assessment, at this fall session coming in the . . .

MR. PAWLEY: I think it would be very haphazard for me to forecast now just what the feelings of all the committee members of all parties will feel in relation to this problem. It would be very presumptuous for me to suggest there would be a fall session arising out of our discussions in the committee on assessment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to take a short part in the debate. I want to assure you, Mr. Speaker, I was prompted to by the soft and purring, smooth tone of my honourable friend, and he is my friend, from Selkirk, the Minister of Municipal Affairs. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, that kind of ran through my head because what did he call the resolution? A noble patchwork? I'm wondering whether or not he would not -- how he distinguished between a noble patchwork promise at election time, because I and many of us certainly that had to face that kind of a patchwork election promise program, is one that I was hoping that my colleagues in the back row would have an actual copy of, and I assure you that before the debate is adjourned we will be reminding them of it in actual fact, because it was very plain and very clear in the material put out by the NDP candidates in the last election -- (Interjection) -- Oh, yes. Printed in bold letters that they would, that they would immediately, should they form the government, take the first \$2,000 off of all assessment -- off of all assessment.

Now the Minister, and he is a compassionate man, he doesn't take issue with my friend the Member from Assiniboia that this particular group that the Member for Assiniboia expresses concern for, namely the persons on Old Age Security or Old Age Supplement -- we're already defining or narrowing down the field of need. In other words, he's not really prepared to simply ask you to do what you indicated to the voters you would do on June 25th, you know, because while you said you would do that, he's a responsible person and we're responsible people on this side. We were prepared to say, "Look, they can't do it all at once; they may want to do it sooner or later when there is a general reassessment," but you said you would do it and you said you would do it very boldly and very clearly on your literature.

Now, I find the syrupy smoothness of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs sounds very much like the kind of standard reply that he may have felt he was getting from other ministers on another day should he have been in the House, when in fact they were not in a position, for one reason or other, to comply with a resolution that had a lot of appeal, that certainly there was an indication, a wanting to do something about it, but for one reason or other, mainly because I suggest the Honourable Minister knows full well that it's not an easy thing to meddle in a patchworky manner with the whole matter of assessment, the whole matter of property taxes. I agree with him that the need is there and the sensible approach is to restructure our approach to property taxes, and that we can in fact in many instances be doing harm or impeding real progress at a later date if we put a patch here and put a patch there and then find ourselves in a very difficult position to bring about that kind of reform, but that didn't hold any of my honourable friends of principle on that side back from worrying about it at election time. Absolutely not. At election time, as we've already been told by their First Minister, it's a different ball game. The question is to get elected. I think that's what he said in front of the whole Assembly of NDP delegates just recently.

Of course, I express a further concern because early in the session of the House we have a new defined way of looking at resolutions, as the House Leader indicated to us; that it's your intention not to turn down any resolution. You remember that, fellows. "We're going to accept all resolutions and in fact consider the advisability of." So now we are really lost on this side, Mr. Speaker. There was a time when you had a government sitting on the treasury benches, that if they knew that something could not be done we were man enough, or we had the guts enough, to accept the difficult position sometimes politically, and reject or refuse that resolution, but with the new rule stated by the House Leader that they're the most reasonable fellows over there, they're going to consider the advisability of everything and anything -- of anything and everything. Now this is fine, you know, this is very great except that, you know, the difficulty, Mr. Speaker, is it really -- and I pointed it out at the time, that it leaves us on this side feeling a little bit like winning the odd hollow victory or blowing into paper bags for an afternoon's enjoyment. We have no particular feeling of satisfaction on this side, and it's not my resolution, it's the Member for Assiniboia's resolution, but we have no particular satisfaction of having made a point with the government. We recognize that we don't make legislation or make laws on this side, but one of the only reasons or one of the few tidbits of satisfaction that private members have on Private Members' Day is to be able to . . .

MR. BILTON: Advise the government.

MR. ENNS: No, is to be able to successfully, through force of argument, through forces of logic and reason, convince the government on the other side to accept a certain course of action, and latterly this has been the approach that we have taken with private resolutions. But this has been taken away from us now, Mr. Speaker. And so really, Mr. Speaker, and I suggest to the members of the press, that if on Private Members' Day you find the benches emptier than they've even been before, this is partly the reason, because we now see, you know, that ...

MR. PAWLEY: Would the honourable member submit to a question?

MR. ENNS: Certainly.

MR. PAWLEY: Would the honourable member be happier or more content if certain sections of assessment were taken away from the committee dealing with municipal affairs, dealing with assessment and taxation?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I am quite prepared to identify this particular area of need, as has been identified by the Member for Assiniboia, as one that cannot wait or cannot tolerate any delay. The assessments are rising right now, and in any event the Minister, I agree that, and I said so earlier in my speech, that the approach to restructuring the property taxes and the assessment generally is not one that you can easily undertake. All the more reason, I would believe, that when the Member for Assiniboia says it may be two or three years, or a year and a half, in all good conscience you say no it won't be that long, it'll be what? Six months? Eighteen months? The Member for Emerson, my friend Mr. Girard, tried to in his shrewd way attempt, for the edification of all of us in the House, to find out whether or not we were having a fall session this afternoon, but the Minister was too shrewd to rise to that bait, and of course quite legitimately he refused to answer that question, so that obviously, then, we have no knowledge of a fall session, so at best we're looking at a full year, we're looking at a full year that the people on Old Age Security and the Old Age Supplement are going to be facing this assessment - and the assessment is rising right now.

Now all this is said, Mr. Speaker, because, Mr. Speaker, we didn't initiate what's in this resolution. No, we may have had the same feelings about some of the things, we had ... to do. But Mr. Speaker, they initiated it. They initiated on June 25th. Mr. Speaker, I will deliver to your office the bold handbill printed, the promises that were made, with respect to this government, so I find it rather, you know, just a little -- and particularly coming from that Minister. You notice, I haven't been able to get into any real swing of the debate because the Minister is a responsible Minister, a hard-working Minister and a fine fellow - and he comes from the Interlake. Here we have it, I think. "A New Democratic Government will give you" - it doesn't make any exclusions - "tax exemptions on the first \$2,000 assessment of your residential property." That leaves out the big business as we of course would assume that they would, but that's fine. Let me read it again: "A New Democratic Government" - they had an inclination that they were going to be government, Mr. Speaker. Well, obviously you can't be wrong all the time; you were dead right on that one. The biggest problem, Mr. Speaker, is that they have, even to this day, some difficulty in accepting the fact that they are government, the way they're handling resolutions here and the way they're certainly carrying out their promises. For the record, again, Mr. Speaker: "A New Democratic Government will give you a tax exemption on the first \$2,000 assessment of your residential property." Now there is no qualification here, no exemptions. They go on to indicate some of the other things that they are going to do and some of the things that they have done, but that was the one that we're currently debating - and Mr. Speaker, I don't want to be ruled out of order for having swayed from the resolution before us, but I just want to check and make sure that I'm not being in any way unfair to my honourable friends opposite because I'd like to see here somewhere some qualification that says "after we have had an opportunity to review the situation" or "after the Committee on Municipal Affairs has had a chance to look into the matter" or that perhaps some other -- you know there should be, but there isn't, Mr. Speaker. It's a \$2,000 exemption - across the board. -- (Interjection) -- No there isn't, Mr. Leader. I've looked -

A MEMBER: It didn't say when. No, it didn't say when.

A MEMBER: It says, "The New Democratic Government will" . . .

MR. ENNS: Yes. Well, it says the New Democratic Government will give you a tax exemption on the first \$2,000.

Well okay, I think that particular point is made. Now I just want to indicate to you what kind of Christian charity we approach you fellows there. The Member for Assiniboia is not

(MR. ENNS cont'd) asking you to keep that promise. He realizes - he's been in politics for a little while too, in fact a little longer than some of you - he realizes that there are occasions, there are the odd occasions when, in the heat of an election campaign, promises are in fact made and not kept. I can remember another one of those - what was the other one about - "free university education"? Free university education? I think a lot of us signed, I think the . . . Minister signed that little document. All right, let's come down to basics. There are occasions when, no matter who they are and on what side -- and you've shown yourselves to be human; in fact I think there were the odd occasions that I would have to say as a Conservative that not all our election promises were kept, and perhaps even the members in a confessional moment they would admit that too. You've only indicated to us now that you are brothers with us in that respect. But we knew that you would have difficulty in doing this. I shouldn't say "we" but the Member for Assiniboia, he knew that you'd have difficulty, so he was going to make it easier for you. He was going to make it easier for you. He said, "This is what you said you'd do; you said you'd take \$2,000 off the assessment off of everybody, but all we're asking for you now to do is \$2,000 assessment of those over age 65 on the Old Age Security pension.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I've made the point very clear that what was regarded in the House now as a Minister that's responsible for his department, what he now chooses to call "noble patchwork" was quite noble election promises at the time he was on the hustings. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): You're up for an Academy Award, Harry.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I certainly was not intending to enter into this debate, but after the weak proposition put forward by the Minister, I could hardly believe that he belongs to the New Democratic Party. I understood him to say that the Member for Assiniboia's resolution was rather weak and didn't go quite far enough and patchwork and what not, but I understood him to say that he was rather disappointed that he didn't make mention of the fact that this should be for people on fixed incomes, or low incomes. Did I understand you to say that, Sir? I wrote it down just as you said it.

MR. PAWLEY: You wish a clarification? I indicated quite clearly - it's unfortunate that my honourable friend wasn't listening at the time - that reference was made to such people, but when it comes to doing anything about it, the honourable member had deleted from the active part of his resolution any attempt to deal with this problem.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the Minister confirmed what I thought I had heard. This means that he is on a fixed income of \$22,000 a year. I don't know how long it's going to be fixed there but he's on a fixed income. This means that you are suggesting that those people should get a tax exemption? I hardly think that this is the intention of the Member for Assiniboia. -- (Interjection) -- The Minister said it a few minutes ago.

MR. PAWLEY: Read the resolution.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: . . . and he's re-confirmed it. Now low income certainly, low income can mean \$5,000 to some people; it can mean 10,000 to some people. So I'm rather surprised at the defence or the lack of defence that the Minister has made.

MR. PAWLEY: Why don't you read paragraph 2 to the House?

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I'm talking about what you said when you were up in the debate.

MR. PAWLEY: Read Paragraph 2.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Now, members on the other side have said, Well give us some time and they intend to implement the solemn promise - I presume it was a solemn promise - made to give a \$2,000 assessment on your residential property, rich or poor, \$100,000 mansion or a \$5,000 home. It's going to be flat across the board as I understand that election promise. Yet they say, Mr. Speaker, "Give us time; we haven't been here that long and we intend to implement our promises". I believe at the first session it was almost a desperate plea: Well wait till next session for some of these promises that we've made. Mr. Speaker, I'd ask members to follow me when I quote from the back page of this pamphlet, and I quote: "There are other New Democratic policies just as reasoned, practical and necessary to improvement of life for Manitobans as the policies listed here." There's no suggestion that this is a very difficult thing to introduce or something that's going to take quite a period of time. It's called "reasoned, practical and necessary". Well, if it's reasoned, practical and necessary, why don't you do it?

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to say a couple of words on this resolution. I don't think the Minister here needs any defence but I'm really amazed to hear the speeches - or shocked and usually from you it's shocked - they stand here and they're haranguing this side and saying that the reason you should do it, the number one reason is because you made an election promise. That's important. Do you think that's important? -- (Interjection) -- Well fine, I'm glad you said it because I'd like to remind you of what happened in this House a couple of days ago when we raised the minimum wage. That was an election promise. Did anybody see the Leader of the Opposition get up? He never said a word. Sat there like a walrus. Never said a word. The Member for Lakeside got up and he was complaining about it. He didn't talk about that this was an election promise and we applaud you for keeping this. This is one party that can keep their election promises. He got up and he made a weak wishy-washy defence on behalf of the establishment, that we didn't make a study of who it was going to affect and how it was going to affect them. And I'll tell you another thing. Auto insurance was an election promise, just as important . . .

MR. MCKENZIE: Is this man speaking to the resolution or is he talking election promises?

MR. BOROWSKI: We're talking about election promises. We promised auto insurance. What has the other side been saying about auto insurance, all across the province. This was an election promise. Instead of getting up here and saying, we demand you bring in auto insurance, you are demanding we bring in this - and it's a good resolution and we're going to vote for it, nobody in his right mind would vote against something like this. And this is one of the reasons it's on that pamphlet, because we think, as the Minister has indicated, this is something that's going to help the people that need help desperately. And I know you'll support it. But if we're going to be hypocrites - and I think we are when we are saying keep this promise and don't keep this one - let's at least be consistent in our hypocrisy.

We got a whole list of -- (Interjection) -- Consistent. You don't know the meaning of the word but you'll learn if you are around here long enough. But if we are going to talk about election promises, then let you fellows get up on that side and say: Look, here's your platform, 10 or 15 promises and tell us - don't ask us - tell us to keep these promises. And this refers to northern roads - which I've been condemned by people on that side - this is one of our election promises, more roads for the north. How many of you fellows get up here and praise the government - you're going to keep your promise and build more roads. And auto insurance is one of the most important. I've seen some of the things that you fellows have said outside this House and will be saying inside the House when the Bill is brought in here introducing some type of auto insurance, which I can't say which type but there will be something coming . . .

A MEMBER: Tell us more.

MR. BOROWSKI: Like the Member for Lakeside, I speak too much sometimes and I stick my foot in it, but the Bill will be around and you fellows will have a chance to get up and be as indignant as you are today, and say: You rascals, you bring in that Bill because you promised; this is one of your election promises. I'm waiting, very anxiously . . .

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Would the Minister permit a question? Would you inform the House as to when you intend to keep that election promise about the \$2,000 assessment?

MR. PAULLEY: In due course.

MR. BOROWSKI: It's a policy that'll come out - I can't say when. I'll use the expert's words, "In due course".

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

MR. WALTER WEIR (Leader of the Opposition)(Minnedosa): The time-honoured phrase is that "I really hadn't intended to take part," and may I start on that base - may I start on that base. This is the first indication that I've had from fellows on that side of the House that we're responsible for their election promises, that we should be prepared to stand and vote necessarily for the things that they promised in an election campaign. Mr. Speaker, if there's anybody who has a responsibility for the election promises of the NDP Party, it's the fellows sitting on that side of the House, and the fellows on this side of the House have a right to vote for them if they think they're right and they have a right to vote against them if they think they're wrong, and to identify to the people of Manitoba their views. We're not responsible for standing up and asking the Government of Manitoba, the present socialists - social-democrats, pardon me, Mr. Mackling, I saw the program the other night - the socialists sitting over there - we don't have to scream at them to implement their policies even though we disagree

(MR. WEIR cont'd) with them. We may ask them where they are, whether they're still standing in the same place that they were at the time they were elected or whether they've moved over, whether it was a straw man they put up at the election campaign or whether it was a real man. But, Mr. Speaker, I reject out of hand any responsibility on this side of the House to ask these people to necessarily introduce all of their election program. But there's no reason why we can't on a selective basis, if we desire, to call them to task on the promises that they made that were in our opinion good for the people of Manitoba, not a reason in the world, and the Minister of Transportation, the Minister of Transportation knows that as he sits in his seat. He didn't appear to know it when he was standing on his feet, but as he sits in his seat I'm sure that the Minister of Transportation recognizes that that's the facts of life. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, he even talks better sitting in his seat and we hear more of him, more of him. He puts his feet in his mouth oftener sitting down than he has standing up.

MR. BOROWSKI: I plead guilty.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, I may be accused of straying a little bit from the subject that's under discussion, but not any further than the previous speaker. All I can say is you can't look at taxation in its straight application in terms of mill rate or anything else. You've got the totality of the tax picture, and I've said in many places across Manitoba and I repeat it here, that one of the problems that we have is that we have a Federal Government who is attempting to keep order in their own house, they're attempting to balance their budget, they're attempting to control their costs, and some of the things that they're doing are making it difficult for our friends opposite because they have a government to operate, and the government would appear - and thank goodness they would appear to be wanting to try to do the same thing in that sphere, which really comes as a bit of a surprise - but nevertheless, this is what they appear to be doing. The result of what both of them are doing is that they're transferring the deficit of the things that the people need from the two higher levels of government to the municipalities, who can't avoid establishing their level of costs in terms of school districts, can't avoid the costs that are necessary in terms of servicing property, and they have to apply it against real property, to the only area of taxation that they have. And it's the one tax, it's the one tax that carries with it, Mr. Speaker, the expropriation, the expropriation of the property if there is an inability to pay - over a period of time. This is the thing that is very difficult about the real property tax. It's the thing that convinced us at the last session that we were in power to take some steps which we hoped, and I think it did, help in terms of real property. It was the thing that I think convinced the NDP that they should include in their program the exemption that we're talking about. I don't think, I'm not naive enough to think that they did it just because they thought it was politically sound. I think that they thought there was a need. -- (Interjection) --

. Continued on next page

MR. GREEN: I just want to ask my honourable friend, not because there's anything that he says that is wrong, but is it not a case that any tax which ultimately is not paid can be used in execution of any kind of property including real property? That would be the truth with the income tax, any other tax.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, I accept the Minister's question. Even though he didn't ask my permission, I accept his question, and I'll do my best to answer it. That's true, it's absolutely true, but in most other types of taxation the bill is related to the person's ability to pay it, his ability to pay it, or if there is an inability there, this is something that is spread over the whole community and it's applied holus bolus across every piece of property and the individual has no right to say yes I'd like to spend the money or no, I wouldn't like to spend the money. It can apply to people whose family has been grown up. It can apply to bachelors that never had a kid; that didn't educate anybody; it's all the way across the board. So that, Mr. Speaker, in terms of that question, the Minister - he's absolutely right, but it has a completely different, completely different application than real property tax. -- (Interjection) -- I hear comments from my friend on the other side, and while if I had it to do over again, I'd do some things differently, they wouldn't be the way my friends did it. We'd have probably done things earlier that we thought over a period of time we'd be able to do better by waiting, but I think that it's probably fair to say if hindsight was available to a person at the time he was making his original decision, we might very well have done things slightly different. Not different in a big way but slightly different in terms of some people at the lower end of the scale. I admit to having said right along like other members of the party I belong to, we're concerned about it, but we weren't sure of how to establish the regulations and we said on many occasions that a little bit of time was required enable to develop the regulations and to know it.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I have really again, for the second time at this session, entered into a debate which was fully carried out at the last Session of the Legislature, and I think one of the things that we wasted more of our time at than anything else in this Legislature, is that of being repetitive. But, Mr. Speaker, I don't know how we can get around it, because as long as we got people like the Minister of Transportation that provoke members on this side - and I don't suppose that there's any possibility that he might have been provoked to have risen to his seat by somebody on this side - it's one of the difficulties that we face in the Chamber.

It had been my intention to say that our position on this Resolution would have been found in Hansard of last year and to have voted for it with any changes that we might have had in position in the meantime; but I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I support the Resolution by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia and I don't accept in any way, shape or form many of the comments that were made by my honourable friend the Minister of Transportation. And I haven't entered, Mr. Speaker, into the minimum wage debate and the variety of other debates that I very well could have.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I haven't entered into many debates in this House during this Session; I have preferred to sit back quietly and listen to my honourable friends opposite tighten the noose around their necks. I think that that is a fact that is very very evident here this afternoon. That my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition has tightened the noose once again or a little bit tighter on the Conservative Party in Manitoba. I listened with great interest to his remarks and I find myself agreeing with him in many respects, because it seems to me that essentially what he said in this debate just a few moments ago, is what we call confession. Confession because of the lack of approach of the previous administration; the lack of understanding of the Conservative Party in Manitoba in the past; and a realization that the reason that my honourable friend and his colleagues are sitting on that side of the House is because they knew not where they were going, what they stood for, and it is only because of the change of government in Manitoba that they are now seeing the error of their ways. I am more than happy to hear from my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition that he is going to support this resolution. -- (Interjection) -- That's right, the resolution of the Member for Assiniboia, which was rejected over the last 10 years, in principle, by the Conservative administration in Manitoba.

MR. WEIR: We rejected it because we couldn't afford it. You people said you could.

MR. PAULLEY: You couldn't afford it? But you could afford a heck of a lot of other innovations that were detrimental to the common wheel in the Province of Manitoba, and that is why you're sitting where you are. And I doubt very much whether you will be sitting there, if there

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) is another provincial election, I think you'll be sitting somewhere out in the corridors looking in . . .

MR. WEIR: You're probably right, . . .

MR. PAULLEY: . . . because of the fact, that if there were any failings of the Conservative administration in the Province of Manitoba was the failing to recognize the facts and the conditions of life. It is really revealing to me to hear what my honourable friend had to say this afternoon. At long last, my honourable friend says to this Assembly, we have a concern for the property taxpayer of Manitoba. We, when we were on that side of the House attempted to indicate . . .

MR. WEIR: We just asked you to put your money where your mouth was.

MR. PAULLEY: That's right and I'm putting it now; I'm putting it now that we are giving consideration to this proposition that my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend Mr. speaker, who just has got up on this proposition, rejected our contention . . .

MR. WEIR: Ten million . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Ten million? Yes that's right. And I will frankly confess that at the present time we may not be able to do all that is desired on behalf of the property owner in Manitoba to relieve all of their problems, we at least are prepared to consider it and the Conservative government rejected even the consideration of the plight.

MR. WEIR: Baloney . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Baloney? Of course it's not baloney and my honourable friend know it. -- (Interjection) -- That's right. Balderdash! Poppycock! I used to enunciate those words from that side to the former administration because what they were giving to this House was balderdash, was poppycock; they rejected completely any consideration and that's why they are there temporarily until they move over to a single seat -- (Interjection) -- that's right to a single seat in this Assembly, if one of you happen to be fortunate in the succeeding election in this province. -- (Interjection) -- And my honourable friend, the Member for Lakeside would be more than fortunate I am sure if in a subsequent election he was returned to this office, this House. So I say, Mr. Speaker, that this government is preparing to act. But my honourable friend, my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition is talking with forked tongue. Here his Federal leader is criticizing the policies federally, criticizing expansion at a time when the Conservative Party feels that there should be retraction in so far as fiscal expansion is concerned. And here my honourable friend who didn't have the intestinal fortitude -- (Interjection) -- he didn't even have the intelligence, but didn't have the intestinal fortitude to even consider such resolutions as is before us at the present time, now stands up and says to this House, that we will be giving support to the resolution of consideration. Prior to May 22nd last year complete rejection, when they had opportunity on this side of the House to consider relieving the local taxpayer, and now they're on that side without the responsibility of government - and deservedly so - are saying . . . -- (Interjection) -- . . . sure we will consider the matter. What a farce. What hypocrisy. There is no stronger word that I am permitted to use in this House but I would love to, because this is a fact. -- (Interjection) -- No. No. I didn't forget gobbledygook at all.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister permit a question?

MR. PAULLEY: My honourable friend though has learned, and learned well, and it's too bad, too bad for the taxpayer at the local level in Manitoba, too bad for the taxpayer in Manitoba that my honourable friend who had the opportunity in his party for 10 years didn't learn. And that is why you are there. Because you had no heart, you had no gumption, you had no consideration for the taxpayer in Manitoba. And this goes for the whole caboodle of you.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Would the Minister permit a question?

MR. PAULLEY: I beg your pardon?

MRS. TRUEMAN: Would the Minister permit a question please?

MR. PAULLEY: Just for you, because I do think that at times you do exhibit far more intelligence than the male members of your caucus.

MRS. TRUEMAN: I wanted to ask the Minister whether he has forgotten the additional \$5.00 per capita unconditional grant that was made by the previous government to the municipalities last year?

MR. PAULLEY: Oh no, Mr. Speaker, I haven't forgotten that at all. Oh, Heaven's to Betsy, the Liberal Party did this just prior to an election and the same thing happened to them as happened to the Conservatives with their intrigue. Now maybe my honourable friend from

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) Fort Rouge hasn't dug into the history of political parties in Manitoba to really realize that the people of Manitoba are less susceptible to such buffonery as the Conservatives attempted to pull off on the people of Manitoba, as indeed the Liberal Party did in 1958.

So I suggest to my honourable friend, I am aware of it, I was aware of it of what happened previously, and the results were the same. The Liberal Party on its way to oblivion as indeed is the Conservative Party today. In all due respect, I would suggest to my honourable friend, I do know a little of the political history of the Province of Manitoba over the last few years.

Now what does this Resolution suggest? Actually it suggests a transfer of the burden of taxation.

MR. ENNS: It's asking you to keep your promises . . .

MR. PAULLEY: That's right. -- (Interjection) -- That's right. It's asking us to do something that you wouldn't even consider.

MR. SHERMAN: You promised it . . .

MR. PAULLEY: That is not true. And I say to my honourable friend the Member for Fort Garry, if you want to talk stand up, and after I'm finished.

MR. PAULLEY: I just said you're asking your brains something you never intended to do. And if you want to air your brains just stand up for awhile.

MR. SHERMAN: Me thinks the Minister doth protest too much.

MR. PAULLEY: Ah! This Minister has been protesting in this House longer than any of the rest of you; and the reason that the Minister is on this side of the House, he protested well -- (Interjection) -- That's right, he's still protesting because the Minister of Labour and Government Services is not satisfied with what is happening in Manitoba. But when I see and listen to the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition in this House, as the representative of a party in Manitoba that for too doggone long held the reins of power, when I hear my honourable friend criticizing this government for not doing what they could have done. -- (Interjection) -- That's right. And we have promised. Mr. Speaker, the exact Resolution proposed by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia was proposed by us when we were on that side of the House that the government -- (Interjection) -- just a minute -- that the government give consideration to the advisability of doing something. And we're doing it. One thing I do like about my honourable friend, the Member for Assiniboia, and the House Leader of the Liberal Party, I give them credit for going back over the Journals, going back over Hansard, and digging out the resolutions that the New Democratic Party proposed when we were on that side of the House. When one looks over the years at the resolutions that we proposed, and now we find the third party -- yes, they're still a party by the skin of their teeth; they're still a party in this House by the skin of their teeth -- digging back over the Journals and Hansard and resurrecting resolutions that we proposed on that side. I don't fault them for it because we were right when we were there, and we're right while we are here, and all that we are asking, all that we are asking, and we're accepting -- we're not rejecting this resolution as indeed my honourable friends opposite did. I would suggest to my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the Leader of the Opposition, it means far more for Manitoba that we will accept this . . .

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, point of order.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . than the rejection of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition when he was the Premier of the Province of Manitoba, and we will . . .

MR. PATRICK: Point of order. Mr. Speaker, I object. The Honourable Minister is giving false information to the members of this House. I would like to tell him that I never look through journals for any of his resolutions, and I've never introduced in this House a resolution that's ever been introduced by another member. The same year, the same session that that party, the Member for Kildonan, introduced a resolution, exemption for 2,000 for all people of Manitoba, for all residents. which would have cost \$24 million, that's the same session that I had a similar resolution, which I had no chance to look in the journals, to exempt, which was a reasonable resolution, only for the people that were in need.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order, please.

MR. PATRICK: I want to correct the Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. I doubt whether the Honourable Member for Assiniboia had a point of order.

MR. PATRICK: Sure. The Honourable Member was making false statements and I wanted to correct him.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe that our rules provide other ways of handling situations of that type.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . thank the Honourable Member for Assiniboia for supporting and proving what I said was correct that we had introduced this resolution, and if my honourable friend cries now because we beat him to the gun then I have to accept. And this is exactly what he has said. He couldn't present it because we had done it before him and this is exactly what I am saying.

So I say to my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition that whereas the previous government rejected by voting against a similar resolution, objected to even considering the proposition, this government is going to consider the application of this by legislation. But I'm sure that my honourable friend will agree with me, I'm sure that my honourable friend will agree with me despite some of the rabble in the second row, he will agree with me that we can't do everything at once. My Premier and also the Minister of Finance has suggested to this House that there has to be a lead time due to the present economic situation prevailing in Canada.

MR. McKENZIE: Ah come on Russ.

MR. PAULLEY: That's right. My honourable friend from Roblin says "ah come on, Russ," and I want to suggest to my honourable friend, I want to suggest to my honourable friend, that the basic reason that we're in the predicament here in Canada economically at the present time, and particularly here in Manitoba, is because of a succession of Liberal and Conservative governments that haven't established the climate and particularly, particularly here in the Province of Manitoba we have been misgoverned, misdirected . . .

MR. JORGENSEN: Since June 25th.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . to the degree that we are in the position -- and my honourable friend from Morris now says "since June 25th." Well my honourable friend should know because he's been kicked out so often of representation and he will assuredly be kicked out at any subsequent provincial election as he was indeed as a representative at Ottawa where he was such an abject failure. So in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I do want to say to my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition, thank you for your support. -- (Interjection) -- And indeed if the Honourable Member for Fort Garry is going to support the resolution as well . . .

MR. SHERMAN: I just said you're my choice for best supporting actor tonight, that's all.

MR. PAULLEY: There is one rule in this House that if my honourable friend wants to speak he's got to get up off his brains so we can hear him, officially according to the rules of the House. I would suggest that to my honourable friend.

MR. Speaker, I do want to say that as one who has had the opportunity of serving Manitoba ineffectually possibly over a number of years, I am so happy to hear the Conservative Party of Manitoba say, through their Leader in this House, that they are going to support consideration for the alleviation of many of the financial trials that prevail insofar as the local property taxpayer is concerned.

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

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if for a matter of clarification if the Minister would permit a question. Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Minister that the government, having presented for many years and having "agreed to consider" at the last session of the Legislature, what conclusion they've arrived at?

MR. PAULLEY: We've arrived at the conclusion that we're going to consider the proposition that's before us.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, would the Honourable Minister permit a question? After listening, Mr. Speaker, at great length to this NDP jumble of espousing at great length can I ask the Minister is he in favour of the resolution or is he against it.

MR. PAULLEY: We have indicated our support to consider the plight of the local taxpayer.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Yes or no?

MR. PAULLEY: I'm having difficulty penetrating the area in between my honourable friend's two ears, but the answer is "yes".

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a few remarks to what has already been said this afternoon. My honourable friend the Minister of Labour was very forceful in his delivery and I hope that he will consider what I will have to say. I'm just wondering when the government is giving support to the resolution whether they're considering this in the light of ability-to-pay, because we have other groups in this province who find difficulty in meeting their taxes and so on and I would not exclude a large part of our farm group at the present time. They are in a very precarious situation where they do not have the ready cash to pay their taxes because of the increase in taxes on farm land. I feel that we should concern ourselves with those people just as well when we consider the matter of alleviating the taxes for certain groups. That does not mean that I do not have sympathy for the older citizens of the province, especially those that are in receipt of old age supplementary assistance. I feel that this would be a very welcome gesture on our part as an Assembly here in providing some assistance to them. I certainly have no qualms about this, I am in full support of the resolution.

But it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that when we started off discussing this matter this afternoon that the government is going to agree to all the resolutions being submitted where we have the phrase inserted "consider the advisability of", that certainly they can go along and give consideration to all these resolutions and thus by agreeing to them on this basis that this does not necessarily mean that they will consider implementing these programs or these resolutions once they have been adopted in this fashion. I think this is where we find we will have to probably amend all the resolutions that are on the Order Paper from here on in order to find out whether they really mean business, whether they really concur in the subject matter that is being voted on and not just whether they concur in the advisability of considering them.

So I intend to propose an amendment to the resolution before us in the following way: And, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, that the resolution be amended (1) by deleting the period after the word "exemptions" in the last line thereof; and (2) by adding the following words after the word "exemptions" in the last line thereof "and implement the program within the current fiscal year."

MR. GREEN: Nice try, Jake. Mr. Speaker, I just wish to raise a point of order on the amendment, submit that it's out of order on the grounds that it is a resolution which would call for the expenditure of public monies out of the Consolidated Fund. My honourable friend knows full well that he can't propose such a resolution.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order. The government has the right to vote down the amendment, it doesn't change the intent of the original request of the resolution.

A MEMBER: Out of order, Mr. Speaker.

A MEMBER: Jacob, you know better than that.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order. I want to ask the Honourable Minister does the reduction of taxes constitute an expenditure of money?

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. If my honourable friend doesn't know, yes it does.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair will take the amendment under advisement and give a decision later.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, there's just one point that I'd like you to consider, is that this is a directive for bringing into effect something at this session. If adopted by the House then it becomes mandatory for the House to do it. I know you will take this into consideration when you're considering the matter; I just raise that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I thank all honourable members for their comments.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order. I want to remind the Honourable Speaker that we're not removing the phrase or the item "to consider the advisability of" from the resolution at all, it's still contained.

MR. SPEAKER: As I have indicated a moment ago, I'll take the amendment under advisement and give my decision thereon when this matter next appears on the Order Paper.

Resolution No. 7. The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Thanks very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm sorry that the Honourable Member from Ste. Rose is not now in the House to listen and to participate in the debate or at least to

(MR. EVANS cont'd.) ask questions if necessary. I think the resolution by and large is a worthwhile resolution which we are inclined to accept. Of the four main recommendations referred to in the TED Report the resolution points out that the first one, namely the creation of a new standing committee on economic development in the Manitoba Legislature, has been accomplished. This has been done.

The second point, the second main recommendation, the appointment of a high level advisory council on economic development drawn from the private sector, I would beg to differ with the Honourable Member from Ste. Rose with respect to action taken on this. He points out that really we have not acted on it in recognition or in compliance with the specific recommendation of the TED Report. And indeed it isn't the advisory committee, the Economic Development Advisory Board which has been set up is not set up precisely the way that the TED Report recommended. It hasn't got the exact number that the TED Report suggested, the Chairman is a renowned economist, a long term public service, a man of experience and capability and not an outside chairman drawn from the private sector as suggested in the TED Report recommendation on this matter.

However, when you refer to the TED Report and its description of terms of reference of this advisory council on economic development, and if you look at the terms of reference of the board which this government has established, you will see that to a large degree we have incorporated the suggestions of the TED Report; that the council, for example, should be drawn from the private sector with the implication that we bring in capable people. I am sure honourable members in the House would agree that we have some very successful and capable community-minded, community-spirited businessmen who have agreed to serve on the Economic Development Advisory Board, businessmen representing large business and small business. We have a co-operative representative, we have a representative from a union, or representing labour, rather, I would suggest.

There are a number of other suggestions in the TED Report pertaining to this particular board - that it should not become involved in administrative detail but rather should be engaged in general studies of economic development programs. It suggests that logistic support could be provided by the Department of Industry and Commerce and of course this can be done. It suggests that the council, or as we now call it, the Economic Development Advisory Board, report on the activities and performance of the Manitoba Development Fund. In effect, the Economic Development Advisory Board has this authority. It's also suggested in the TED Report that this council or that the Economic Development Advisory Board review the Department of Industry and Commerce and other government departments affecting economic development, to report on their activities and their performance. And this, too, is in the terms of reference of the Economic Development Advisory Board. If we want to use an abbreviation I suppose we can refer to it as EDAB, provide economy of words, but EDAB is essentially meant to perform those suggestions, that course of action which is laid down in the TED Report. So on this score I would differ with my friend, the Member from Ste. Rose.

With respect to the other suggestion, Number 3, establishment in Ottawa of an office of Manitoba economic affairs, this is a matter that we are now considering. I think there are pros and cons involved here. The Manitoba Government did at one time have a London office, representing Manitoba in the U.K. We had one very capable public servant staffing that office and while not taking anything away from what was performed at that time, it was decided by the previous administration that such an office should be closed because it could not as effectively represent the interests of Manitoba pertaining to economic matters as could individual Ministers, individual Deputy Ministers or public servants who could travel to London, travel to England, travel to other parts of Europe from time to time on specific matters with specific problems and talk to the individuals responsible, and therefore it was closed. In many ways, the suggestion in the TED Report, the establishment of an Ottawa office pertaining to Manitoba economic affairs, there's a great parallel here; so really, while the suggestion has merit and indeed should be seriously considered, and is being seriously considered at this very time, I would suggest that in this day and age of modern communication, not only Telex, but telephones, the airplane takes us to Ottawa in a matter of a couple hours, that in many ways we may be able to perform the intent of the suggestion more effectively by sending individual public servants to discuss the problems at hand with their counterparts in the Federal Government. And, of course, I would refer to recent visits of members of this government; the Minister of Agriculture was down not long ago on an important matter; there are officials of

(MR. EVANS cont'd.) my department who have been on various visits to Ottawa pertaining to important matters involving details of economic development in this province; a large percentage of the Cabinet was in Ottawa early in the New Year, early in 1970 and has a face-to-face meeting with about a third of the Federal Government on the whole concept of regional economic development. I suggest that perhaps this is the more effective way of representing Manitoba's economic interests in Canada's capital city. But the suggestion has merit and I think we should consider it and we will consider it.

The fourth recommendation referred to in the resolution, the development of an applied technical and economic research capability for industry in a new institute. I'm pleased to report that the officials of my department have been holding discussions for some months now with certain individuals in the University of Manitoba with this very purpose in mind, to see whether or not such a developmental institute could be established, whether such was feasible, whether it could apply and receive federal grants. I'm not prepared to discuss the details because certainly this is in the idea stage, it's in the stage of discussion, preliminary investigation. But again, I suggest, Item 4 is a worthwhile proposal and all my intent at this time is to say that we are really following through on this proposal and therefore we would be pleased as the resolution says, "to consider the advisability" of implementing this proposal and we will continue to do so.

I might add also that the Manitoba Research Council could very well help in this process of upgrading our technical performance in this province. We are now engaged in looking at the Research Council to see in what way that we may effectively strengthen it and make the Manitoba Research Council even more effective than it now is.

So I repeat, Mr. Speaker, we are really examining the suggestions put forth and we're therefore prepared to accept the resolution with one exception, and that is I really believe that Item 2, the appointment of an Advisory Council as referred to in the resolution has been done -- not exactly as the TED Report suggested, but substantially as the TED Report suggested. Therefore, I would like to propose an amendment to the resolution at this time:

I would move, seconded by the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, that the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose be amended by adding after the word "first" in the first line of the fourth paragraph the word "two", and by changing the word "recommendation" in the second line of the same paragraph to read "recommendations", and by deleting the word "three" in the third line in the fifth paragraph, substituting the word "two". In effect, I'm suggesting that the resolution should read: That this House consider that the government be instructed to consider implementing the last two recommendations instead of a third.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Arthur, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution No. 15. On the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye. The Honourable Member for Rhineland. (Stand).

Resolution No. 16. On the proposed motion of the Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre. Resolution No. 6. I'm sorry.

MR. BUD BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): I beg leave to have the matter stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Stand?) On the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry. (Stand.) For the information of the honourable member, Resolution 9 was just called.

MR. SHERMAN: Sorry, Mr. Speaker. I was out of the House when you called it. Could I ask the indulgence of the House in having this matter stand?

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution No. 12. On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I ask the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution No. 3. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. PATRICK: May we have this matter stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable member realizes the consequence of this?

April 7, 1970

MR. PATRICK: It goes to the bottom of the list.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution No. 4. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): . . . to have this matter stand, Mr. Speaker?

MR. FROESE: It goes off if it isn't adjourned.

MR. BARKMAN: Which one is that? Pardon me, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution No. 4. Resolution No. 8. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. GREEN: I believe the Honourable Member for La Verendrye still possibly would like to speak on Resolution No. 4. I believe if the honourable member doesn't speak, the resolution falls from the Order Paper.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I think I should introduce it. I'm not ready to speak on it but I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia,

WHEREAS at the recently concluded conference on the serious problem of inflation, general agreement was reached between the federal and provincial governments to make a serious effort to hold the line on government spending, increases in prices, business profits and restrain wage increases,

AND WHEREAS the Government of Manitoba concurred in principle,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that recently granted increases in gas rates and electric power rates be rescinded.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, while the resolution is very short and I think quite definitive, I should perhaps say a few words. The matter, of course, is the fact that the Provincial Government has had a chance to present some of their problems to the Federal Government and they're admitting of course that a serious effort has been made on their behalf. I think we've read and heard much about the Federal Government trying to hold the line and I think in line with the federal thinking -- I'm sure, I feel certain it must be the thinking of the Provincial Government; and if it is, I don't think we should just talk about it, I think something should be done about this. Since our increases, one increase upon another is falling one item after another, I think this is where the present government could quite easily take the position that, well if the others must take that kind of a stand, so must we. If you are taking this kind of a stand, where are we going to start with either rescinding or at least try and take some action on the problem at hand? I'm simply suggesting that if this is really sincerity on the part of the government then surely this is not too much to ask to rescind the increase in gas rates and also electric power hydro rates.

I think this is all I wish to say at this time, Mr. Speaker, but I do think that responsibility falls on the present government and they should consider this resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party

WHEREAS Manitoba farmers are facing a serious shortage of cash income,

AND WHEREAS many farmers will be unable to pay their bills and taxes,

AND WHEREAS this situation is already having a serious impact on the economy of rural communities and will adversely affect the entire provincial economy,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Standing Committee on Agriculture be called into emergency sitting immediately at the current session of the Legislature to consider all aspects of the problem and to recommend means of alleviating it,

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that representatives of the Canadian Wheat Board, the Canada Grains Council, The United Grain Growers, the Manitoba Pool Elevators and other concerned public and private agencies be invited to appear before the committee with submissions and recommendations respecting the problem.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Committee be instructed to report back to the House at the earliest possible time during this session recognizing the urgency of the problem and the need for prompt action to assist the farmers of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I think we had an opportunity to discuss some of the problems at hand as far as agriculture is concerned when the estimates opened roughly a week or so ago, I guess it was a week ago yesterday, and I don't think there's any question in the minds of any member of this Legislature or in the minds of most of the farmers of Manitoba that this resolution, I feel, is quite in order to be presented. I don't think I have to rub it in and say we fully realize as far as the cash position is concerned in Manitoba today is possibly more critical than ever before as far as the farmer is concerned. The straight grain farmer today cannot sell as we know. While he's been given certain incentives and certain advances, it seems that the moneys that have to be spent for groceries, fertilizers, gasoline or hydro bills, telephone bills and hospital premiums and the like, it seems that in a lot of areas they're getting down to a point where that certain cash is just not available any more. Then, of course, beyond the problem of trying to keep some of these bills covered, bills have been piling up for some time now, the problem is getting out of hand as far as taxes are concerned; where quite a few of the farmers especially have had the opportunity of delaying their payment of taxes perhaps for a year or two, that grace seems to be running out.

All this resolution does is call for immediate sittings and reference is made -- if the situation in agriculture is as grim as has been stated here by nearly everyone that has spoken on it, why not get at the problem immediately and form this committee -- or it is formed I should say, but to start working at some of the problems that are so evident. I don't think that needs too much discussion; we're all aware of that. I think it would be a real good idea to get some of the best brains and experience of the Manitoba different councils, the Wheat Board, and of course the Canadian Grains Council, United Grain Growers, Manitoba Pool Elevators, and I'm sure there could be others. But here at least are four to start with. I think if we ask some of these individuals from these certain firms, we know they are a serious group, we know they have some very dedicated people that would not mind exchanging ideas, would not mind submitting some of their knowledge of the subject to this committee, and I see no reason Mr. Speaker, why at this time, we're in session anyway, I see no reason why we should not go ahead and have this Committee sit immediately. If the problem is really as serious as has been stated in this House time and time over, and we know it is, then surely we should be doing more about it than we are at the present.

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

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Mr. Chairman, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from St. Vital, that we adjourn the debate.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry to interrupt proceedings, but I'm wondering if by leave of the House you could go back to Resolution No. 3. I was following the resolutions by the book and not by the corrected . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I appreciate the confusion which the error in the printing may have caused. Does the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose have leave? Resolution No. 3. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the honourable Member for La Verendrye,

WHEREAS the Government of Canada rebates to Manitoba and other provinces 75 percent of the Estate Taxes collected in those provinces,

AND WHEREAS the two other Prairie provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan have abolished the provincial portion of the Estate Taxes,

AND WHEREAS the TED Report recommends similar action in Manitoba to retain our investment capital, attract new investment capital to the Province and provide more job opportunities for our people,

AND WHEREAS such a move would give the entire Prairie region a competitive advantage over Eastern Canada and would be a positive and meaningful step to help break up the concentration of wealth in the East,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of introducing legislation to abolish the provincial portion of estate taxes levied in Manitoba by the Government of Canada.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

April 7, 1970

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

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to thank the members of the House very much for giving leave to introduce this; I understand it had been called once before this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, I have debated this particular subject in this House previously and I want to say at the outset that I would prefer that the competition between provinces for the inducements to industry not be on the basis of this particular tax. I would prefer to see this tax basically collected by the Federal Government, handled by the Federal Government, and the one that is uniform across the country. But we are faced with the practical reality that our neighbours to the west, the Province of Saskatchewan, the Province of Alberta, both have moved in this direction. Faced with that situation, I think that the Province of Manitoba has to consider the same type of decision. The Province of British Columbia has made some changes. I think these are really in the residential area, more so than in the question of attracting new industry. But a change has been made there as well.

Let's go back then, Mr. Speaker, to the proposals of the TED Commission. The TED Commission investigated this very carefully in the process of their study on taxation in the Province of Manitoba. The TED Commission came to the same conclusion - recommended to the government at that time that this was one area where the province should move immediately in the abolition of the estate taxes. This is part of their recommendation. Now this was studied by a large group of people. The TED Report did proceed to make an intensive review of the tax situation in the province. So, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the government in this area should be prepared to move. Last year when it was discussed the government said, well we'll have a look at it, and amended the resolution so that they were going to give it consideration during the course of the following year. Now a year has gone by and no action has been taken, although it may be that my friends are now prepared to state exactly what they are willing to do on the subject.

I think there is an advantage in having the three prairie provinces act together on this. It would mean that in this particular area there would be a real incentive to prairie development. One of the complaints that westerners raise - I'm one of those who has raised this complaint frequently - is that there is an unhealthy situation in Canada with the concentration of wealth in the central part of our country; the fact that too many of our economic decisions are made there in central Canada. It's unfortunate, in my view, that too many of our political decisions are made in Eastern Canada; but the same applies to the economic decisions, whether it's a question of banking, finance or development of manufacturing, by and large we find ourselves in the necessity of going down to Toronto or to Montreal to deal there with the people who make the basic economic decisions.

MR. GREEN: . . . Washington.

MR. MOLGAT: Did I hear the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources say Washington? Was he referring to business or to labour decisions, which did he have in mind really?

MR. GREEN: Both.

MR. MOLGAT: The very fact that wealth has tended to concentrate in eastern Canada means that I think there's a tendency for it to continue to grow there, because that's where the decisions are made, and by and large you know the area in which you deal better, you're there on the scene, and I don't think we can fault the banking system for having a tendency to invest more in that area than they are here in western Canada. We're just too far removed. It's much more difficult for them to assess the risks, to understand the situation, and if they have investment opportunities close at hand, then, they proceed to invest there.

So if we're going to break up this economic concentration in the central provinces, I think this is one of the steps that could be taken to do so; because this would induce capital to move from those regions into our region here. Now the government will say, well of course this is going to cost money. And certainly if there's a rebate of taxes it does mean that it is less money going into the government operations immediately. But it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that while the immediate situation may be a reduction in revenue, that the long term could be the very reverse; because if we get the capital to come here, invest here, establish plants, produce employment, then the return will come in that direction. As long as the capital remains in eastern Canada, there's no way in which the Province of Manitoba can tap it. We can't tax manufacturing plants established in Ontario or Quebec. There's no way that

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) we can get a portion of what they're doing except through the equalization payments which we get from the Federal Government. But there's no means by which we get as a province any direct portion of that. So I think the assessment here is, what in the long run is going to be to the benefit of our province, faced, as I started off by saying, with the situation that Saskatchewan is removing this tax, or has removed it, and so has Alberta. Mr. Speaker, let's consider someone in eastern Canada now who is thinking of establishing elsewhere; who wants to come and tap the western market. Faced with this sort of a situation, how can we in Manitoba compete in the attraction of new industry and of new capital if our two neighbouring provinces are prepared to proceed and give 75 percent rebate. I think it puts our Minister of Industry and Commerce in an untenable position in many cases, that he simply cannot compete adequately with the other two provinces.

MR. CHERNIACK: Prove it.

MR. MOLGAT: Now the Minister of Finance says prove it. Well I think that the figures in Alberta have shown that it brings in very substantial new money. -- (Interjection) -- Well you'd have to get the figures from Alberta. The figures that I have seen are that they have had substantial new corporations established, new head offices who have moved into the Province of Alberta.

MR. CHERNIACK: Give us the benefit . . .

MR. MOLGAT: Certainly. Well any information that I have obtained indicates that new corporations have established, particularly new head offices have established in large numbers in the Province of Alberta.

MR. CHERNIACK: Please give us the benefit . . . please help us.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, my honourable friend maybe should refer himself back to the TED Report and tell me that the Minister of Finance does not agree with the study that was undertaken.

MR. CHERNIACK: Is that a fact fact or opinions you're quoting from?

MR. MOLGAT: . . . from the TED Report?

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, I presume that this is their recommendation based on their study of the fact. I ask the Minister, is he saying that the TED Report is all opinion that he doesn't agree with? That's a statement? Let the government state their position on the TED Report. I've asked previously and I haven't yet had what their views are. -- (Interjection) -- Well, I don't think that we've had a clear-cut statement as yet. But certainly the statement . . .

MR. SPEAKER: May I remind the honourable member that it is 5:30 and may I ask him is it his intention to continue for some time?

MR. MOLGAT: Well I must produce some figures for my honourable friend the Minister of Finance. He's very anxious to have some, and I'd be delighted to get them for him.

MR. CHERNIACK: Good.

MR. SPEAKER: It is now 5:30 and I am leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 o'clock tonight.