

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Friday, May 8, 1970

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 30 Grade 10 students of the Melita Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. Nylin. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Arthur. And 10 Grade 11 students of the Waskada Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. McGavin. This school also is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Arthur. On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you here this afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, with the general understanding, if it's still agreeable, can we move to the second readings on private bills, Bill No. 36 and so forth on Page 14.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): I think that's agreeable as far as we're concerned, Mr. Speaker.

PRIVATE AND PUBLIC BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Logan. Bill No. 36. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. GREEN: Stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Second readings - Private Bills. No. 64. The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. BILL URUSKI (St. George) presented Bill No. 64, An Act consenting to the merger and amalgamation of the Manitoba Farmers Union with the National Farmers Union and others, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

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

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the Farmers Union, the Manitoba Farmers Union have petitioned this Legislature for the passing of a private bill to amalgamate the Manitoba Farmers Union with the National Farmers Union. I might add that the Manitoba Farmers Union was incorporated by an Act of this Legislature on April 18th, 1953, and with the passing of this bill the Act of '53 would be repealed.

I might add also that this bill is in conjunction to a bill which was passed on the 12th of March, 1970, by the Senate of Canada, Bill S-22, an Act to incorporate the National Farmers Union. In this Act that was passed in the Senate, the Manitoba Farmers Union, the Saskatchewan Farmers Union, the B. C Farmers Union and the Ontario Farmers Union, petitioned the Government of Canada to incorporate the unions and subsequently a bill was passed. This bill in itself is enabling the Manitoba Farmers Union to amalgamate with the other provincial farmers unions to form a national union in Canada.

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

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, the presentation of this bill certainly meets with no objection from the members of my party as such. It does give us an opportunity though, Mr. Speaker, to express one or two comments about the proposed merger and the amalgamation of the Manitoba Farmers Union with the National Farmers Union and I would, you know, certainly wish to wish the new national organization well, and in particular of course the Manitoba section of it which is now merging with the national organization. Any action that we can do in the various legislative houses across Canada and in the House of Commons in Ottawa that would add strength to the position of our farmers across this land is one that I doubt very much whether any person in public life, any politician, would want to object to, and I want to make it very plain that I support the bill as introduced by the Honourable the Member from St. George.

I do feel that the opportunity also exists to express some regrets that the farmers union and the National Farmers Union position of late is such that it seems to be bent on a course of divorcing itself from some of the activities and actions of the many other fine farm organization groups that we have in this province and in Canada at large, in particular of course the Canadian Federation of Agriculture. More recently, it was with some concern that we watched the representatives of the National Farmers Union walk out of the meetings of the Grains

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) Council. Now we can say what we like about the Grains Council as to their effectiveness in this role, but again I only stress that if farmers' problems and the problems of agriculture that we face in this country are to be solved, I can assure the honourable member that the refusal to sit down and discuss those problems with all segments of the industry hardly augurs well for eventual success in this direction.

I would have to also take this occasion to remind the members opposite, and to remind the Minister of Agriculture that is not in this government, that while I don't have the specific figures before me, but I'm trying to recollect the position as it was I thought quite aptly stated by the Federal Minister of Agriculture, that he respects the positions that the National Farmers Union takes as he would respect any other organized group, but he draws to our attention, and I think it should be drawn to our attention here, that they do represent a relatively small portion of the farmers across this country - I believe it's some eight percent - and I have noted there has seemed to have been a tendency on the part of this government, on the part of the Minister of Agriculture to acknowledge the Farmers Union organization as being "the" organization speaking for all farmers of Manitoba.

Now I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that as a former Minister of Agriculture I had always hoped that perhaps - and I expressed this desire and hope and I'm sure that any Minister of Agriculture has, not only provincially but federally - that if that day ever happens we'll have happier ministers of agriculture across this province, because nothing is more difficult for the person charged with formulating policies, agricultural policies, is to have a fairly wide diverse approach taken by the very industry that he seeks to serve.

So I make no -- I don't want my comments to be taken out of context and saying that the Minister of Agriculture should not listen to the Farmers Union. He obviously should because they do represent a dynamic force in our agriculture not only in Manitoba but in Canada as a whole, but there are very major groups of farm people, farm producers that are not represented by the Farmers Union and who have of course the right to the Minister's ear, to the government's ear as much as any other organized group.

So, Mr. Speaker, with those few remarks I do wish to indicate that I certainly don't oppose the bill that is being introduced for second reading at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words and to agree with what my colleague the Member for Lakeside has just said. I have no objection to raise in the passing of second reading of this piece of legislation; in fact, probably in consideration of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that we are having difficulty in this House to bring our agricultural committee together and to get the voice of Manitoba across, particularly to the Federal Government, that we would hope that in this amalgamation of the Manitoba Federation, or the Manitoba Union with the Federal Federation that they will carry with them into the Federal Federation a voice that will be heard not only in Ottawa but across the Dominion of Canada.

So with these few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I say to the Member for Ste. Rose that I have no objection to passing this bill on second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rock Lake, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 51. The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RON McBRYDE (The Pas) presented Bill No. 51, An Act to amend The Child Welfare Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, this Bill No. 51 is designed at amending that section of The Child Welfare Act that deals with adoption, specifically that section that deals with the religious section of our adoption law in Manitoba. Hopefully, Mr. Speaker, this bill will make adoption easier and simpler by making that section of the religious faith part of the law more flexible. Hopefully, Mr. Speaker, it will move in a direction of putting the welfare of the child ahead of other considerations when it comes to adoption. Some of the members who have been in this House before, I would like to help to explain it by saying that this bill moves in the same direction as bills formerly introduced by Mr. Hillhouse, the former Member for Selkirk, I believe. It's not the same as the bill introduced by him but it moves in that direction although

(MR. McBRYDE con t'd.) not quite as far.

In the Province of Manitoba there are four types of adoption. There are selective adoptions, that is children adopted by adoptive parents selected by the Children's Aid Society or by the Department of Health and Social Services. The second type is the parent's own adoption. This covers the case where a child is adopted by his own parent and a step parent. The third type of adoption we have in Manitoba is a private adoption, that is children adopted by adoptive parents chosen by the natural parents or parents other than the authorized agencies. The fourth type of adoption we have is de facto adoptions where children are adopted by adoptive parents who have fully maintained the child for at least five years, where the placement was initially arranged by the natural parent or parents as a temporary plan. The amendment in Bill 51, Mr. Speaker, deals only with the first type of adoption, that is adoption in which placement is made by an official agency, an agency recognized by the government to place children for adoption.

There were some changes, Mr. Speaker, in Manitoba's adoption laws to bring them more in line with other provinces in the past. In 1961 an amendment allowed parents surrendering a child to say that they had no religious preference in regards to that child. In 1963 there was an amendment which stated to the effect that if a child could not be placed in a home of the same religion, that the matter could be taken to a judge who could allow the child to be placed in a home of a different religion. Mr. Speaker, these were improvements in The Child Welfare Act in regard to adoption and someone might ask then what is Bill 51 all about. The reason that I have introduced this bill, Mr. Speaker, is because there are still problems that affect adoption in Manitoba, that makes adoption more difficult and in some cases provides serious hardship to children and to adopting parents.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to use an example in this case and I'd like to use my own example. Previous to coming to Manitoba my wife and I and our own child lived in British Columbia in a small community. One weekend there was no social workers in town and there was a child for whom a home had to be found. At that time we had the young girl brought into our home because there was no place else for the child to stay. We had no intention of becoming adoption parents and this was our second experience at becoming short-term foster parents.

Mr. Speaker, this was a seventeen-month-old girl and she was with us, or still is with us, but in less than six months we had realized that she had become part of our family and we wished to adopt her, so we applied for adoption in the Province of British Columbia. Less than a year after that, or after the girl came to our place, we moved to the Province of Manitoba and we were assured that there would be no problem, that we could proceed with our adoption through the Province of Manitoba. After we were here for some time and applied to the proper agency here in Manitoba to carry through the adoption that we began in B. C., we found that we ran into a problem. I think at that time we were about three-quarters of the way through with the adoption process which does take some time, and the social worker in B. C. assured us there would be no problem coming to Manitoba. But the Manitoba social worker informed us that since the child happened to have a different religion than my wife and I have that it would not be possible for us to adopt in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, the girl that we had in our home had been in foster homes all the time and had never been with her natural mother since birth, and yet it was a requirement of the law that she be placed with a family that had the same religion as her natural mother. By this time Mr. Speaker, this girl had become our daughter, a part of our family. She had been with us for two years and that was most of her life. I'm sure the members could understand, Mr. Speaker, how we felt. If they had children and they can imagine, because of a technicality in the law, there be a requirement that a three or four-year-old child of theirs would have to be taken to another home and removed from their home, I would ask the honourable members how they would respond in such a situation.

Mr. Speaker, we had been foster parents before and we had looked after one small baby and a 13 year old girl, but these were temporary placements, Mr. Speaker, and we knew that and we knew that these children would be placed in another home. As a matter of fact we met the parents and became friends with them. It was not a problem for us to adjust to this situation, but when we applied for adoption, and after a girl has been in our home for two years as part of the family, we found out we couldn't proceed with adoption here in Manitoba. At that time, Mr. Speaker, the very same time this problem came up, Mr. Hillhouse's bill was before the Legislature and we were quite hopeful that this situation would be solved. I imagine at that

(MR. McBRYDE cont'd.) time when the bill was defeated, Mr. Hillhouse's bill, I know I myself cursed the members of the Legislature for taking such an attitude.

Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, we still had another option. Because we had begun the adoption process in British Columbia, we could return to British Columbia and we were able to get the adoption processed in British Columbia. Mr. Speaker, had we been residents of Manitoba, had we not begun adoption procedure in British Columbia, we would not have been allowed to adopt the child; she would have had to be removed from our home after this long period of time in which she had become part of our family.

Mr. Speaker, what would have had to happen if we had been permanent residents of Manitoba or had not begun our adoption procedure in British Columbia, is that the child we wanted to adopt would have to be circulated throughout Canada, and if anywhere in Canada there was a family of the same religion, although they had never met the child, who wanted to adopt her, they would be allowed to. Mr. Speaker, in the Town of The Pas I know only two other couples besides ourselves who have adopted. One of them had no problem because of the present law, but us and another did, so two out of three have had problems in adoption which Bill 51 attempts to overcome.

Mr. Speaker, in the other case there was a similar situation where a child came into a home as a foster child, then the parents after the child became part of the family attempted to adopt, but again they were of different religion than the child whom they had as a foster child. Now fortunately in this case, Mr. Speaker, there was a social worker who understood the situation and who was able to stretch the law enough to allow this adoption to go ahead. That is, when they advertised the child throughout Canada for someone of the same religion, they described the child in such a way, sort of that the people would see the child as undesirable for adoption and therefore no one else wanted to adopt. But that couple had to wait for two or three months for this procedure to take place. It was quite a traumatic experience for them to see if they could finally adopt the child they wished to adopt, who had been part of their family, or not. Mr. Speaker, I hope that Bill 51 will change the situation so that the law will not have to be stretched and played with in this manner so that this particular problem can be overcome.

Mr. Speaker, religion is not mentioned in the adoption bills of British Columbia, Ontario, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia or Prince Edward Island. Mr. Hillhouse asked in his bill that the religious aspect not be mentioned in the Adoption Bill of Manitoba. In the Act that I have introduced, Mr. Speaker, religion is still mentioned but it does not impose the hardships that I have described. It allows the parents surrendering a child for adoption to give a religious preference if they wish, and that the agency will attempt to place a child in a home of a similar religion. Mr. Speaker, I do not feel strongly about the wording of this section or whether religion is entirely left out or put into this Bill; I feel strongly, though, about overcoming the type of problem that I have mentioned.

I have canvassed my colleagues somewhat and have introduced the bill in its present form because it is agreeable to more of them than if religion were left out entirely. Mr. Hillhouse's bill was defeated because the former Ministers of Welfare said that there was no hardship caused by the present law. Mr. Speaker, as often happens in government, I feel that they probably relied on the advice of senior civil servants who are out of touch with the workers at the field level and the field level problems. The adoption social workers that I know have experienced the hardships of the present law and support this change. The present Minister and his department supports Bill No. 51 which I've introduced. It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Conservative group in the House will not vote as a group against this type of bill as they did in the past on the advice of their Minister but that they'll vote individually on this bill and that the majority of them will be able to support this bill as it brings about desirable changes in the Adoption Act.

Mr. Speaker, in talking to my group, I feel that the majority will support the bill as it stands now and I hope that the Member from Swan River will give it serious consideration and not prejudge it -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, the discussion has deteriorated so I'll end my explanation of Bill No. 51.

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

MRS. TRUEMAN: I move that the debate be adjourned, seconded by the Member from Birtle-Russell.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. Bill No. 52. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, may we have this matter stand? (Agreed.)

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading, Bill No. 63. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS presented Bill No. 63, An Act to amend the St. Boniface Charter, 1953, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: I hear "Explain"; "Dispense"; "Pass"; I don't know what's going on, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I think as a courtesy to the St. Boniface Hospital I would like to suggest that we pass second reading of this bill. I don't think there is any question of approving anything blindly. I've discussed this with the Minister of Municipal Affairs and he agrees that if this could be done then we could hear the explanation. It is a kind of complex bill, there are quite a few different requests, and His Worship the Mayor of St. Boniface as well as the City Solicitor and some of the aldermen would like to come and address the committee, so I wonder if this would be satisfactory to the members.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 71. The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. JACK HARDY (St. Vital) presented Bill No. 71, An Act to amend The St. Vital Charter, for second reading.

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

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

MR. SPEAKER: Orders for Return. The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Morris and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Kildonan in amendment thereto, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Brandon West in further amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, it seems that yesterday when the Honourable Member for Lakeside was complimenting me, unfortunately I wasn't here to listen to his kind words and I understand it is well worth reading in Hansard. Today, I find that I have a few complimentary words for the Honourable Member for Morris and he in turn isn't here, so maybe the Honourable Member from Lakeside will take a few notes and let him know.

Now at the time, Mr. Speaker, you were -- (Interjection) -- It's no improvement, you might as well come down.

Mr. Speaker, I think that during this debate the Honourable Member for Morris took advantage of your easy way of trying to please everybody. -- (Interjection) -- I think that's a quality, Mr. Speaker, don't let them -- and he gave us a speech, it seemed like a Throne Speech because he really covered the waterfront. He made some completely false accusations and he took 40 minutes in doing so, and his whole point was this, the right of the members of the Opposition to ask questions, and if he was here I'd challenge him to show us anywhere in Hansard where anybody in the House tried to deny them, denied any members of this House the right to ask questions.

MR. BILTON: Talk to Mr. Green.

MR. DESJARDINS: For any gentleman that sat in that Chair there, I don't think you understand. I said the right to ask questions, not necessarily automatically answer all the questions. It's not the same thing at all.

Now of course the honourable member, as he always does, made his own rules. He even wanted to close the debate. That's the one that wants to leave all the freedom to the members of this House but he wanted to close the debate on a sub-amendment. No wonder his speech was so completely irresponsible; he thought that nobody would be able to talk to him after. Of course he has an advantage over us; he served his apprenticeship in the House of Commons and I guess maybe that's the way they do that there.

For someone who is talking about the freedom of the members of this House, as I said he wanted to close the debate and then he gets furious, Mr. Speaker, if you dare try to make an amendment on one of his motions. That's his own little property and he's the only one that can ask these things. And he resents it - don't play around with my little motion, I think this is what he said a few weeks ago - and he doesn't like interjections when he speaks but he's

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) never quiet. I admit that I interfere, but I can take it at least and he can't. He's got to have a set of rules for somebody else and a set of rules for himself.

Now he's talking about the parliamentary language of our honourable friends here but he can call everybody else all kinds of names - self-styled king of the barnyard, I guess we can call him, because he's always talking about the barnyard and scratching for something on the floor of the barnyard and so on. Well, I think that this strutting little rooster will not get away with it and when he wishes to hurt me personally, when he wants to embarrass me, he associates me and my tactics with hockey or with sports, and actually I don't know - maybe my honourable friend could take a note on that - this is very complimentary to me, and I think that if he knew a little bit more about team sports he'd learn about fair play, he'd learn about teamwork and maybe a little bit of courage, and he'd see that the rules are usually made to be kept by both sides. Maybe he should get mixed up in sports a little bit and I think that he would profit by it.

Mr. Speaker, what is actually the issue with this. He covered everything except the real issue. The government refuses to give information that, first of all, is already known. I'm not going to suggest it's out of order because I accept your decision, Mr. Speaker, but nevertheless this is already known, and the government feels that it's none of the business of the Honourable Member from Morris. As a matter of fact it's none of my business either; it's an internal matter.

Let us look at some of the quotes that my honourable friend used in his long 40 minute speech when he was closing the debate. This is one of the things he said: "Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition must fearlessly perform its function." Very good. "When it properly discharges them, the preservation of our freedom is assured." That's also excellent. "The reading of history proves that freedom always dies when criticism ends." That's true and I'm doing my part for history; this is why I'm criticizing him today.

But he forgets something; he forgets a certain word in there. He forgets the word when "properly" discharged and that's a very important word. I don't know if he forgets it purposely or if he doesn't know the meaning of the word. "History also tells us, mentions someone who had many questions to ask. He asked these questions fearlessly and oftentimes they were quite embarrassing questions, embarrassing mostly to the individual." And this gentleman also could quote the same quote used by my honourable friend from Morris because he did not understand the word "properly" either. His name is McCarthy and you know what his claim to fame is, Mr. Speaker.

Embarrassing the government - yes, embarrass the government, that's fine; embarrass a political party - that's also fair game. But why an individual? Why drag an individual in this House? Why place a person on public trial in this House? Why use an individual as a tool to cause embarrassment to a rival party? There is the Civil Service Commission, there's the Ombudsman now, and I'm sure that any members themselves who are not satisfied with the treatment that they receive by the government certainly can bring the matter up themselves in public if this is his wish. Then it's something else.

Now let us look at one of the statements that the Member for Morris made the other day, and I quote from Page 1606. This is on May 5th. He's saying here, "In his statement to the press" - he's talking about the First Minister here - "he said there were three areas upon which we had no right to ask questions and the first one was security, and that, Sir, makes one wonder - are we to have a security police force in this country?" See how intelligent this is, how intelligent this is to use something like that. I guess he would like to be able to write the headlines like the Honourable Member from Lakeside did yesterday. You see in the paper "Socialist Schreyer Government Setting up Police Force." That would look good. Now this is the kind of thing we have in this province and then we are talking about scaring people away. This is the way we're responsible here in this House.

He also says: "He also suggested that personnel relations are those that could not be discussed or questions could not be asked in this Chamber." Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said, criticism - yes, but constructive criticism; scrutiny - yes, but let us not yell wolf every minute, every second. Power is not that important that we should divide our people to conquer, and especially to conquer our own personal ambitions. I would like to appeal to the member, he's not here but maybe somebody will tell him, I think he's an intelligent person, I think he's experienced and he certainly has a contribution to make, and I wonder, I would like to -- well

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) I confess here, Mr. Speaker, that I'm very disappointed that he's not here because I was going to try to set him up. I was going to ask a question. I was going to ask him how sincere and how much he needed all the information, how much he really wanted from the government. And do you know why I was going to try to set him up, Mr. Speaker? Because I was going to quote from Hansard of April 30, 1969 on page 1781, and this was during the speech on the flooding of the north when the members on this side of the House were asking questions, pertinent questions and he was asked -- this happened and I might as well start quoting right now and I think you'll get the idea.

He was asked by Mr. Molgat, the then Leader of the Liberal Party: "Will the honourable member permit a question, Mr. Speaker?"

"Mr. Jorgenson: Sure, sure."

"Mr. Molgat: Has the honourable member seen the studies to back up whatever losses are involved in the flooding?"

"Mr. Jorgenson: (and get this, Mr. Speaker; get this - and this is a member that said you see, Sir, it makes a big difference to them whenever they sit on this side or the other side of the House - listen to this) "I'm not privileged to see the report any more than you are. They are the property of the government." The government in this case happening to be the members of the Cabinet. He said it, he said "the government made the decisions. Under our system the government is entrusted with the power of making these decisions. If they are right or wrong, they take the responsibility; they, the front bench." -- (Interjection) -- I beg your pardon? I sure have, I sure have. "If they are right or wrong they take the responsibility and they are going to be judged on the basis of accepting that responsibility." And I can just see him, you know, with his hand on his heart, "I'm quite prepared to accept years of tradition in this Chamber, as in other chambers throughout the Commonwealth and throughout the free world, in following the practices that are laid down for the smoothest passage of the business of a Chamber of this kind." This is the man that is criticizing now, because you are not telling him who got a raise. But he was ready to leave it to somebody else then.

And in the same quotation, Mr. Speaker, I asked him a question.

"Mr. Desjardins: Mr. Speaker, is the honourable member suggesting that the role of the opposition is to take the word, to vote on a question of principle only on the say so of the Cabinet of the government? This is exactly what my honourable friend is saying. You are saying that but you yourself don't know enough to make a decision."

"Mr. Jorgenson: My friend is at liberty to vote as he pleases on this issue."

"Mr. Desjardins: Thanks very much for informing me but do you mind answering my question." -- (Interjection) -- I can't read, there's no more; he never answered it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, does he think for a minute that the people of Manitoba are going to be taken in with this kind of stuff in a 40 minute speech because this government did not want to answer all his questions, did not want to help him with this witch hunt? I would say that for those that have any doubt after reading Hansard that I've just finished quoting, it's obvious that he was thinking of himself, or he should have been thinking of himself when he said: You see, Sir, it makes a big difference whenever you sit on this side or the other side of the House.

MR. SPEAKER put the question on the sub-amendment and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Those in favour of the motion as amended . . .

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Swan River, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member from Ste. Rose. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I ask the indulgence of the House to let this matter stand. The member is not here now and I'd like to discuss it with him.

MR. SPEAKER: Order for Return of the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the honourable members of the Opposition might gain the impression that they are having some difficulty with me in respect to Orders for Return. They may gain whatever impression they like, however the Orders for Return will be dealt

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) with in a manner that I think is completely fair and impartial.

In respect to this Order for Return, Mr. Speaker, I had indicated when the honourable member asked a question which had some bearing on this matter that I was prepared to permit either the honourable member who asked the question, or any others, to review in detail all of the files that were in my office in connection with this matter, and that opportunity and that invitation still stands. There is no reason for any secrecy in respect to any of the files that deal with the subject matter of this enquiry. The individual involved has made application to my office, my department has reviewed the circumstances in this case and come to certain findings and facts. Those findings in all of the reports and so on are available and I'm perfectly willing that individual members review them if they so desire.

However, I question, Mr. Speaker, that the nature of the Order for Return is one that should be properly accepted by government. Now I say that quite advisedly. In respect to the first question, No. 1, I have no hesitation in giving an answer to that question at all. The answer is that the gentleman involved, Mr. Pankhurst, was not represented by defence counsel May 29th when he was convicted for an assault in pointing a firearm and which hearing was heard before Magistrate Mitchell.

In respect to questions 2 and 3, I question that they may be properly considered by the House. Now I looked for some authority - I confess that in the heavy volume that we have to consider from time to time that I haven't been able to obtain all the research on this question that I might otherwise have liked to have followed, but from my brief reference to Beuchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, I again am faced with the information that, so far as I can see, questions, whether they be written or oral, must follow certain guidelines, and Rule 171, or paragraph 171 of Beuchesne indicates that a question, oral or written, must not - and if you go down to (m) - ask solution of a legal proposition such as interpretation of a statute, a minister's own powers; (n) reflect or relate to character or conduct of persons other than in a public capacity; (p) be asked which might prejudice a pending trial in a court of law; (q) contain or imply charges of a personal character; and particularly (dd), deal with matters not officially connected with government or Parliament or which are of a private nature.

Now looking at questions 2 and 3, I really believe that they do fall afoul of the general guidelines that I have indicated in the outline of Beuchesne as to what questions are not proper to be put. I want to assure you, Mr. Speaker, and the honourable member, and all honourable members of this House, that I have the answers and I'm perfectly willing if the House decides that it is in the interest of this Legislature that these answers be given, but I really don't think that the answers ought to be given because they go into a rather private matter and a matter where there is an allegation of violation of private rights and that isn't the kind of enquiry that I think is proper in an Order for Return.

Now I indicate that if the House says that my interpretation is not so and it is in the interests of the party and it is in the interests of the House that all of this information, no matter how private it is, be made public through the House, then I will be bound by the decision of the House and be prepared to do that. But I think that this isn't the case and these answers and the private nature of these circumstances are perfectly available to any private member or to the Ombudsman or anyone that feels that they have an interest in making further enquiries, but I really don't think that it is in the interest of the party or in the interest of the House to answer these questions in the manner in which I think I ought to give the full information.

Now I indicate that I think if I did that, it would be against the precedents that are indicated as guidelines to the House on these matters. I leave it with you, Mr. Speaker. I will answer question 1 and I have done so. In respect to questions 2 and 3, I think they ought not to be put and would decline to answer.

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

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, unless anyone else would wish to speak, I would move that the debate be adjourned, seconded by the Member from Brandon West.

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

PRIVATE MEMBERS RESOLUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The motion of the Honourable Member for Churchill. The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, could I have this matter stand please. (Agreed.)

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia and the

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.) proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Rhineland in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, with all deference to my honourable colleague, I don't want to create a precedent that we can't stand with and the honourable member is in the course of debate. This matter has not been stood and I don't believe that it's possible to stand a matter which is in course of debate.

MR. BOROWSKI: Well, Mr. Speaker, I had some statistics that I wanted to bring in to speak, and if I don't have them is there any way we can get around it so I can speak at another time?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Cultural Affairs, that debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: You are speaking now of resolution - you are going back to No. 20?

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Rhineland in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to support the resolution. This resolution we have had before us before and I think most of us registered our concern about the people over 65, his high assessments, mill rate, and the combination of the two, his high tax bill and the problems to the pensioners.

Our municipality has a population of about 10,000 with an assessment of about 20 million, and in that area there is 3,000 homes with 200 of these homes being owned and occupied by pensioners. The mill rate in the area on an average is about 45-46 mills depending on the development, and failing the passing and implementation of this resolution our municipality seeks the authority to make this exemption available through our own funds. Our council passed a resolution some six weeks ago, not realizing that we didn't have the necessary authority to make this concession, but we intend to seek it out. It would only cost our municipality in the neighbourhood of \$20,000 which is one mill at the present time. Our resolution has restrictions much like Bill 63 has and Bill 71. To be eligible, the pensioner would have to have lived in the municipality and paid taxes over the past ten consecutive years previous to applying, and they would have to re-apply every year. It wouldn't be something that was continuous in case circumstances change in the home; for instance, the husband dying and leaving the widow that was under 65. Mind you, she wouldn't be any better off I don't suppose, but this is the situation to cover most.

And then in some areas of the municipality, market gardening and farming, there is no building assessment, only land assessment, so our council thought this should be restricted as well to building assessment only, because if there is no building assessment there is not that amount of taxes involved to start with. We of course would like to be reimbursed by the provincial government. I think this probably is a fair way, but failing that, we would, as I say, try to get the permission of the department to carry on at our own level with it.

Bill 63 brought in by St. Boniface, I see they make reference to an exemption of some type to those over 65. They have certain restrictions there. We say \$2,000 exemption on buildings regardless of the mill rate. I think they are holding theirs to \$120 restriction. They also ask that people be in the municipality for ten years out of the 15 preceding years and own the property. In Bill 71, St. Vital's after our council passed this resolution I was talking to the Member of St. Vital and I can see where he drew that bill from because it's identical to our resolution. Jack's not in here. I'm going to have to get after him about that. Our council gave consideration to this exemption not being automatic and go out to everybody. They'd have to come and apply for it because I think there's some people that realize they don't need this concession.

I noticed in the Government News Service the other day that the Finance Minister had sent out a brief of a type, and No. 5 of the brief says "that exemptions are the wrong way to give relief to the low income earner, and in any case most exemptions are of minimal value. Tax credits are more realistic, equitable and economical." Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that anybody that's paying taxes in the neighbourhood of \$200, \$250, and they give him an exemption of \$100, I'm sure they would appreciate it and not consider it minimal. As I say, I support the resolution.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think a few comments on the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for Rhineland would be in order. I think as far as the main resolution itself is concerned, there's no real difference of opinion between the proposer of the resolution, the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, and ourselves, and as has been indicated previously, this government is prepared and has announced that it is giving consideration to all of the problems facing the municipalities and the taxpayers in the Province of Manitoba. We have suggested that there should be a reasonable period of time for us to enact legislation and to give effect to legislation that will relieve the local taxpayers of their financial obligations. It has been stated in the House on a number of occasions that we are in the process of endeavouring to arrive at a method by which this can be achieved.

But, Sir, when we look at the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for Rhineland, I question whether or not even the honourable proposer of the amendment would agree that it would be feasible to accept the resolution, because the amendment of my honourable friend the Member for Rhineland states that the resolution be amended by saying "and implementing the program within the current fiscal year." I feel that this is an impossibility. My honourable friend the Member for Charleswood, who has just taken his seat, indicated a number of municipalities that have had increases in their local tax rate and the question of other bills that may be before us to apply exemptions on the first \$2,000 of municipal assessment. The figures have already been arrived at in my own City of Transcona. The mill rate has been struck with an additional seven mills and the tax bills have gone out. The Member for Rhineland suggests that the program be implemented within the current fiscal year. I think that this is impractical; I don't think that it is possible to go ahead with the adoption, or the suggestion of the recommendation of the Member for Rhineland and I feel that this House should reject the proposition for the current fiscal year that of course we've entered into both provincially and municipally.

I want to say to my honourable friend the Member for Assiniboia, and I'm sorry he's not here, that this isn't something new by way of a proposition of a representative of the Liberal Party, or could well be by the Conservative Party, and I understand from my honourable friend the Member from Charleswood who has just spoken that he endorses it.

In the first instance, the matter of this exemption, if I recall correctly, was introduced in the City of Winnipeg Council by a representative of the New Democratic Party, a former member of this House, Donovan Swailes, who rendered such valiant service for the City of Winnipeg and the Province of Manitoba. So it's nothing new and I think that we should pay a tribute to my old friend and colleague in this House, Donovan Swailes. He had a heck of a job, Mr. Speaker, if I recall the history of the functions of the City of Winnipeg in even attempting, or having finally had the members of the Council of the City of Winnipeg, some of whom have become members of this House, to agree to the proposition of this exemption. And I think too, Mr. Speaker, that I'm correct in my observation that even today as far as the City of Winnipeg Council is concerned, that they do not endorse the exemption except of course with somebody else picking up the tab for them by way of the differential between the revenues to the municipalities.

So this all, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, hinges on the endeavours of this government to do what it said it would attempt to do while it was in opposition -- (Interjection) -- That's right; that's right. We did, Mr. Speaker. My honourable friend the former Speaker is not in error for once. And I recall, as I sat on the other side of the House, that I pleaded with my honourable friends in the official group in opposition to take this matter under consideration, but, Mr. Speaker, without avail; it fell on deaf ears. And sometimes, you know, when we talk about the different seats that we now have in this House, my honourable friends on the other side now used to say to us when we were on that side of the House, would you please give us a chance. We accepted that, and all that I am suggesting now, Mr. Speaker, is the same. The only difference of course is this, that whereas my honourable friends who are now the diminishing group in opposition as the official opposition party, used to say to us a blanket "no, we will not consider it." But the present administration is doing what we requested in opposition, that is to consider the advisability or the methodology by which we may be able to relieve the burden on the local taxpayer. There is a difference. -- (Interjection) -- Pardon?

MR. BILTON: Are you going to vote for this Russ?

MR. PAULLEY: I'm going to vote for the main motion but I can not see how we can vote

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) for the amendment because the amendment suggests that this should be done within the current fiscal year. So this is what . . .

MR. BILTON: I'm content.

MR. PAULLEY: You're content? I happy then, Mr. Speaker, that my honourable friend the Member for Swan River is content with at least something that I have said in this House.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I feel that it would be proper - or let me put it the other way around - it would be improper for us to accept the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for Rhineland because it's simply impossible, in my estimation, to accept that for this year. But I want to indicate to my honourable friend the Member for Swan River, and all the others, that we are and will continue to give earnest and positive consideration to the subject matter as soon as it's economically feasible for the Government of Manitoba to do it, and unlike my honourable friends who had the opportunity when they were on this side of the House, as soon as we feel and figure that it's feasible, we will do it and we will not reject, we will not reject, as did my honourable friends, any reasonable proposition that emanates from that side of the House, because my honourable friend, the Member for Swan River particularly, Mr. Speaker, when he sat in your Chair - and of course he was silent in those days, as indeed, Sir, you have to be . . .

MR. BILTON: I had to be.

MR. PAULLEY: But I recall my honourable friend -- (Interjection) -- my colleague the Minister of Transportation says the honourable member is catching up now.

MR. BILTON: That's what he thinks.

MR. PAULLEY: But I recall, and I'm sure he does too, the speeches from this side of the House of rejection. All I want to indicate, Mr. Speaker, to my honourable friend and my friends opposite, and my friend the Member for Assiniboia who brought in the original motion, it will be given consideration and not rejection, but I don't think that it's feasible or possible to accept the amendment of the Honourable the Member for Rhineland.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the amendment?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the Minister a question? Can he indicate in making his decision how much money this represents to the Treasury?

MR. PAULLEY: That is one of the points we would have to consider before arriving at a conclusion .

MR. CRAIK: Then I'm going to speak to this.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: I'm going to be very brief too. I'm not going to speak very long at all. I'm speaking to the amendment on this and I see -- (Interjection) -- I would like to, and think he should properly have told us how much money this involves before making his decision which he has made. He said that it couldn't be done in the present fiscal year, but the government again has seen fit to change the Foundation Program of financing education and as a result of it has withdrawn funds out of it that would normally have gone into it. I know you don't like to hear it but it's a fact of life. It's between four and five million dollars. And this program, if you can do that in one year just with the stroke of a pen which you've done, how can you stand and make a strong case saying that you can't make this move this year? And you don't even know how much money is involved. The Member for Assiniboia has it figured out; it comes to \$800,000, which is only a fraction of what you removed from the Foundation Program.

MR. GREEN: It's not only money that's involved.

MR. CRAIK: It's primarily money.

MR. GREEN: No, it's a question of whether it's the right way of doing it.

MR. CRAIK: Well, you thought it was the right way a year ago. I mean you voted for it before; you must have thought it through. And it's not a matter of money, it's only a matter of principle.

MR. GREEN: You had to consider it a year ago too.

MR. CRAIK: . . . and how the principle was established a year ago, it's established now and now you say it's not a matter of money. You have no reason not to vote for it.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, a year ago we asked . . .

MR. CRAIK: No, no. I've got the floor. You guys just aren't making sense. I'm not going to take any more time on it, it's just a simple fact of life, that if you can make a change of between four and five million dollars which you must have done consciously . . .

MR. GREEN: But it's not true. That's not true either.

MR. CRAIK: It's not true?

MR. GREEN: No.

MR. CRAIK: Well thank God somebody is going to give me the answer because I haven't been able to get it yet. Maybe you will.

MR. GREEN: It's not true. The Minister of Education gave you the answer.

MR. CRAIK: But for a program that costs \$800,000, which is only a fraction of the change you've made in the other direction, you say you can't do it in the present fiscal year because you say it's not a matter of money. It's just absolute nonsense and there's no reason why the government can't support this amendment that the Member for Rhineland brought in for this motion.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if my honourable friend would permit a question. -- (Interjection) -- Here we got old Dief back again. You know the House was really conducting itself on a proper scale before you came back into the House. I wonder if my honourable friend would permit a question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order.

A MEMBER: What's the point of privilege?

MR. GREEN: No, it's not a point of privilege.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder if my honourable friend the Member for Riel would permit a question.

MR. CRAIK: Certainly.

MR. PAULLEY: I forgot to clear it through the Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Your time has been exhausted; you've already spoken on this.

MR. PAULLEY: Boy oh boy, some of these immigrants from the House of Commons in Ottawa. I want to ask my honourable friend the Member for Riel that does he think that it is feasible in view of the fact that tax bills are in the process of going out at the present time, and in many instances have gone out at the municipal level, to implement this program for the current fiscal year, or would the cost of the refund really exceed the amount of the reduction to the individuals.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, if you had to do it by way of rebate you wouldn't be doing anything differently than used to be done. If the tax bills have gone out and you're going to do it therefore by rebate, you wouldn't be involved in a program that was any different than the program that did exist at one time in rebates and the program that exists in some other provinces. So that's certainly no stumbling block. As a matter of fact and on a point of cost, the old program was administered at less than half of one percent of the total amount of money involved so you're not talking about an amount of money in issuing rebate cheques. So as far as I'm concerned the answer is yes, even though tax bills are out you can go ahead and you can do it.

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

MR. ENNS: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

MR. SPEAKER: We're dealing with the motion of the Honourable Member for Rhineland in amendment to the motion of the Honourable Member for Assinibola, Resolution No. 5.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Beard, Bilton, Claydon, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Ferguson, Graham, Hardy, Henderson, Johnston (Portage la Prairie), Johnston (Sturgeon Creek), Jorgenson, McGill, McGregor, McKellar, Moug, Patrick, Sherman, Watt, Weir and Mrs. Trueman.

NAYS: Messrs. Allard, Barrow, Borowski, Boyce, Burtiak, Cherniak, Desjardins, Doern, Fox, Gonick, Gottfried, Green, Jenkins, Johannson, McBryde, Malinowski, Miller, Paulley, Pawley, Petursson, Schreyer, Shafransky, Toupin, Turnbull, Uruski.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 23; Nays, 25.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the amendment lost.

Are you ready for the question on the motion? The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. JOHANNSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak on the main motion. I realize I lost my right to speak on the motion as amended but I still have the right to speak on the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is not amended.

MR. JOHANNSON: I'd like to speak on the main motion. The main motion certainly has merit and our party is going to vote for it. It's another manifestation of the very progressive views of the Member from Assiniboia. He's a man who has humanitarian feelings, who comes up with very progressive legislative proposals which I listen to with respect. Mind you, there are limits to his progressivism. When once we come up to the barrier of the free enterprise doctrine, the progressive views stop. However, I can agree with the honourable member that pensioners who own homes and who are receiving the supplementary allowance do have a problem today, and I think our party has as much concern for the plight of these people as has the honourable member. In fact, I would say that in my constituency there are probably a good number more of these type of problems than there are in his constituency because in the east end of my constituency I have a large number of retired people. This is part of the inner city core. The Honourable Member from Assiniboia represents a suburb and the suburbs don't usually contain a great number of pensioners who are receiving the supplementary allowance, and I think the honourable member would probably agree with me on that. So this isn't a question of concern. We are concerned about the welfare of these people.

The problem is the nature of the resolution. The resolution is a limited solution to a wide problem, and that wide problem of course is poverty. Poverty affects not only the pensioner who is a home owner and who is receiving the supplementary pension, it affects the pensioner who doesn't receive the supplementary pension; it affects the pensioner who is a tenant, and it affects low income families. So the problem of poverty is a widespread one.

I said that our party will support the resolution. We are considering this resolution. We are also considering other solutions to the problem of poverty. The Honourable Member from Assiniboia, and several others, reminded the members of this party that we should be keeping our promises, and I'll quote the honourable member: "I think the government can act on this immediately. They can act on this during this session of the House, and really what I am trying to do is trying to help the administration." We like that. We appreciate the honourable member's intent. "... trying to help the administration so that during the next election they will not be accused of falsely lulling the populace with promises and then not keeping their promises." The honourable member reminded us to keep our promises with regard to exemptions on property tax. The Honourable Member from Lakeside did the same, as did the Honourable Member from St. Vital.

However, in answer to the Minister of Transport, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition said that the Conservatives are not responsible for our election promises. They will prod us to implement only those election promises - that is, our election promises - which his party supports. For example, they're not going to prod us into bringing in auto insurance. -- (Interjection) -- I'll deal with that.

Now, that's an interesting logical exercise. The Member from Lakeside, the Member from St. Vital, the Member from Assiniboia, imply that our promises involve a moral commitment, a moral commitment to the voters, and I think they would agree this is what they're implying, that we have a moral commitment to the voters on this, but the Leader of the Opposition, interestingly, reserves the right to decide which promises of which moral commitment we should keep. The proposition is interesting. It's a proposition of selective morality, or partial honesty, and if I'm to choose who shall decide which commitments our government should keep, I'm afraid that I will rely on the people rather than on the Opposition. The people gave our party a mandate to carry out our program, not in one year, but in four years. This is the normal length of a legislative mandate. So we have -- if the Honourable Member from Swan River will be patient, we have four years in which to keep our promises, and we intend to keep them.

The Conservatives present us with a restatement, in effect a restatement of a very ancient theory of government. They are in effect saying that they want veto power over our legislative program. The Leader of the Opposition says that they will support only NDP promises which his party supports. The Member from Fort Garry says that the NDP is precipitating an election by introducing a Bill which the Conservatives must vote against. We're precipitating an election because they are going to vote against a Bill which we introduce.

The Member from St. Vital claims the right to determine the priorities for the

(MR. JOHANNSON cont'd.). . . . government. He claims that this particular resolution should be priority number two, following a shifting of the costs of Medicare to income tax. This should be our second priority. It seems to me that this is a restatement of the divine right to rule. The Conservatives can't accept the fact that they're no longer the government - can't accept the fact that they're no longer the government.

MR. HARDY: Would the member permit a question at this time?

MR. JOHANNSON: Yes.

MR. HARDY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now I'm just suggesting that I don't think any - and I'm prefacing this with a very short comment - can in fact, in view of the comments that were made by the Honourable Member from St. Matthews with respect to the divine right, can the honourable member indicate in fact what degree of priority that government is going to give that particular election promise?

MR. JOHANNSON: I will say again what I said before. We have a four-year legislative mandate, providing of course that we're not defeated in the House.-- (Interjection) -- I'll sit down when I choose to sit down. We have a four-year mandate and we will decide the priority of this item. Now we've said that we're considering it, and we're also considering other solutions to the particular problem that this resolution attacks.

The Honourable Member from St. Vital demands, with a great show of self-righteousness, that we implement this resolution immediately. That's rather interesting, Mr. Speaker. His party has just finished more than a decade in power, more than a decade; we have been in power for less than a year. His party was in power for more than a decade.

MR. BILTON: That old cliché.

MR. JOHANNSON: However, in more than a decade in power they never implemented this, and now they're insisting, with a great show of self-righteousness, that this should be done, should be implemented by us immediately. The government is considering the resolution of the Member from Assiniboia. It is also considering another approach to solve this problem, the problem of people on fixed incomes. (If you don't mind, I'll take the questions at the end. I've been interrupted a bit already.)

We have another solution that we are considering. It is a long term solution to the problem of poverty among pensioners, and it is a housing plan; not a system of tax exemption, it's a housing plan. This housing plan is not original to me. In fact, this housing plan was presented to the Conservative Party some time ago but the Conservative Party never did anything about it. They never did anything about it. It is a plan for lifetime housing for older citizens. The purpose is to match the stream of costs for housing for a family over time to the increases and decreases in family income over a working lifetime.

Now it seems impossible, with the present methods of financing, to adjust the annual costs of housing in proportion to the annual budget capacity of the individual family. To illustrate: a young couple frequently has two breadwinners, no children, and it has a high capacity to save - the couple have a high capacity to save. They can accumulate savings because their expenses are not terribly high and at present there is no income available to them which is hedged against changes, changes in housing prices. Families in the period of family formation, who have relatively low per capita income, are faced with a large housing need. They need more room and they have less money available because of their expenses to meet this need, so they have difficulty stretching their budgets to meet their expanding need because of the fact that they are having increasing numbers of children.

Families in middle years, whose children are grown up, have a substantial capacity to save and yet they find they've taxed themselves severely to build up equity in housing during the period of relatively low income, an equity which they could now build with much less difficulty. So they now find they have surplus money available which they could have used in earlier years.

Older people often find that the maintenance and tax costs of the housing in which they live is eroding their fixed income. This is the group that the Honourable Member from Assiniboia is most concerned about, and it's the group that probably has the most problem, the most severe problem. Older people find that the maintenance in tax costs of the housing they live in is eroding their fixed income, but they're reluctant to draw on accumulated equity which they've invested in their housing, for fear of loss of further security.

So one of the big problems in this is the fact that the cost of housing over time doesn't coincide with the income of the normal family over time. The result is that two groups suffer, the young family and the senior citizens on low fixed income.

(MR. JOHANNSON cont'd.)

Now the solution that the government is looking at, that the Minister of Municipal Affairs is looking at and is considering as a wider solution, a more far-reaching solution to the problem of poverty among elderly people, the solution that the Minister is examining is a housing plan which involves what you might call a cooperative or a mutual fund. It is proposed that Manitoba families be encouraged to shift from private ownership to corporate or cooperative ownership of housing. It is proposed that a corporation be created to acquire new housing of all types from existing builders across Manitoba. The corporation should also be empowered to acquire existing housing from present owners. So this corporation or cooperative, you can call it what you will, will have housing built by builders and it will acquire existing housing.

The ownership of the corporation would be available only to persons residing in housing owned by the corporation. The individual family would invest in the equity of the corporation instead of equity in a particular housing unit. Instead of owning equity in a house, the individual family would own equity in thousands of housing units all across Manitoba. Any unit of any type anywhere would be available, as it became vacant, to any equity owner. In other words, if the Honourable Member from La Verendrye decided to move into Winnipeg and he were a member of this corporation, he would simply on a month's notice have option to select any vacant unit available, for example, in the City of Winnipeg, and his equity would remain in the corporation. -- (Interjection) -- I don't know.

The owners of the corporation would be the tenants of the housing owned by the corporation. The rents would therefore be calculated and managed to reflect changes in equity value. Since rental costs and equity would be interdependent, it would be possible to sell the form of housing equity which would provide a better hedge against changes in housing costs and rent and present full ownership. The returns in this equity investment would be applicable against the annual costs and lifetime cost of housing.

Now there would be four methods of adjusting the amount of monthly rent. The first method would be as follows: The tenant - who is of course an equity owner in the corporation - the tenant would pay rent, which would include monthly interest from the invested capital in his particular housing unit, taxes and maintenance costs. He would pay rent, he would pay equity accumulation, which he would decide - in other words, he could build up equity as rapidly as he wanted to or as slowly as he wanted to; this would be his choice; no compulsion. -- (Interjection) -- No compulsion. A voluntary scheme, Jim. And he would pay rent, he would pay equity accumulation, and he would pay the monthly share of the annual dividend on his accumulated equity. So he would pay these three payments each month.

Now, a second method of adjusting the amount of rent. The individual would pay rent plus the monthly share of the annual dividend and accumulated equity. Now the first method could be chosen, for example, by a young family, which has two people working, no children. They can build up equity quickly. The second course of action could be adopted by a family whose children have grown up. The third method - in the third method the couple would pay the rent minus the monthly share of the annual dividend on accumulated equity. This could be adopted by the young family with children. And a fourth method would involve the payment of rent, minus the monthly share of the annual dividend on accumulated equity, minus the proportion....

MR. BILTON: I wonder if the honourable member would permit a question?

MR. JOHANNSON: At the end. Thank you.

MR. BILTON: I wonder what he is telling us now has to do with the resolution.

MR. JOHANNSON: If the honourable member would be patient for one moment, I'll explain. It has a relevance, although he may not see it. The fourth method, as I said, of adjusting the amount of monthly rent, would involve payment of rent minus the monthly share of annual dividends on accumulated equity, minus a portion of accumulated equity, which would be insured. Now this last method would be the method adopted by the retired couple, and it could involve reducing the cost of housing for the retired couple to zero; to nothing. And this is the relevance. This plan would not save a retired couple \$150.00, it would save them the entire amount of money that they would ordinarily spend on housing. So in fact, a retired couple would have free housing available to them through equity which they've accumulated in the corporation over the years. And this is the relevance.

I think -- I was going to go on but I think I've taken enough time. I think that as a long term solution to the problem of poverty among retired couples, this type of a plan has far more merit than the suggestion of the Honourable Member from Assiniboia. This type of plan, which as I

(MR. JOHANNSON cont'd.). . . said was not proposed by a Socialist; the man who proposed it is a very pragmatic individual - it's a broad approach to the problem of poverty among retired people; it's a long term solution to the problem of poverty among retired people; and I think the NDP could support it as a cooperative. Liberals and Conservatives could support it as a mutual fund -- (Interjection) -- You are. Fine. So I would hope that the Minister of Municipal Affairs will give very serious consideration to this particular proposal.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. ENNS: I wonder if the last speaker would permit a question. Mr. Speaker, in his closing remarks the member indicated that this plan that he is advocating was not drawn up by a Socialist, but I wonder, would he feel embarrassed or in any way thought that I was using a smear tactic if I described it as a Socialist program?

MR. JOHANNSON: Not at all.

MR. ENNS: Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Probably you will be more confused than I when I've finished what I have to say, but -- I don't know whether that's possible or not but we'll try our best. I supported it to see whether the Minister of Finance could rustle around and find that money in such short a period, the amendment, and if he could have I would have been asking where could he get that sort of money in such a short time.

But Mr. Speaker, really getting to the serious part of this proposal, I don't like it. I don't like the program under which it has been requested because it doesn't arrive at an over-all assistance for those people that need additional money. It will look after somebody that is living in a large urban centre in which the municipality can assist in assessment, but it won't look after anybody who is not living within a taxable area, and of course then again I refer to the many people that live on Reservations that have the problem of not having enough money at a particular time. (I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I've even chased you out of the Chamber, but you can't have a captive audience all the time, I suppose.)

I think that the problem can be answered, and can be answered either by the provincial or the federal government, and that is the fact that if the people need more money on an individual basis, then let them apply and give it to them, because on this basis somebody could get an exemption and it would be an unfair one. They could perhaps require the exemptions at the time it was given to them, and the next day they could have the additional money that wouldn't require this assistance, and so I think it washes it down the drain; I think it moves it on at the municipal level. So then this government is going to have to pay the municipal government additional moneys, and in changing hands it's going to cost more and more, and of course the province will again turn to the Federal Government and request additional money.

So I don't agree with it on that principle. I think the principle is that we have advanced, as far as the Old Age Security, in that these people get a given amount when they become a certain age in life, and if they require more they can apply for it and tell them that they need more than X number of dollars, and they can rise to, what is it? - \$109.00. If they need \$125.00, then they should be able to apply for that amount, and they should say that "we have a house," and I believe, as I think most members do, that if somebody has over the years saved in some way, shape or form, and acquired a house, then just because they are not able to work any more they shouldn't have to lose that house because they can't pay the taxes. That was the case at one time, but I'm sure that if people have worked over many years and acquired enough money and enough will to buy a home, and enough desire, then I don't think they should lose it just because they have arrived at that age where they can't work any more or that one of the family has passed away, or for many of those circumstances, so really I say that this doesn't really cover much. It's a good political gimmick, I suppose in a way, but I'm not sympathetic at all towards this type of approach. If it's the only alternative, well then it'll help some, but it isn't equal to the challenge of looking after all of the old age pensioners. It's good but it doesn't go far enough.

Now then, the last speaker has given us a philosophy on what he thinks should be brought forward, and I hope that we're not just hearing about a duplication of another program, because there are these types of programs available, and if you have to change it to call it Co-op or something to make it more acceptable for this particular government, well then call it that instead of low-dividend housing. Call it that instead of applying for an application for Central Mortgage and Housing. But today, people, young people, don't look at the house that they live in

(MR. BEARD cont'd.). . . . as their own in the same basis as people did 30 or 40 years ago, where they had no alternative except to pay cash or make the particular deal on their own ability to deal with the person who was selling the house. In fact, most houses, I suppose, were bought for cash at that time. So that was your house and that was your castle, and this was your equity in life and it was very important. But today, where you have a basis of Central Mortgage and Housing getting into the field of financing most of your house, then really the only thing that you regard as your ownership in that house is the down payment of the house itself. The monthly payments of principle, interest and taxes are actually rentals that carry on for years; and if you sell a house that you've partially paid for, then you first of all say you want your down payment back; and secondly, if you've lived in it five years, you really don't say that you can expect any more than your down payment back because the depreciation has taken care of what you've put back into the house. The only thing that you assess is whether the value of the property is any more or any less, and so that is the same system that we've worked under reasonably well.

The only thing is this government has never got around to get low dividend housing going, and whether you transfer your equity from one community to another isn't as desirable a thing, I don't think, by having to join a co-op as just going out and saying to the government, you be the co-op, you be the owners of these houses and we will rent them from you on a basis of an ability to pay. And this is the same as need. If you need a subsidy of so much you get it, or if you have the ability to pay then you pay for it. But I think this again is offering the old age pensioner the same old half a loaf when he is asking for a loaf.

So on that basis I think that the government should be very careful in accepting this type of proposition because it's not an answer; it's not the complete answer, it is only a partial answer, and as far as I'm concerned it will only affect those people in the larger areas. The larger the area the more opportunity they are going to get to take advantage of it, but as an overall plan for all of Manitoba, I say no, this is not going to be the answer because for one thing some municipalities may feel they can do this and others won't. If you went down to the small municipalities then maybe they again would become a personal problem in respect to those that are living there. So I don't think that this is the proper answer. I think the government, if anything, has to go a little further and get together with the senior government and say to them, this is the problem; we've got to face it together; we can't load it on to municipalities; we have to accept the responsibility because these people have by and large through their lifetime lived in many many areas of Canada which may have been from one coast to another.

So it isn't the problem of the municipality in which they live now, it is Canada, in which they have spent either all their lifetime or a great deal of their lifetime, and I think this does become the responsibility at the highest level and that is the Federal Government. If they're not willing to go ahead, well then I think we should be on some other type of complementary program.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, apparently my friend from Churchill didn't understand the resolution because this is not loading anything on the municipalities. In fact what it says is the government must rebate the municipalities for any consideration given to these people, so it is not loading on any of the municipalities. As I said before, this would be a tremendous problem and a great burden on many of the small municipalities in Manitoba, and if we would have carried out the recommendation the Minister of Education had in this House a couple of years ago this would have been the case, that it would have almost eliminated the total assessment base that was in any small town, and for this reason, in my motion, the government must reimburse each municipality for any consideration given to these people.

The other point the Honourable Member for Churchill mentioned was it would not give any consideration I believe to the people up north. I would say this is wrong. It would; it would give to any person in any town. It applies to everybody the same. Of course it wouldn't give anything to anyone on the reservations, our native people, but our native people do not pay property tax so this wouldn't be a factor.

The other point, I listened with interest to the Honourable Member for St. Matthews and he has made an interesting point on the other two issues that he raised. I was most disappointed with his comments. He mentioned that he has more people in his constituency, old age people that are receiving assistance, than I would have in my constituency, and Mr. Speaker, I am most disappointed if any member in this House is only concerned about his constituency. I'm concerned for the whole Province of Manitoba and for all the people in Manitoba, and what policy is

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.). . . . good for my constituency, I would hope and wish it would be a good policy for the rest of the province. So in that respect I think that I was most disappointed.

Mr. Speaker, the other point that he raises - and I wasn't going to bring insurance, auto insurance into this debate but the member did - and I'm sure that the member must agree with me that -- and I was glad that he told us, he said specifically that the government is acting strictly politically by bringing out insurance in this instance because it was promised in the election campaign. And this is the whole problem, Mr. Speaker, because as far as I'm concerned, I think the government should be acting on facts, on studies, and really can they give a better deal to the consumer, a better and a cheaper rate, and this is the whole thing. To say that the government promised it in the election and this is why they're bringing in, I think it's unfortunate that this is the attitude of the government.

He also mentioned that the people on this side mentioned that you're maybe wanting to go to the people this time, and again I say this is also unfortunate if the government purposely is trying to engineer a defeat on the insurance issue - most unfortunate. I think we've had so many elections in this year that the people are really getting fed up, and to say to the members on this side, either you support it or not, we got a gun to your head and you're going to force an election, I think it's unfortunate that's the attitude the members take.

Mr. Speaker, I was most disappointed with the House Leader - not the House Leader, the Minister of Labour, because I know he gets carried away on many of his speeches in this House, and when he gets carried away most members sort of have a little fun with him and enjoy his dissertations and just take it as a joke. But on a more serious vein, I consider the member quite serious and I think he's a humanitarian, but I was most disappointed with his attitude in respect to this resolution because I personally feel that this government is preoccupied with auto insurance, not even based on fact because it was a political promise. Because what have we got here, Mr. Speaker? We're talking about 82,000 old security pensioners in this province. There's 46,000 receiving partial or total supplement; there's 60 to 50 of these people live in apartments. We're talking of less than 50 percent of them living in their own homes, and if you really calculate it, what it amounts to by giving them a \$2,000 exemption, or even if we went further and removed total education costs to these people, we're talking in the neighborhood of 360 to 600 thousand dollars. This is peanuts, Mr. Speaker, and I think it is a most important issue before this House today at this session, because these people do have a problem; they are being forced out of their homes and this government is not giving it attention. -- (Interjection) -- Sure.

MR. SCHREYER: The honourable member seems to have taken some trouble to calculate how much money it would cost to give some alleviation to these people, older people on lower incomes. Did he take the trouble to calculate how much was the saving to them by reducing Medicare by \$100.00 a year?

MR. PATRICK: Yes, I did. Mr. Speaker, I'm talking about people that are getting a Medicare Card. These people have not received anything in consideration of Medicare; they were already getting a Medicare Card.

MR. SCHREYER: . . . cost the Crown to reduce Medicare premiums for those on lower income? Does the honourable member know?

MR. PATRICK: Yes, I do.

MR. SCHREYER: How much?

MR. PATRICK: Yes, I do. Yes, I do.

MR. SCHREYER: How much?

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I'm talking about 360 to 600 thousand dollars that would relieve many of these people who are faced out of their homes today, and the government has said they have \$800,000 surplus. Is it such a big problem to give some consideration? I don't think it was a big problem because you have the money, you stated so, and I'm sure if you didn't have it you would have been able to find it because it's not a large amount; it is a small amount. And I know and I agree with many of the members here, it does not solve the problems for all the people. Sure there's other people, and I could talk about people on poverty, there's just as many people on poverty today that are getting worse than they were last year. The people bounded by CPR tracks, Arlington, in that area in the mid-centre of Winnipeg by the CPR tracks, their condition is getting serious, more serious each year. Has the government to this date considered any kind of income supplement for these people? No. You didn't have enough time, and I agree this takes time, but this is an area that I think it does need immediate

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.). . . . consideration because really today the municipal governments are embarrassing you and forcing you into situations where they are taking some action. They're bringing bills to this House - St. Vital, St. Boniface, Charleswood - and they're asking for this legislation so they'd be able to do it. Why? Because they have these people coming to the municipal offices and saying, look, I can't pay this tax. And when you're talking about \$360,000 or \$600,000 - it's somewhere in between that area - I think it's a small amount, it's peanuts, and surely the government should have considered this. Personally, I think that we are pre-occupied with. . . .

MR. SCHREYER: Why didn't you do it last year?

MR. PATRICK: I could be just as critical of the former administration in this respect. The point is that the government had accepted this resolution last time, last session - it's been before here for a couple of years now - and we're saying well, we'll study it more. How many studies do we need? I mean everything is based on studies and our libraries have collected reports and the dust is collecting on it, because we need more studies, and. . . .

MR. SCHREYER: Would the honourable member permit a question? Can the honourable member tell me why he objects to us asking for 18 months to implement the four major proposals of our election program, four major programs which we intend -- two already in effect; one in the works now; a fourth one by the end of the 18th month approximately. How does the honourable member compare that with the fact that a major Liberal promise to bring in The Canada Development Corporation at the federal level has been in six successive Throne Speeches and is not law yet?

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I hope the First Minister doesn't blame me for what Ottawa has done or has not done. I'm sure if the First Minister would get up in this House and say, look, this is what we're going to do for these people, this is our program, this is our platform and we're going to carry it out within the next 12 months, I'd sit down and I'll say great.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I said that within 18 months the matter of real estate taxation and education costs, which is really at issue here, that we will be treating it in the way that we said we would. -- (Interjection) -- What did you give them?

MR. PAULLEY: You didn't even consider it.

MR. SCHREYER: You nailed them with \$204.00 a year in health premiums, so don't ask any questions.

MR. BILTON: You collected the 20 million to do it. You collected the 20 million to do it. Don't take too much credit, we're buying it. -- (Interjection) -- Now Russ, you may go for a walk first.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia may continue.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I again hope I can convince the First Minister that this is a very important issue and I think it should have had priority before automobile insurance. The First Minister was out of the House and I didn't want to bring automobile insurance into this debate but the Member for St. Matthews did, and again while he's in the House I wish to repeat it. I hope that he's acting on facts and studies because the Member for St. Matthews said we'd politically promised it. If it costs more or not that's irrelevant, but we're going to bring it in, and I think that shouldn't be an issue with any government. I think that any government should act responsibly and say look, we're going to act on facts and we're going to prove it and show it to you, and up to this date this has not been done. I'm just bringing this in. I think that this is a very important issue because, Mr. Speaker, I've had people come to see me, I've had people come with problems and say look, I don't know where I can find accommodation but I am behind \$500.00, or my second year tax is not paid; what can I do? I know the Member for St. James, or Sturgeon Creek can confirm this, they've had people come before council and I think the council has acted in some instances where they have given some consideration in that respect. We've had three or four members speak on this where the municipalities themselves are bringing in legislation here so they can do something, and if the cost factor would have been so extremely high I could understand nothing could be done, but I feel that these people should have the right, these people should have the right. . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . get the money -- Where?

MR. PATRICK: You have \$800,000 surplus; I'm talking about between \$360,000 and \$600,000; that's what I'm talking, to do this. That's what the Finance Minister told us. So I think it should be the right of any individual, our senior citizen should be able to live out the rest of his life in dignity in his own home and not be forced out, and I think it is an important

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.). . . . issue, and I think that this is something that we should have been dealing with this session because, as you will recall, last fall the government said this is what we're going to deal immediately because it must have priority, but this has not happened. This has not happened. I will not have much more to say, but any paper that you've picked up in the last two years, every single one - soaring taxes costing people some of their homes; and this is what you have and all kinds of it. I don't think that I need to bring it up any more, but I wish to point out to the Honourable Member for St. Matthews again, when he stated that the co-operative housing will solve all the problems and they'll buy the homes from the old people and get them to come in a co-operative, surely it has some merit and we need more accommodation, but the point is, the member will have to respect that it's still the desire and the wish of over 85 percent of the people in Canada to be able to own their own home, not to be forced into public housing. It's still the desire of these people to own a home of their own, and I think this could be accomplished.

The government of Ontario is doing a pretty good job. Through their home owner easy plans for many of their people, by subsidizing interest rates, by low down payments and through condominium concepts, they are making provisions for these people, for young people to be able to purchase their own homes, and they've done a good job. I feel that this is an area that we can do much more than we have been doing to the present time. But you say that co-operative housing, or public housing, will solve everything. I don't think it will, because it is the desire of the people to be able to own their own home. This is what the statistics say. This is what the study recommends. I agree that it'll fill the gap if we have to proceed and do something, but not to say this is going to solve it.

So, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to -- I see the Honourable Minister of Labour is out of the House again. I'm most disappointed in his actions. I said if there is a member in this House that's one which I thought was a real humanitarian and that's Mr. Paulley, Russ Paulley not the other one, but I was disappointed in his actions today, really disappointed, because a year ago, two years ago, it was a priority item; it was urgency. Today it's not, and we're preoccupied with auto insurance which is not based on facts. I will accept the First Premier's notice to the House that within 18 months we'll have legislation in respect to property tax. I hope that he'll -- I'm sure that they could have explained it to the House this year, this session, what the intention of the government is. So I hope that during the next session we will have legislation, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, it's not too often that the First Minister enters into a debate on a Private Member's Resolution, but what I heard today has been so unrealistic. Well, Mr. Speaker, may I ask this question of the last speaker. His ideal, which he holds up, the hope that we can do something to alleviate taxation for the Old Age pensioner, those on modest incomes, and his hope that we could do something as well to assist those people who have the hope of owning their own home, in the light of all that would he not agree that in order to achieve these ends it's a case of better distribution of available wealth? Isn't that what really lies at the heart of it? And if he says yes, well then I can accept all that he had to say. If he says no, then I say that his whole argument was nonsense.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, if I can answer, that's the whole principle of the resolution really. The reason I talked about homes, I was replying to a question of the Honourable Member for St. Matthews. That's why I brought it in. But consideration for the Old Age pensioners, I thought we could have dealt this session, because I did think -- (Interjection) -- Well, you had some money. You have \$800,000 surplus.

MR. JOHANNSON: Would the honourable member submit to another question? In view of his statement that he says people generally prefer to own their own houses - I think the figure he gave was 85 percent - would he care to tell us what the breakdown of new units in Metro Winnipeg was in 1969; how many were apartment units; how many rural housing; how many individual units. Give us this information, please.

MR. PATRICK: I would guess - that would be a guestimate - that apartments would probably be in the majority.

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

MR. PATRICK: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Has the honourable member support? Call in the members. We are now dealing with Resolution No. 5 appearing on Page 6, resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Allard, Barkman, Barrow, Beard, Bilton, Borowski, Boyce, Burtniak, Cherniack, Claydon, Craik, Desjardins, Doern, Einarson, Enns, Ferguson, Fox, Froese, Girard, Gonick, Gottfried, Graham, Green, Hardy, Henderson, Jenkins, Johansson, G. Johnston, F. Johnston, McBryde, McGill, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, Malinowski, Miller, Moug, Patrick, Pawley, Petursson, Schreyer, Shafransky, Sherman, Toupin, Turnbull, Uruski, Watt, Weir and Mrs. Trueman.

NAYS: Nil.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 49; Nays, Nil.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose and the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce in amendment thereto. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I ask the indulgence of the House to let this matter stand. (Agreed.)

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose and the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: I'm not going to be very long. I'll be very very brief; very brief. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I intend to be very brief on this. I'm in a very mellow mood this afternoon. I would like to say thanks to the marvelous hospitality of the Speaker of the House at noon today. I had dinner with him and I think that all of us should have that experience and we all probably would be much more mellow when we're here.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the amendment of this resolution. This subject has come up in this House last session and this resolution has come before us this session. It's very plain, the feeling of the men who have put the resolution and the many people that are in favour of this resolution on this side of the House, and the reasons why we're in favour of the resolution, but what the amendment basically says is that the province of Manitoba, the government of Manitoba, are again requesting that Ottawa come along and make some sort of a regulation - and I say some sort of a regulation - or take over a policy regarding estate tax for the whole of Canada. And this is very commendable. I think it's something that we would hope that the government of Canada would take a look at. But it's obvious that they're not, and it's very obvious that the province of Manitoba at the present time is not in line with the other prairie provinces, and that is basic.

Now I know the Minister of Finance has given all the arguments that there are that say that we don't have to be in line with the other provinces on this subject, on this rebate of estate tax. But it still has to get basically down to the problem that the province of Manitoba has one more - and I can't say piece of legislation because we don't have the legislation - but has one more obstacle in the path of the growth of Manitoba. We certainly cannot go along thinking that we can have things in this province that are going to cost people more money to be in it. And I know the argument will be from the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources that it's going to cost every person of the province X number of dollars to have this, but that argument doesn't hold water either. The argument again, Mr. Speaker, goes back basically that if the province of Manitoba is going to be consistent with the other provinces in the prairies so that we can grow as far as they will, so that people in Manitoba won't want to move to another province when they get to the point when there's estate tax involved - and it'll happen - we've got to get in line.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said, I was going to be brief, and as far as I'm concerned that's the basic issue. This province has to consider these facts. You just can't overlook them. You've got to be realistic, and the realistic thing is you can't sell something when you haven't got what the other people have to offer, and the province of Manitoba is not offering the people of Manitoba what other provinces are offering them, and in this respect we have to keep our heads out of the sand. We've got to be progressive on it and we've got to have a look at the estate tax. And I say, this is a "consider the advisability of" - again a resolution that considers, but the government is saying we are not even going to consider it. Their stand is very obvious, and they have to consider it. Maybe they don't have to consider it from the point of view of this resolution, but they have to consider it and come up with something regarding estate tax, and if you don't, as I said, you basically have not got what other provinces have to offer. And this is not going to help the people of Manitoba. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. CHERNIACK: I wonder if the last speaker would permit a question, Mr. Speaker. May I confirm my impression with him that, unlike his leader, he is in principle opposed to estate taxation. Well, I'll rephrase it if it's too difficult. May I rephrase it?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: You may rephrase it, yes.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, would the honourable member care to inform us whether or not he is in favour of the principle of estate tax?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to estate tax. I just said, in what I said here, the province of Manitoba have to be in line with the other provinces on the prairies. We have to offer the same benefits as the other provinces around us or we are not going to have the benefits for the people of Manitoba that the other provinces have.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I also will be very short. I certainly didn't intend to take part in this debate but, after listening to my honourable friend, either I don't understand what he is saying or he doesn't understand the amendment, and I suspect that he doesn't understand the amendment. He belongs to a party that went to Ottawa not too long ago and said, "We need more fields of taxation - need more fields of taxation for Manitoba. Give us some of this gravy." I know he wasn't a member of the party or the government -- (Interjection) -- that's right.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: You're right; now you can quit.

MR. DESJARDINS: You did. Oh no, but I won't quit. You would like me to quit but I won't quit. But you would like me to quit. Now you come back, you have something here, you have something here and they say, well, because the other provinces are saying, well, we are going to try to induce you to stay here so therefore forget this tax; forget this tax. He said you have to stay in line, you have to stay in line and to get in line because you've got to compete with them; you've got to compete with them. Isn't that exactly what he's saying? He's not against the estate tax but if the other provinces are saying, all right, we won't charge it, then he certainly has a valid point, a very valid point, because it is possible that some people will leave Manitoba to go to other provinces, but this is why; this is why -- I started by saying I don't think he understood this amendment; this is why he should support this amendment; this is why he should support this amendment because then there won't be these have-not provinces, and I think that it's fair, without knocking Manitoba, to say that compared to Alberta and maybe some of the other provinces we are a have-not province, and -- (Interjection) -- I beg your pardon? No. This is why you should vote for this. This is why you should vote for this.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, I would much prefer it if you would let me finish, and I'm not trying to duck anything because I don't intend to speak for half an hour.

MR. BILTON: You've got thirty minutes.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, just a minute. Now we are saying, let's go back to Ottawa and say, "You administer this. You collect this money and then you turn around and give it back to us and we won't be embarking on some kind of a give-away deal with the other provinces." Now, doesn't that make sense?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: You weren't listening, Larry.

MR. DESJARDINS: I tried to listen and I wish I ... As I said, maybe I didn't understand you or you didn't understand the question because I know we're after the same thing.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: You weren't listening.

MR. DESJARDINS: I know we're after the same thing. We need more money, we need more money for Manitoba and we need more of the wealth that comes from Canada in general, and this is why they, the former government - I'm sure this government will go to Ottawa and will say, "Give us more money or give us, leave us more taxation. Let us have some of the ways to tax, to get some of the tax ourselves, get out of certain things." But if we follow this and then follow the suggestion of my honourable friend again, this is just a start. You know what's going to happen if we say all right, Alberta and B.C. and these people have no estate tax so we haven't any estate tax. For a couple of months we're on the same level as them, but they're not going to be satisfied with that. They're a "have" province compared to us, so next time they might give the provincial income tax back. You'll have to -- oh no, no, no. It's been done. It's been done. It's done in Alberta. It's been done in Social Credit -- and my friend I'm sure can give you a speech on that.

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.)

So what are you going to do? You're going to say the same thing; you're going to get up and you're going to say, "We've got to stand in line. We've got to see that Manitoba progresses, and we've got to do the same thing." Now this is what this resolution -- you say it's all right? Well, where are you going to get your money then? Where are you going to get your money? You're crying for more money from Ottawa and then when they say, "All right, tax in this field," you give it away.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: It was going to be done.

MR. DESJARDINS: What was going to be done?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: It was going to be done.

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes. What was going to be done is that you would turn around and say to the people, "You don't pay any more taxes here." Is that what was going to be done? Right?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: No.

MR. DESJARDINS: So you can compete with the other provinces. And we're saying -- we're not saying we're not going to look at it, we're saying here in this resolution that you are going to continue to make representation to Ottawa and you're going to say it's no use giving us the field of taxation if the "have" provinces are going to go back and give it back to the people. Anybody that has anything here in this province will leave because they want a good deal, and this is what I'm afraid of and I certainly -- I think we're all after the same thing. We're after more money but then we know we have to compete, and if this, if the Ottawa government, and I think they should, if they act on this they are taking this field of unfair competition away, and this is why we have a Federal Government. This is why; to spread this wealth around or there's no point at all.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: They don't spread it around though.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, they're certainly not going to spread it around if they say here, "You have the right to tax this," and you say, "Okay, we'll tax and give it back." That's exactly my point. I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, apparently I can't explain my thoughts well enough, but the members, some of the members on the opposite side don't seem to understand.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, will the honourable member permit a question?

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, I would now. Yes.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Did he not hear me say that the amendment was not a bad idea but it's not happening; we could wait forever?

MR. DESJARDINS: My friend says it's not a bad idea but it's not happening. Well then, Ottawa's not giving us much more money, so any time we go and ask money to Ottawa and say well, it's not happening, forget it. This is a real pessimist attitude to take. -- (Interjection) -- What do you mean, it's not for members?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Is it going to go ahead or not?

MR. DESJARDINS: Eh? -- (Interjection) -- 25 percent. All it says: "THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba continue to press upon the Government of Canada the desirability of exclusive Federal administration of Estate and Succession taxation in Canada, with equalized compensation for the provinces in lieu of any direct provincial sharing in Estate Tax revenues."

MR. F. JOHNSTON: That will take as long to get that through as to get the same thing through the heads of you fellows.

MR. DESJARDINS: It might be. It might be. Some people are a little smarter than others and some people are dense. Some people are dense, but if you're so smart that you're going to start on a give-away program, if you want to start on a give-away

MR. F. JOHNSTON: No, no.

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . competing with Alberta and B.C., you'll wake up one of these days without your pants and you'll see what you can do for Manitoba.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Saskatchewan too?

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, I hadn't intended to enter into this debate, but after listening to the Member for St. Boniface I feel that there's perhaps a few words that should be said on this matter.

When we look at the amendment, what does it really tell us? In essence, it's saying that this province is not willing to compete with the other provinces. This province wants to go crying to Ottawa saying that "we can't look after our estate tax properly; will you look after it for

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd.). . . . us and give us some of the money back?" This is what this government over here is trying to say, that they can't even look after their own affairs, and it's a crime for the people of Manitoba to have such a thing perpetrated on them.

MR. GREEN: May I ask the honourable member a question?

MR. GRAHAM: Now, Mr. Speaker. . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, is he not aware that that was the position of the former administration?

MR. GRAHAM: Will you shut up, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I believe on or about the first of May the honourable member had taken the adjournment of this amendment and subsequently has lost his right to speak. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, just before the amendment goes to a vote, I raised a matter speaking on the budget debate yesterday. I for one cannot and do not subscribe to the amendment. I feel that our people, when they have earned an estate over the years, they have paid taxes and therefore they should not, the estate should not go and be taxed over again, and this is exactly what they are doing. The matter is this, that it can happen that one estate might be taxed two or three times within a matter of a few years and that another estate might not be taxed for 20, 25, 30 years, and there is no --

A MEMBER: . . . to 40.

MR. FROESE: Pardon? Yes, I would think so, and therefore I don't think -- it's not even fair to put in a taxation of this type, and I do not subscribe to the principle of taxing estates any way. I feel that this type of a taxation should be abolished, not that we would, or the other provinces, would have to be rebating. I think it should be abolished altogether and forget about it, because I feel that the taxes have been paid by the people that have owned the estates when they were alive and therefore they should not be subject to further taxation after the person is deceased.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the amendment? The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Winnipeg Centre, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: I'm just informed that the honourable member of the adjournment had also lost his right to speak.

MR. BOYCE: I beg to move, seconded by the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution No. 8. On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. George, which I am holding.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order here. Before you wish to make a ruling, I would like to make a few comments. I think the amendment is out of order. I feel the amendment is completely isolated from the principle, or from the resolution, the original resolution, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think that this amendment is definitely out of order. I have no objection if the member for St. George wants to suggest or pay a compliment to the Minister, the Minister of Agriculture. This certainly is up to him, but I think he should form his own resolution, and if agricultural things get a little better we might even support him, but I feel the way it is now it's isolated from the principle and I thought I'd wish to bring this to your attention.

MR. WATT: Well, Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, I am in full agreement with what the Member for La Verendrye has just said, and I see no connection whatsoever with the amendment to the resolution. If the amendment is intended to nullify the effect of the resolution, I think that it should have been brought in on a separate resolution by itself and not as an amendment to the resolution that is before us. It has nothing whatsoever to do with the calling of the Committee on Agriculture, and I strongly urge you, Sir, to consider very carefully when you're making your decision on this amendment.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may, on the point of order, point out that there has been an established custom in this House that the type of amendment as proposed by the Honourable Member for St. George has been accepted by many Speakers in this House in the past

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) . . . and, Sir, may I quote Beauchesne Fourth Edition, Citation 203, that: "A sub-amendment which proposes an alternative to the original motion is in order, provided it is relevant to the question," and certainly the actions of the Minister of Agriculture of the Province of Manitoba and his representations on behalf of the farmers of Manitoba is relevant to the proposition proposed by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

I say again, Mr. Speaker, that this type of amendment has been accepted in the past by administrations of different political parties, and I respectfully suggest, Sir, that there is no question of doubt that the motion is in order, and Beauchesne clearly points out in many of its citations and annotations, an amendment which deletes all of the words following the word "that" in the operative part of a resolution, has been deemed to be acceptable in this House, and indeed in the House of Commons at Ottawa.

MR. SPEAKER: I wish to thank the honourable members for their additional comments, and I intend to take them under advisement.

On the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Riel in amendment thereto, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek in further amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the amendment that is before us - I don't think I would want to speak on the main motion or the earlier amendment made. The amendment before us has to deal with the matter of having the request made at an early date, and while we voted on a similar amendment this afternoon, I do feel that we should take the matter in hand immediately. I think the request that is made in the Resolved part, that a Special Committee of the Whole House study the entire matter of that as referred to in the main motion, and I certainly go along with the amendment and the sub-amendment and that we take the matter under hand and start working on it. Surely enough, we've had very few committee meetings so far at this session. We could have made use of some of the mornings during the present session and devoted them to study on matters that have been requested in this resolution and in others, and I feel that the amendments, the one that is before us and the one that was voted on this afternoon, are quite in order and that we do support them, that we not just ask the government to consider a certain thing but that we know that action will be forthcoming and that something will result from the consideration.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I won't speak to the main motion now, but I am in support of the amendment as it is proposed.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I follow just the Minister of Finance's comments regarding this amendment. The Minister of Finance indicates that he opposes the principle of the amendment but that he is in the process of making a further amendment which will subsequently delete the words, and therefore it's a matter of little consequence if the amendment passes at this stage because he intends to make a further amendment. So I want to indicate to the House that if this amendment does pass in the form in which it is, that it's because the Minister of Finance doesn't take issue with it, but he still intends to introduce another amendment which may not satisfy my honourable friend.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The question on the amendment. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Labour, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Assinibola. The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, I don't wish to speak at great length on this because many of the arguments I'm going to use are really old hash and I'm sure all members have heard them before. However, they are, in this kind of issue, worthwhile repeating and I think that we shouldn't treat this matter lightly; rather we should stand up and be counted in favour of this issue.

We can't deny, Mr. Speaker, that last Session we hurriedly approved the changing of the age requirement as far as voting in provincial and municipal elections. I don't begrudge this kind of move at all; as a matter of fact I was in favour all the way and I still am. However, I must confess that we in government did a bit of a messy job because we should have considered it more in depth. We should have thought of the consequences and the situations that arise that are seemingly conflicting with each other. If you lower the voting age in one case and not the age of another type of activity, I think that we're presenting unnecessary inequities in our system.

We permit people of 18 years old to assume responsibilities that are as much and more than voting. We permit them to be married at 18, and this means assuming responsibilities. We permit them to -- we permit them, not only permit them, we expect them to stand strong and defend our principles in our country. We expect these people to assume some responsibilities on one hand, and on the other hand we say to them, "You know, you are not to be trusted. We can't afford to take chances on you. We can't trust you with a vote because you might do foolish things with this." -- (Interjection) -- Now, I'm not so sure -- if I heard the member right, I'm not so sure that that would be foolish.

There is one underlying argument, however, that doesn't seem to be mentioned often and this is the one I'm most concerned about. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that people assume responsibilities as they are called upon to do so. I mean by that, that the young people in our society, who are sometimes called irresponsible, might be just exactly that because we have not given them the responsibility. I've been dealing with young people for many years, and in my experiences I find that school students and young people generally, are very willing and very able. The only thing lacking is that too often we are a little restrained when it comes time to give them that kind of responsibility. I go even further, Mr. Speaker, and I say that adults are very much the same. I would not have to assume responsibilities if somebody else does it for me. If someone is going to provide me an income, I don't really have to worry about it and likely I will not. If somebody provides me with a means of transportation, I wouldn't have to worry about it and therefore I would not. And I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that in order to use the willing responsibility that these people, these young people have, the best way we can do it is by giving them that kind of responsibility, and therefore not only in the field of voting but in the field of all legal respects that require this kind of limitation.

MR. GREEN: I wonder if the honourable member would permit a question?

MR. GIRARD: Yes, certainly.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I understood my honourable friend to say that if someone provided him with an income that he then wouldn't do anything, he wouldn't worry about it. I'm sorry, I . . .

MR. GIRARD: Mr. Speaker, I think he misinterpreted what I said. I said that if somebody provided me with that need, a need I have for a certain income, if somebody provided me with that income, this is one area I would not have to assume the responsibility in. Now it's quite different, Mr. Speaker, if you say well that means you're going to do nothing. I might not be necessarily productive in that area -- and I understand full well your question. I'd like to say, however, that if by giving the young people that responsibility, that they're going to assume it and they're going to become citizens that are probably better citizens because they are going to use their potential, their interest, and assume that responsibility.

And just to go a little further, I'd like to say, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly why I like to leave people generally assume the responsibility of making our system work. This means that if we look at the field of enterprises, this means in my view that if we, as a government body, assume the responsibility that should rightfully be assumed by individuals, or even groups of individuals, that we are in fact doing them a disservice in many circumstances because we are rendering them or we're removing from them a responsibility that they are

(MR. GIRARD cont'd)
willing and able to assume.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to dwell at this at length but I want to show that I have no hesitancy in supporting this resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Winnipeg Centre, that debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan has lost his right to adjourn debate.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, . . .

MR. FROESE: May I adjourn it -- oh. Are you going to speak?

MR. DOERN: No, I intend to adjourn it. If the Honourable Member wishes to speak, he may.

MR. FROESE: Yes. Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye that debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I would like to beg leave of the House to make a brief statement, if I may.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member is announcing something that relates to his constituency or something of that nature, then we have no objection, but if he is making remarks which he knows or should know would be in the nature of contentious matters, or which could give rise to debate then we don't.

MR. GRAHAM: It's not contentious.

MR. GREEN: Okay.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, tonight marks the 25th anniversary of the cessation of hostilities in the European theatre of the Second World War. As one who served in that theatre, I would ask the members of this House, as they leave this Chamber this afternoon, each in his own way to pay their respects to those who served in that conflict and paid the supreme sacrifice in defence of this nation and freedom from tyranny.

MR. SPEAKER: It is now 5:30.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Labour, that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House adjourned until 2:30 o'clock Monday afternoon.