

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
2:30 o'clock, Monday, April 26, 1971

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills.

PROVINCE OF MANITOBA

This is to certify that pursuant to a Writ of Election dated the first day of March, 1971, addressed to Mrs. Ena Pothier of St. Boniface, in the Province of Manitoba, Returning Officer for the Electoral Division of St. Vital, for the election of a Member for the Electoral Division of St. Vital, in the place and stead of Jackson A. Hardy, who, since his election as representative of the said Electoral Division of St. Vital, hath resigned his seat, Derek James Walding, Optician, of St. Boniface, has been returned as duly elected as appears by the Return of the said Writ of Election, which is now lodged of record in my office.

April 26th, 1971.

PROVINCE OF MANITOBA

This is to certify that pursuant to a Writ of Election dated the twenty-sixth day of February, 1971, addressed to John Zaplitny of Oak Brae, in the Province of Manitoba, Returning Officer for the Electoral Division of Ste. Rose, for the election of a Member for the Electoral Division of Ste. Rose, in the place and stead of Gildas L. Molgat, who, since his election as representative of the said Electoral Division of Ste. Rose, hath resigned his seat, Aimé Rawleigh Adam, rancher, of Ste. Rose du Lac, has been returned as duly elected as appears by the Return of the said Writ of Election, which is now lodged in my office.

April 26th, 1971.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present to you Aimé Rawleigh Adam, Esquire, Member for the Electoral Division of Ste. Rose, who has taken the Oath, signed the Roll and now claims the right to take his seat.

MR. SPEAKER: Let the Honourable Member take his seat.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present to you Derek James Walding, Esquire, Member for the Electoral Division of St. Vital who has taken the Oath, signed the Roll and now claims the right to take his seat.

MR. SPEAKER: Let the Honourable Member take his seat.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: I should like to direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have 45 students Grades 10, 11 and 12 Standing of the Lowe Farm Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. R. Dalby and Mr. K. Fast. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Morris. Also in the gallery we have 60 students from Grade 6 Standing of the Buchanan School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Breckman and Mrs. Benneault. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you all here today.

STATEMENT

MR. SPEAKER: Before proceeding I should like to make a statement which I hope will be of assistance to our new members and possibly a refresher to all honourable members. The question period preceding Orders of the Day has become a matter of concern to me. I well appreciate the importance of the question period and I am aware of the fact that of all the institutions in our democratic society certainly the Legislative Assembly ought to give the greatest opportunity for the expression and exercise of freedom of speech. I also feel, I am certain that the honourable members will concur, that the question period ought to be used only for the purpose intended. Our rules Chapter 6, Rule 46 on Page 23 fairly well defines the questions but is not completely specific. A perusal of Chapter 5 of the Fourth Edition of Beauchesne also did not provide me with concrete statements of the purpose of the question

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.) . . . . . period. I then went to an authority cited from time to time by Beauchesne, namely Cushing. In his "Law and Practices of the Legislative Assembly," 1907 Edition, Citation 1571 he states as follows: "Questions ought regularly to be such the answers to which will afford the information to the House relating to some pending measure or to some public event connected with the administration or to enable the House to form an opinion of the policy of the government."

It is interesting to note that Campion in a subsequent text written in 1929 entitled "An Introduction to the Procedure of the House of Commons" also states in comments on the matter of questions before the Orders of the Day as follows: "Most of the authorities agree that the privilege of asking questions is liable to be abused." Campion goes on to say that the first recorded question was in 1721 by Lord Cowper in the House of Lords as follows: "Whether there was any ground for a certain rumour." Today of course such a question would be ruled out of order.

May I also suggest although it may sometimes be necessary to preface a question for clarity that an assertion or an allegation of matters and inferences and opinions leading up to or prefacing to leading up to a matter dealing with a question of government policy which the Minister is asked to announce, discuss and declare, fall into the same category. It would also expedite matters if members extended the courtesy, which to the best of my information exists, on giving notice to Ministers in respect to questions when feasible in order that answers may be short, terse and to the point.

I should also like to refer the honourable members to Page 385 of the Manitoba Legislative Assembly Hansard, September 3rd, 1969, where the Honourable Speaker Hanuschak made similar references to the question period, and I quote: "May I remind the honourable members of Beauchesne's Fourth Edition, Citation 171, which reads in part as follows: 'In putting a question a member must confine himself to the narrowest limits. In making a question observations which might lead to a debate cannot be regarded as coming within the proper limits of a question. The purpose of a question is to obtain information and not to supply it to the House.' And further, the same citation states: 'A question oral or written must not be a speech however short.' Citation 181, subsection 1 of the same text offers counsel to Ministers: 'Questions must be answered briefly and distinctly and be limited to the necessary explanation though a certain latitude is permitted to Ministers of the Crown whenever they feel it necessary to extend their remarks with the view of clearly explaining the matter in question.' "

In conclusion I would like to quote Campion on Page 127 of "The Introduction to the Procedures of the House of Commons" in respect to questions as follows: "To be in order the question should be genuinely directed to seeking information or pressing for action addressed to a Minister who is officially responsible for the matter with which it deals and framed in accordance with the rule of constitutional usage and parliamentary etiquette." I am certain the honourable members will concur and cooperate with the Chair towards this conclusion.

There are two other matters which from time to time arise. Points of Order and the matter of Privilege. For my own edification, that it may be of benefit to the members as well, I should like to read the following into the record:

Points of order are questions raised with the view of calling attention to any departure from standing orders or the customary modes of proceeding in debate or in the conduct of the legislative business and may be raised at any time by any member whether he has previously spoken or not. Beauchesne's Fourth Edition Page 59, Citation 70: "A point of order may be raised with respect to the use of parliamentary expressions." Beauchesne's Fourth Edition, Page 130, Citation 155: "If a point of order consists in putting a question to the member speaking it is a mere interruption or if it is defective for other reasons the Speaker will sharply rule it out. A point of order cannot be raised on a point of order. Our rule No. 5, sub 1, provides that the Speaker shall preserve order and decorum and enforce the rules and shall decide all questions of order subject to appeal to the House. No. 5, sub 2, in explaining a point of order the Speaker shall state the rule or authority applicable to the case. See also our rules No. 29, 36 and 40.

Matter of privilege. Members sometimes raise so-called questions of privilege on matters which should be dealt with as a personal explanation or a correction either in the debates or the proceedings of the House. A question of privilege ought rarely to come up in the Legislature. It should be dealt with by a motion giving the House power to impose a

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.) . . . . reparation or apply a remedy. There are privileges of the House as well as of the members individually. Willful disobedience to orders and rules of parliament in the exercise of its constitutional function, insults and obstructions during debate are breaches of the privileges of the House. Libels upon members and as persons upon them in their relation to parliament and interference of any kind with their official duties are breaches of the privileges of the members. But a dispute arising between two members as to allegations of fact does not fulfill the condition of parliamentary privilege. I thank you.

Orders of the Day.

#### ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C. (Leader of the Opposition) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Labour. I understand that the Mayor of Flin Flon has requested the intervention of the Honourable Federal Minister of Labour. I wonder whether it is the intention of the provincial government to support that request?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Minister of Labour for the Province of Manitoba was a month and a half ahead of the Mayor of Flin Flon in requesting action on behalf of the federal authority into a matter under their jurisdiction. My honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, I am sure is aware that press reports have indicated that the Minister of Labour of Manitoba had lengthy discussions with the Federal Minister, and I want to report to my honourable friend that it appears that action will be taken to resolve this dispute quickly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition -- a supplementary?

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question. I wonder if the Minister of Labour will indicate to the House whether it is the intention to support the request by wire today of the Mayor of Flin Flon for the intervention by the Federal Minister of Labour.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition had been listening to what I said he would realize that ahead of the Mayor Flin Flon I had made this request.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to file the schedule of basic coverage, premiums on drivers and premiums on private passenger vehicles for the Autopac, the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Plan. I'll be making copies of this, Mr. Speaker, available to the Leader of the Opposition, House Leader of the Liberal Party, the Member for Rhineland and the other two Independent members of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, may I rise on a point of privilege? I understand the Minister of Municipal Affairs has . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I just believe I read a lengthy statement in regards to points. There are no points of privilege. If it's a matter of privilege of the House or the member, yes.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, privileges of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: The Minister of Municipal Affairs has made a statement to the press which carried a comparison of rights, quite lengthy stories in both papers, and I think it's the customary practice in this House and in the House of Commons to make statements to the members of . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. The point of order by the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: . . . make it absolutely clear to the House that the story that the honourable member is referring to was not from the lips . . .

MR. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order, I'm sorry. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, my concern is that I think it's the practice in this House, it always has been the practice of all Ministers and it's also the practice in the House of

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.) . . . . Commons, to make the statement in the House so all members of the Legislature including the Opposition could have, you know, the information before it's released to the papers. That's my point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I do feel it's incumbent upon me to reply to the remarks as a matter of personal privilege. The honourable member stated that the Minister of Municipal Affairs had released certain information to the news media and held up the page of the Winnipeg Tribune, I believe it is, in respect to last Friday. If the honourable member will read the article in question he will see that in no case did the statements alleged to have been made there did come from the lips of the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Secondly, I would like to tell the honourable member and to the House to provide them assurance that the information referred to was not released to the news media Thursday or Friday by myself or under my direction or under my knowledge, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. I do have . . .

MR. SPEAKER: There is no question, I'm sorry. There is no question before the House. If you wish to place a question before the House, yes. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Before the Orders of the Day I wish to place a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I believe him if he makes the statement -- if he didn't leak the information -- Can he tell me where the information . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. That's a statement, I'm sorry. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, this is on a matter of personal privilege. The information that was just released and tabled in the House has in fact been released to the press and is in the hands of the press prior to the opening of the House. We're aware as well that the Minister . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sorry. I just read a statement in regards to questions. I do believe you should state your questions. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I'm on a matter of personal privilege. A press conference has been called by the Minister dealing with the matters tabled in the House. It is my feeling, Mr. Speaker, that there is an obligation on the part of the Minister to make that statement in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: . . . matters raised by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, he is correct, a conference has been called. I intend to answer questions to the media rising from the statement that I have tabled in the House. This I gather is customary when major documents have been filed in the House. I feel I have a duty to the public of Manitoba to explain to the news media any questions they may have in regards to the documents that I file.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR (Virden): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this to the Minister of Health and Social Development. Would the Minister inform the House if raw sewage is still being dumped into the Red and Assiniboine Rivers by the University of Manitoba and the penal institution at Headingly?

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

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health & Social Development)(Springfield): Mr. Speaker, the question that has been directed to myself should be directed to the Minister of Mines and Resources and Environmental Control.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MCGREGOR: Mr. Speaker, then I'll direct this to the Mines and Environment.

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

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q. C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, there are areas in Greater Winnipeg from which raw sewage is still being dumped into the Red River. That is a responsibility which was to be overcome by the Metropolitan Corporation within a period of 10 years; I believe that they are within their schedule and the matters that the honourable member is referring to are being dealt with. But

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) . . . . there is raw sewage still being dumped in. I can't specify with regard to the second location that you mention.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Although we have not yet seen the table of insurance rates, may I ask him to inform the House whether the rates include only the compulsory coverage or do they include the supplementary coverage as well?

MR. PAWLEY: The rates filed in the House cover rates in regard to the basic compulsory package. We expect that in about one month's time we will have the additional rates in respect to the additional coverage.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question. I wonder if the Minister can inform the House why we do not have the supplementary coverage at this time?

MR. PAWLEY: The answer is very simple, Mr. Speaker. A great deal of work has gone into the preparation of the material that is already before the House; it was my anxiety that the information that you already have there be given to you as early as possible; that I should not hold back this information waiting for the additional information in regard to the supplementary rates so that you could work upon the information released to you. Just as soon as I can, I'll release to you the additional information.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question. I wonder if the Minister of Municipal Affairs can indicate to the House whether the figure is approximately 80 or 90 percent of the additional coverage, that 80 or 90 percent of the people in the province would now have to be able to compare this rate with the basic rate in the supplementary to be forthcoming?

MR. PAWLEY: The Leader of the Opposition has raised a point that is well appreciated. A large number of people would want additional coverage. I would like to say this to him, that we are satisfied that when we table the rates for the additional coverage, that those rates will indicate that the savings will be carried on from the basic into the supplementary or the additional coverage as we have done in respect to the basic, so if the honourable member is concerned about increased costs due to the additional coverage, let me assure him that I do not think he need have this concern.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition has had two supplementaries already. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister can indicate whether the coverage presented to us will in fact -- (Interjection) --

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

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs. If the fault is assessed by the courts that there is more than one automobile at fault, will only one deductible apply, or will the \$200.00 deductible apply in each case?

MR. SPEAKER: I should like to warn the members that we are starting to get into a debate on automobile insurance. I do think a lot of these details could be ironed out at a more appropriate time when the Minister's estimates come up before the House. I don't mind questions of clarification and I hope that they'll be brief. The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: I would like to answer the Honourable Member for Assiniboia because he has a valid concern that the practice commonly adopted in Saskatchewan will be extended in Manitoba in respect to both parties being at fault. Let me advise him that we intend to provide the same coverage as presently exists in Manitoba under the circumstances outlined by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: One more supplementary: I understand there are two separate rate categories, business and pleasure. What would you suggest that the differential is between business and pleasure. Would you consider driving to work as business?

MR. PAWLEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, the attempt that we have attempted to bring about here is to avoid the flat rating system which is followed in its most strictest form in Saskatchewan in many areas; we've been able to sophisticate the system here in that we do have the two classifications as mentioned by the honourable member. There will be the two groupings, one of course if presently known as the 013 rating group which we are carrying on where the rates will be lower than other premiums as they are at the present time under the present private insurance system. In respect to business and pleasure driving to and from work, there is the second group, but those rates, too, are lower than under the present system and there is a differential at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Could he advise the House on the results of meetings in Ottawa with respect to the cutbacks at CAE?

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry & Commerce) (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, as I informed the House last week, we have been endeavouring to set up a meeting with the appropriate authorities in Ottawa. Although we have worked very hard at this, we have not yet arrived at an appointment date, but it looks as though we will be able to meet with the appropriate people in Ottawa next Friday.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Would the Minister consider re-establishing the Air Canada policy committee prior to that time?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure we would be prepared to entertain that suggestion as well as other suggestions regarding tactics and strategy to keep the CAE base a viable operation here in Winnipeg. I did indicate to members of the House last week that we consider this to be a preliminary meeting and that it would be attended essentially by the Minister of Labour and myself plus advisors.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, my question is probably for the Minister of Health and Social Development; but if it is not him, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Premier would listen to the question. It's to do with the announced resignation of the Newstart Program Director at The Pas, three weeks ago. Who is running the program that entails the administering of 40 or 50 employees?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, if the Member for Portage la Prairie is referring to Manitoba Newstart, I should like to advise him that even though the name of the program is Manitoba Newstart, it is a federal operation. The only direct liaison with the province is that the province is asked to nominate one, possibly two persons for the Board of Directors of Newstart. I'm just not able to say at the moment whether it's one or two but that's really the full formal extent of the province's jurisdictional involvement. Other than that it is a federal operation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Honourable the Minister of Finance. The question is: Are farmers required to pay the 20 cent tax on diesel fuel when used in farm trucks?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (Minister of Finance) (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, the answer I know is not quite a "yes" or a "no".

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (BUD) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a friendly three-part question to the Honourable First Minister, and ask him whether he will be bringing the prestige of his person and his office to bear tonight to mark the return of Triple A baseball to the Stadium? If so, will he be throwing out the first ball; and if so will he be throwing from the right or from the left?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I really ought to know by now that when the Member for Fort Garry is asking a three-part question that he's probably given it a good deal of thought. If he has some yearning to participate in the opening ceremonies, I would be quite happy to delegate him to take my place since I am unable to be there.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, my question is either to the First Minister or the Minister of Youth and Education with respect to Newstart. As a result of the reply to the previous question, I'm wondering if there's been a change in the setup with respect to Newstart from the original which was the naming of all board members by the province plus the general manager?

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Youth & Education) (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the question is that the Manitoba Government is asked to submit names for the board; the Federal Government of course appoints the people from amongst the list submitted. There are four board members. The appointment of the general manager is a federal matter and as has been indicated, the present general manager has resigned and a new one is being appointed or has been appointed by the Federal Government.

MR. CRAIK: A supplementary. Mr. Speaker, can the Minister advise whether or not recommendations are being made by the Provincial Government with respect to the new manager?

MR. MILLER: No, Mr. Speaker. The Provincial Government is not involved in the appointment of the new general manager.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Honourable the Minister of Highways. When can we expect the border crossing at Gretna to be repaired so that traffic can resume between the two countries? Mr. Speaker, I think this is very important because both the Customs are closed and . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order. The honourable member very well knows the Minister is not forced to reply. Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure which Minister to direct my question to so I shall direct to the First Minister. Is it true that this government has decided not to accept bids from either Chrysler, Ford or GM for the purchasing of cars or trucks for the Province of Manitoba?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for La Verendrye might recall that at the last meeting of the Prairie Economic Council, the three Prairie Province Premiers did agree to a resolution - recorded motion, actually - that the three prairie provinces would desist from any further purchases of automobiles from these three companies until their policy with respect to fleet purchase discounts were reviewed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: My question is for the First Minister, Mr. Speaker. I wonder whether the First Minister would care to comment at this time on the threat by the Attorney-General of Quebec to control the flow of goods from Ontario into the Province of Quebec?

MR. SCHREYER: I don't think it would be proper for me to do so, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Finance. I wonder whether he can indicate whether it is the intention of the government to finance its long-term debt this year, its requirements, outside of Canada?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, that's a matter of policy which will develop.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question to the Minister of Finance. Has he received a communication from the Federal Government and from the Minister of Finance indicating the long-term debt is to be financed from the Canadian Markets?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct another question to the Minister of Highways. Is it the intention to construct a bridge at that point, at the Gretna border crossing where the washout is at the present time?

HON. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Minister of Public Works and Highways) (Thompson): Well, Mr. Speaker, since he's so persistent, I'll answer the question. He knows very well that we replace bridges or culverts as soon as it's possible. In the case of Gretna, we're looking into the idea of putting a bridge in instead of culverts because the culverts obviously can't carry the water. The problem there is, if we put a bridge there may be complaints from flooding the other side. The question is being looked at and when a decision is made we'll either put culverts in or the bridge.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to reply to the question from the Leader of the Opposition who asked if I'd received a letter. I've received several letters, the latest of which is confidential.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I suggest the Minister of Finance look in the Globe and Mail for his confidential letter.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I would appreciate if members would keep their comments to another time when we are debating matters and leave the Question Period to questions only. Orders of the Day. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: My question is for our Railway Commissioner. -- (Interjection) -- Well, I believe he's our Railway Commissioner. Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Pacific have requested an 11 percent fare increase to go before the Canadian Transport Commission, 11 percent increase on rail fares. Is it the intention of the Provincial Government to make any representation?

MR. PAULLEY: When we're in full possession of the request, we will make representation in the interests of the economy of Manitoba.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing:

1. The names and addresses of all persons who have joined the Civil Service of Manitoba since June 25, 1969.
2. The departments in which these persons are located.
3. The qualifications of each person who has joined the Civil Service since June 25, 1969.
4. The positions held by each of these persons.
5. Whether or not each of these persons filled a new position, or were replacing another person who had left the Civil Service.
6. The salaries of each of these persons.
7. In each case, was the position filled by competition through the Civil Service examination, or was the position filled by appointment.
8. If by appointment, who made the appointment.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, we have no objections to accepting this Order for Return but I wonder whether my honourable friend -- or may I first of all say that it will take considerable time to compile the information sought by my honourable friend and it will be rather costly because of the staff problem and research, to answer his question; and I'm wondering, Mr. Speaker, whether my honourable friend would be prepared to more clearly define "persons and positions". Does he mean casual personnel, term personnel who may have only been here for a short period of time? If that is the case it is far more comprehensive and will take a lot longer of time. If he's referring to established positions within the Civil Service it will be quicker in being produced and less costly. But basically, Mr. Speaker, we have no desire to hide the information and if my honourable friend would be prepared to clarify what he means by "positions and persons" I would be most happy.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to clarify. I would like to know anyone that has been employed for a longer period than three months, because a casual can be employed for 20 years, so I still would not get the information. So let me clarify - anyone that's been employed, as of this date, employed over three months.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside, (Stand) The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member from Birtle-Russell that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing how many appointments have been made outside the Civil Service Act in all departments, commissions and committees of the government during the years 1969-1970 and 1971; in each case the name, position, qualifications, in what city they last resided, remuneration and expenses allowed.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I don't object in principle to the Order but I am not sure that it is clear enough for the people responsible for preparing this kind of list to be able to answer it, because there are some general words that may need definition. The word "appointments", the word "committees" and in what city they last resided. Does that I presume mean prior to their living in Winnipeg and does that mean twenty years ago, forty years ago? I'm prepared to accept it but I would ask that there be either clarification by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge or an understanding that clarification may be obtained after I have an opportunity to discuss it with the Secretariat who would be responsible for preparing the answers so that we can get the kinds of answers that the honourable member wishes. On that basis I'm prepared to accept it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker that would be fine.

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

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I beg to move, seconded by the Member for La Verendrye that an Humble Address be voted to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor praying for copies of all correspondence, reports and agreements between the Government of Manitoba and the Jordan Wine Company; the Manitoba Development Corporation and the Jordan Wine Company; the Government of Manitoba and Valley Rouge Wines of Morris; the Manitoba Development Corporation and Valley Rouge Wines of Morris; the Manitoba Government and Tartan Breweries; the Manitoba Development Corporation and Tartan Breweries, since June 25th, 1969.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the importance of the Opposition obtaining information is of course crucial. At the same time there are long standing and well understood rules and guidelines with respect to the kind of information that can be made available in the public interest and incorporated in this particular request are negotiations that are still current, still under way, and therefore the matter should either be withdrawn or simply held in abeyance until negotiations are concluded.

It should be obvious to the honourable member that the making public of information in a matter that is under current negotiation can jeopardize the successful conclusion of negotiations.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: In compliance with the request, I accept the condition but I would like to remind the First Minister that I was told by the Minister of Industry and Commerce to make that an Order for Return question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, if I may, I believe that the Minister of Industry and Commerce did suggest that rather than have certain questions pertaining to these various firms asked as verbal questions that the honourable member would be better off to submit a written question or Address for Papers and he has done so, but that still does not change the fact that there are some matters still under current negotiation pertaining to several of these firms.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, just on the question. Do I understand from the Honourable Member for Portage that he agrees to withhold the Order for Return for the time being as suggested by the First Minister? And if that is the case, then it may be advisable not to proceed with the vote at this time, because if it is voted in the affirmative then it establishes an Order of the House. And I would like you consider that, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed?

#### GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading, government bills. The Honourable Minister of Finance. Bill No. 2.

MR. CHERNIACK: Could we have this matter stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Agreed) The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Would you call Bill No. 9, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 9. On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, may I say at the outset in speaking to this bill that I personally appreciate the action that the First Minister took a few weeks ago, in concert with the Minister for Urban Affairs and others of his colleagues, in appointing the special Boundaries Review Commission, Greater Winnipeg Electoral Boundaries Review Commission, to listen to and look into representations with respect to the proposed ward boundaries under the government's proposed one city plan. I think it was a constructive and a progressive step for the government to take and I would feel that I was being unfair and unnecessarily obtuse if I didn't commend them for taking that step. I also wish to extend my congratulations, Sir, to the members of that Commission for the work they did, for the obvious degree of sincerity

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.) . . . . and study and good conscience that they brought to their task.

On the basis of their report though, Mr. Speaker, and on the basis of my own point of view with respect to the government's proposal herein embodied in Bill 9, and on the basis of consultations that I have had with my colleagues and representatives of municipalities in the Metro area, I must register my opposition at this point to Bill 9 and declare myself, Sir, as being one of those in this Chamber who is against its passage. I recognize that the Minister has asked in good faith for the co-operation of the Opposition. He has asked, in his own words on Page 107 of Hansard, the afternoon sitting of Thursday, April 15th, that "honourable members assist us in dealing with this bill in the normal course with due consideration" and I respect that appeal. At the same time, I must say that I find it impossible and impractical at the moment for me to accept the bill as it stands or to comply with his sincere request for hasty or relatively hasty passage.

The Minister has said that there are three actual important factors contained in the bill, Sir, and he has detailed them as follows: One, he has said, is to enforce an element of budgetary review and control over municipal budgets to be given to the Minister for Urban Affairs. Two, he has identified as being the need to prepare for the possibility, and in his words he reminds us that it's a probability that there will be an election this fall in Greater Winnipeg for a new regional council, and that that being the case, it would be necessary to have enumeration take place immediately in order to prepare for that election.

The third matter of urgency on which he bases his rationale for the proposed legislation and his request for the speediest passage possible by this Chamber, is cited as being the fact that municipal elections in the Metropolitan area should be postponed in 1971 and that a follow through on that caveat simply would mean that existing councils would continue to operate until the end of this year.

Mr. Speaker, we have no objection to the second and the third so-called important factors in this legislation cited by the Minister in his introduction and presentation of same, but we find it difficult to accept factor No. 1.

Factor No. 1 is the purpose that the Minister has stated as being that "of enforcing an element of budgetary review and control over municipal budgets to be given to the Minister for Urban Affairs." We have extreme difficulty in accepting that factor and acceding to his request with respect to it, Sir. The fact of the matter is that the government would appear to be saying in this legislation that it is not prepared to trust the municipalities fully insofar as administration of their current revenues and their reserves -- insofar as the current revenues and reserves exist at the present time.

Now I know that in supporting his introductory address to the bill, the Minister has gone out of his way, gone to some length in fact, to suggest that he does trust the municipalities to follow through in their normal fashion. He says, for example, that he expects the municipal councils to carry on in the manner in which they have in the past and certainly not to violate or breach the expressed good faith of the government at the present time with respect to the legislation on one city amalgamation that is doubtless forthcoming in this session. He says that the purpose is to prepare for the possibility that there will be a change in municipal government for the next calendar year, and that being the case, it was felt it would be desirable that the budgets of the various municipal councils should be very much in line with the way they had been in the past, that the pattern established would be such as is not breached in this year by any effort to change the pattern so as to in any way force the new government, whatever form it may take, from being in a position of finding committed programs which were not expected in the normal course or indeed dissipation of accumulated assets to the benefit of any particular community.

The Minister went on to say that he has had some correspondence with all the municipal governments in Greater Winnipeg and he says that he has received, in one form or another, assurances to the effect that it was not the intention of councils to vary from their normal practice. One of the forms taken was one that was rather indignant, he says, in my suggesting the possibility that this would be done, but in any event, whatever form they took there was that indication and therefore what I am requesting, says the Minister, in this Bill is that there be the budgetary review and control which is spelled out in the first few sections of the bill.

Well as I said a moment ago, Sir, the Minister has taken some pains and gone to some length to advise the Chamber that he expects the municipalities will act in good faith, but it

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.) . . . . seems to me that intentionally or unintentionally, by the wording of this legislation itself and perhaps by the attitude and posture behind it and the posture implied in it, that he is not so sure that the municipalities in the Metro area will act in good faith. -- (Interjection) -- I beg your pardon? -- (Interjection) -- Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the honourable member if he feels that there should be a blanket guarantee, say by him or by somebody else equally responsible, that it would be actually the way that he and I hope it will be, and isn't that what legislation is all about?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Well I agree that that is what legislation is all about provided, Sir, that there is a mutual appreciation of co-operation between the two sides involved. I suggest to the Minister that my discussions with some of the municipalities and their representatives would indicate to me that the municipalities do in some cases feel that the Minister does not trust them fully to maintain or to apply restrictions to their programs and to wait for the final disposition of whatever one city legislation comes into this Chamber, and I suggest that in his own remarks in the House on Thursday, April 15th, which I read back from Hansard a few moments ago, that he's been exposed to that kind of thinking on the part at least of one of the councils because he said that one of them was rather indignant in his suggesting that that possibility be done. So although I agree, my answer to the Minister's question a moment ago would be a qualified yes, I think that communication has suffered to a certain extent between the Minister and some of the municipalities and there is a climate of anxiety, if not mistrust and suspicion, because of the unfortunate manner in which the government's approach to this question has been communicated to the municipalities. The legislation seems to say that the government really doesn't trust the municipalities to keep the bargain, keep the deal and wait for final disposition of whatever one city legislation should come in this year. The fact of the matter is that the municipal officials with whom I have had discussions on this subject have indicated to me that they were fully prepared to mark time with respect to their budgets and with respect to disposition of their revenues and with respect to the treatment of their reserves, pending disposition of the legislation that we know is going to be forthcoming and I think it is only logical and only natural that one or two of them reacted with some indignation to the actual wording of the legislation itself.

However, be that as it may, the fact of the matter is that point number one or factor number one that the Minister spells out as being one of the three important factors in this legislation, remains unacceptable to us on the basis of conversations that we've had with various municipalities in the Metro area simply because it implies an attitude of compulsion and betrays -- betrays perhaps a certain tendency on the government's part to trust municipalities only so far and no further. We take considerable exception and we feel considerable anxiety, Mr. Speaker, over the measure in the legislation that would place under the Minister of Urban Affairs the entire responsibility for budgetary review and control at the municipal level of all the area municipalities in Metro. We believe that that move represents a concentration of tremendous power in the hands of one Minister, in the hands of one man, Mr. Speaker, and we see it as being an unhealthy proposal potentially -- extremely unfortunate for the municipalities themselves and through them for the whole Metro area.

The Minister said in speaking to the bill last Thursday that the situation now of course -- and he added, "as all members must know" -- is that under The Municipal Act the municipal councils are required to file their budgets with the Minister for Municipal Affairs for review and consideration and he went on to say that I believe I'm correct in saying that they cannot be dealt with by municipal councils on second reading until they have been approved by the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Well I believe that there is an element at least of exaggeration, perhaps not intended, but at least of exaggeration in that claim, Mr. Speaker. It creates a false impression, it leaves a false impression, whether the Minister intended to do so or not is beside the point. I'm sure he didn't but the fact is that whatever the intention there is an incorrect impression left. The impression left is that this legislation really does nothing insofar as control of budgets in the municipal areas is concerned. In fact, Sir, it does a very great deal. Under the present Municipal Act, if I read it correctly, the budgets of the individual municipalities are certainly subject to review by the -- well speaking in figurative terms it's the Minister of Municipal Affairs but in actual literal terms it comes down to a

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.) . . . . director of municipal budgets within his department and the control that the Minister and his department exercise is limited to insuring that there are no violations of The Municipal Act. This at any rate is my interpretation of the legislation as it presently stands on that point. There must be no violations of The Municipal Act and the review by the Director in the Municipal Affairs Department is designed and calculated specifically to achieve that and insure that. But as for enforcing an element of budgetary review and control over municipal budgets - and I'm using the Minister's own words from Page 106 of Hansard - as for that kind of compulsion in the area of possible and potential spending, none exists under the present setup. This would be an innovation, it would be a new feature incorporated into municipal administration if Bill 9 went through; and therefore I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that whatever the intentions, good, bad, or otherwise, of the Minister, the unfortunate fact is that his remarks in speaking to the bill created a distinctly wrong impression on this point.

Mr. Speaker, in our opinion the bill before us, Bill 9, really becomes redundant in a reverse kind of way when one considers the fact that one of the most provocative and perhaps one of the most controversial pieces of legislation that all of us in this Chamber expect before us during the life of the present session is the government's bill proposing amalgamation of the municipalities in the Metro area into a one city complex. We are under no illusions about the harmlessness of Bill 9, for all the protestations of the Minister that it is really meaningless and that it really is a piece of enabling legislation and that it really has no effect on whether or not the Metro area will become amalgamated in municipal terms, for all those protestations we must say to you, Sir, that we dig in our heels and appeal to this Chamber to go slow on the point and to scrutinize the intent of this legislation very carefully. The legislation may be simply enabling legislation or preliminary legislation leading to the major and more provocative legislation, proposed legislation, that the government will bring in later in the session on the one city idea. But the spirit remains the same. We intend to make our positions clear on the one city proposal that this government will bring forward and we would be hypocritical -- I suggest we'd be hypocritical, Mr. Speaker, if we were to assume an attitude . . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I would like to suggest to the members who are bringing in foreign objects into this Assembly, this is not conducive to decorum. Would they kindly remove it please. I'm sorry to have to interrupt the honourable member.

MR. SHERMAN: I suggest that it would be hypocritical of us, Mr. Speaker, on this side to assume an attitude of passivity and acquiescence on this piece of legislation when we are prepared -- and I believe the Minister and his colleagues on the Treasury benches opposite know we are prepared to raise strenuous but hopefully constructive objection pretty substantially right down the line on the one city proposal that they intend to place before this House. For us to say well this is simply preliminary and enabling legislation if you like -- although I'm not using the term "enabling" in its precise legislative sense, but the Minister I'm sure knows what I'm implying -- although it is preliminary legislation it nonetheless is part and parcel philosophically of the position that this government and the Minister of Urban Affairs in particular have taken on the question of municipal government and administration in the Metro area. Our position philosophically on this question is sharply opposed as the Minister knows and it seems to me, Sir, that it would be an indefensible legislative exercise for us to say, well all right we'll lie down and let the preliminary legislation roll over us and go through, when we feel as strongly as we do about the whole concept and the whole philosophy.

What we say to the Minister at this point is we'd like to see the uni-city bill, we would like to see the government's proposal on amalgamation for the Metropolitan area and then we'll concern ourselves about the freezing of reserves and the necessity for an area-wide enumeration. We think it's incumbent upon the Minister at this stage in this session, having gone as far as he's gone in speaking to Bill 9, and having gone as far as he's gone in fact, Sir, in having in concert with the First Minister set up the Boundaries Review Commission that so widely and substantially proposed alterations in the government's original one city proposition, having gone that far we say that Bill 9 really does become redundant, really does become meaningless in the context of the debate. Let's have the one city proposal, let's have the debate on the one city bill on the government's one city concept right now.

Further to that, Mr. Speaker, I think I could underline the point without distortion of it if I suggested that by passing Bill 9 we would actually be endorsing the principle of

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.) . . . . amalgamation of the Metro area. The Minister may not agree with that but he'll have to convince me otherwise. By passing Bill 9 we would be endorsing the principle, the concept, the idea and the philosophy of total amalgamation in municipal terms of the Metro area. We are opposed to that so we cannot proceed in all honesty, in all integrity, we cannot proceed with simple and expedient passage of a piece of legislation of this kind.

One of the objections raised most strenuously by the municipalities, of course, Mr. Speaker, is the action that the proposed bill takes, and I recognize I can't go into sections, we're dealing with the principle, but the action that the proposed legislation would take with respect to their reserves; it's on this point perhaps more than any other that the different municipalities have decided to make a fight. We've had many -- (Interjection) -- well we've had many -- the Minister says I'm helping them. I don't know that I'm helping them, Mr. Speaker; I'm merely trying to do my job in the opposition as he is trying to do his job in the government. The Minister believes that the panacea for all Metro area's ills and problems is total amalgamation. I don't happen to believe that and some of the people with whom I've talked on this subject, and certainly a good many of the people whom I represent in the Rural Municipality of Fort Garry, don't happen to believe that. I suggest to the Minister that I'm merely following through in a manner that I would give him the credit for doing in taking the stand I've taken in my responsibilities as a member of a party and as a member of a community of thought that is opposed to the concept embodied in his beloved amalgamation proposal. The question of the reserves, as I've said, is one that causes extreme concern and unhappiness where the individual municipalities are concerned because they have after all through the exercise of varying degrees of efficiency and good management accumulated funds from their own people, from their own taxpayers, for their own purposes and see no legitimate or moral reason why provincial legislation should be permitted to deprive them of those funds.

Now I don't want to get into the whole argument of what the municipalities in their varying degrees of affluence have done and haven't done and should be doing with respect to provision of services, that is a spectrum of issues that has been debated at some length in the public meetings conducted by the Minister and his colleagues and will be debated beyond a doubt at much fuller length when the government's proposed legislation comes into the House. But I raise the point merely to emphasize the position we must take on this side of the House in this caucus and in this party if we are to be true to our responsibilities. Our responsibilities are to defend the positions of those who elected us, who sent us here to represent them, and up to this point at least in our consultation with them the consensus is heavily against amalgamation and it's certainly heavily against what appears to be a kind of arbitrary usurpation on the part of the provincial government of the individual municipal reserves. So on that basis we suggest to you, Sir, that in the interests of consistency we launch our fight now against the uni-city proposal that the Minister will be bringing in and we classify Bill 9 as preliminary legislation as redundant on those grounds.

One or two other points I would make in the few moments remaining to me, Mr. Speaker. One is the fact that in my view, and I don't know that this necessarily represents the view of all my colleagues on this side of the House, but in my view the report of the Greater Winnipeg Electoral Boundaries Review Commission which was tabled in this Chamber last week and of which every member has a copy, actually destroys the one city proposal of the provincial government. It does so much to expose flaws and warts and weaknesses in that proposal that it effectively destroys that proposal and it buttresses the argument for a much longer, broader and more intensive review over the period of the next twelve to twenty-four months, of the whole idea, of the whole concept, and it buttresses and endorses the argument against haste. Having operated within fairly narrow terms of reference, and they were pretty narrow terms of reference, that Review Commission found many objections, many things to which it objected in the government's white paper. If there are those flaws to be found within those terms of reference, Mr. Speaker, I think it could be logically argued that it follows there are many more flaws certainly to be found within enlarged, expanded terms of reference. I think their report adds weight and substance to the argument from our side that the whole concept of total amalgamation of the Metro area, the whole government one city proposal should be re-examined, should be reviewed from top to bottom once again. On that basis, Mr. Speaker, although I don't intend to make a formal motion at this point . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has five minutes.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I won't need all that five minutes thank you. On that basis, although I don't intend to make a formal motion at this time, I suggest through you to the Minister, Sir, that the government withdraw Bill 9 from consideration in this Chamber and that it give a six-month hoist in its own planning at this stage of the legislative program to the one city proposal that it intends to bring in later on. Bill 9 has been effectively deflated and effectively destroyed by the report of the Greater Winnipeg Electoral Boundaries Review Commission and the only logical course for the government to follow in the wake of that report is withdrawal of the bill.

As for its one city proposal, that's what we're most keenly interested in. We're arguing semantics and concepts when we're addressing ourselves to Bill 9 at this stage. We want to see what the actual proposed legislation is from this government with respect to amalgamation of the Metropolitan area. We want to deal with that now. We want to see what's in there, and if there have not been sufficient constructive modifications arising as a result of the report brought in by the Greater Winnipeg Electoral Boundaries Review Commission, we will very likely press, when that legislation comes into the Chamber, Mr. Speaker, to have it given a six month hoist, to have it similarly withdrawn while the whole question is re-examined from top to bottom once again. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Finance will be closing debate.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I didn't intend to speak unless no one else is prepared to, but I wanted to know if I could ask a question of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance on a question.

MR. CHERNIACK: Would the honourable member please indicate just what would be the adverse effect if Bill 9 passed and what he calls the one city of uni-city bill does not pass? Just what would be the adverse effect as a result of doing what we asked be that done?

MR. SPEAKER: I should like to say to the Honourable Minister that his question is argumentative, that it raises another point of debate. Now if it was a matter of clarification yes, but I really don't see how the honourable member can answer it without debating the point again and our rules do not allow us that. Anyways, I'll give him the benefit of the doubt. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't mind attempting to answer it. I would say my objections are twofold: In the first place what this legislation really does is take what has always been an administrative type of control and transform it into a political control, a political type of control, and that would happen if Bill 9 were passed. In the second place, by passing Bill 9, I thought I made it clear during my remarks, Mr. Speaker, we would be acquiescing in the government's proposal for total amalgamation of the Metro area. We're opposed to that concept, we're opposed to that principle so it seems to me to be hypocritical and illogical to pass the preliminary legislation.

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

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye that debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J. R. (BUD) BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, I would fully defend the role of the Opposition to propose reasonable alternatives to legislation but I really can't understand the position of the Opposition in this particular case. I think it's more of an obstructionist role than an opposing role.

In my view, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Municipal Affairs put the case quite succinctly what Bill No. 9 is all about. Now, I realize that the Member for Fort Garry said that there were three principles involved but really there are only two; he added the third as a principle when he said that the Minister of Finance asked that the House proceed expeditiously with this matter. He did refer to the two matters that are before the House and I hope I can address a few remarks to the principles, not the spirits or not the philosophies or other matters that are behind this bill, but the principles that are involved in Bill No. 9.

First of all there is the necessity of having an element of budgetary control for the fiscal year 1971; and two, which -- (Interjection) -- if you'll bear with me a few moments I'll perhaps explain. Secondly, the necessity of taking steps now to prepare for elections in the fall of '71, in the event that this House approves legislation, in the event that it does

(MR. BOYCE cont'd.) . . . . approve legislation to be introduced at a later date.

The Honourable Minister emphasized at the time of the introduction of this Bill, that the approval of Bill 9 in no way -- and I repeat for the benefit of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry -- that it commits this House in no way to approval of legislation to be introduced later respecting the proposals reorganizing the municipal governments.

Mr. Speaker, I know that we aren't debating the specifics but I would draw the attention to the members to one of the latter sections of the Bill which spells it out in very careful terms that if this House does not pass the legislation respecting reorganization of municipalities by the first of September, 1971, Bill No. 9 is automatically repealed. -- (Interjection) -- "So what?" The Member from Sturgeon Creek says "So what?" Now I can understand, as I mentioned earlier, the role of the Opposition to make sure that their constituents - I'm beginning to wonder more and more who they actually represent in Manitoba - but that their constituents are protected, so we on this side of the House are willing to build into the bill every reasonable safeguard. The government has given an undertaking, Mr. Speaker, to say that if legislation which is being anticipated is not passed by September 1, 1971, Bill No. 9 will be repealed.

But, Mr. Speaker, it was reported in the Winnipeg Free Press on April 23rd, that the Manitoba Progressive Conservative Party has decided to resist rapid passage of Bill No. 9. Now the Minister of Municipal Affairs here a few moments ago was taken severely to task for giving legislative plans and procedures outside the House to the newspaper, but I as a government backbencher have to read the newspaper what the Opposition's intentions are. But it was reported that the Progressive Conservative Party has decided to resist rapid passage of Bill 9 and that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition was quoted as saying that there was "no justification for rapid passage." And that his party would oppose it when the legislative session resumes on Monday. Well, we've seen an example of what the Opposition apparently intends to do, is to resist passage of this Bill, not because of the merits of the bill, just because they have decided to do this as a tactic of Opposition. But it is obvious that the Opposition either does not understand the necessity or urgency of Bill No. 9 or in the alternative -- (Interjection) -- If the Member from Charleswood - maybe this bill is absolutely necessary for that particular member. But it is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that in the alternative the Opposition does understand the necessity and urgency but is deliberately delaying the passage of Bill No. 9 for its own political purposes. If such is the case I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is irresponsible.

The Free Press report on the 23rd listed certain areas in which the Conservative Party opposed Bill 9 and this opposition appears to centre around two areas; that the passage of the Bill would be a commitment in principle to the government's proposal in respect of local reorganization. Now of course the Member for Fort Garry tried to drag this in as part of the discussion of the principle of Bill 9, and really, Mr. Speaker, I was at a loss to sit back and see why somebody didn't jump up on a point of order because it really has absolutely nothing to do with this particular bill. And the second point, the jurisdiction over municipal finances by the Minister is unnecessary.

Mr. Speaker, let's just review. The fact is, it is known that the government will be introducing legislation at this session in respect to the organization of municipal government in the Metropolitan Winnipeg area. -- (Interjection) -- You know that we're going to bring in a bill on reorganization - do you want me to say it again? -- (Interjection) -- Have I seen it yet? Oh, I've seen lots of things that have gone into the Bill. Do you want me to identify the "i's" that I dotted and the "t's" that I crossed when it gets here? I'll be glad to go over it with the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. He's jealous.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I wish the member would continue with his debate.

MR. BOYCE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. -- (Interjection) -- Gee, I'm glad I'm on this side. It's even got a little bit of . . . input in it. You fellows will learn - the Minister of Finance at least knows what the word means now.

Secondly, it is known or should be known to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that the Local Authorities Election Act requires each municipality to carry out an enumeration in preparation for the usual election in October in each of the 13 municipalities. He knows we have to do this. It is known, or should be known to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, that it is necessary to commence the enumeration in April of each year and it would be wasteful for any enumeration to be carried out on the basis of the present municipal structure if there is a possibility the structure might be changed. Why? -- (Interjection) -- You got a

(MR. BOYCE cont'd.) . . . . computer. What the members are saying over there chirping at me, Mr. Speaker, is "Why, why, why?" He's suggesting that each municipality go out and spend \$175,000 perhaps unnecessarily. So what this bill actually suggests -- (Interjection) -- Oh, you want the people of Manitoba to pay twice to satisfy the members opposite? That's what you're asking.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that if we give the people of the Province of Manitoba another opportunity they'll tell us again that the members opposite aren't representing them very well, that the people of Manitoba are getting sick and tired of their political games. Oh, they get me so mad, sometimes, Mr. Speaker. It's the rank stupidity of some people that gets me mad.

What Bill No. 9 proposes is that the Provincial Government carry out the enumeration in 1971 and it uses the Assessment Branch of the Metropolitan Corporation. The Metropolitan Assessment Branch has for several years been responsible for the enumeration in the City of Winnipeg and St. Boniface. It is proposed that the enumeration be done in such a way that it would be available as a basis for an election under the present municipal structure, or if there is a change, then under the new setup. Now, let me repeat that for you, Mr. Speaker. -- (Interjection) -- The member has a serious question?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek,

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Well, I would like to ask the honourable member what new setup, what boundaries would you set it up under?

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, how the member can sit there and keep harping the same question. I don't know what the results of what this legislative body's deliberation will be any more than he does, but to repeat myself, once more, Mr. Speaker, to make it abundantly clear, perhaps if I holler loud enough it will get through some skulls that are rather hard to get through once in a while, but it has to be done. We have to enumerate for a fall election, whether we go one way or another because the delays, the legislation which exists at the moment only allows for a certain amount of delay. If we go beyond that we have to have an election. We have to have an enumeration. All we're suggesting is that this is the best way to do it from an economic standpoint and from a logistical standpoint or any other standpoint that you want to take into consideration, and we're saying at the same time we're proposing it that if we shouldn't proceed with the reorganization of the Metro Government we can still use this. In other words, Mr. Speaker, we're saying to the people of Manitoba, and trying to say it to members opposite, that we want to get a buck's worth of service and a buck's worth of results. We want to spend \$175,000 once, not twice. -- (Interjection) -- I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. And some of these people have the audacity to sit on local councils! -- (Interjections) --

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, I must appreciate the Minister of Finance's interruption because sometimes I'm just as guilty as the members opposite. And I would appreciate my colleagues not chirping at me because I find them just as provocative as the members opposite sometimes. But let me just come back up to where I was before I got sidetracked. The two principles involved - one budgetary and one to resolve the situation around the election machinery.

Just to finish on this point of the necessity of carrying out an enumeration at the present time and that we have to pass this bill expeditiously to set up this machinery and it would be to the advantage of the Province of Manitoba if we do set it up and if we do proceed expeditiously. If the government's proposals for reorganization are passed by this House we will have saved an unnecessary and useless enumeration and the cost of \$175,000 as I have suggested, but if the proposals for reorganization are rejected, the enumeration will be in a form which will permit elections on the fourth Wednesday in October, as usual. So, Mr. Speaker, on that point, if we do proceed to set up the enumeration machinery that they can carry out an enumeration on the basis of the old boundary, taking into consideration any new boundaries which may come into existence, and if no new boundaries do come into existence, we can use that information to carry out an election on the basis of the way the situation is at the present time.

But, Mr. Speaker, on the second point, and this is the point belaboured by the Member from Fort Garry, I wish to review the question of municipal budgets, and really no matter what the Member from Fort Garry tries to make of it, it is not a matter of mistrust by this

(MR. BOYCE cont'd.) . . . . government of the local or municipal governmental bodies, it is a matter of uniformity. But the Free Press states that the Opposition feel that a sufficient degree of provincial control over municipal budgets already exists to a degree which would insure that there would be no large departures from past spending habits. It further suggests that the clear intention of the bill - this is a quotation by someone, or at least a quotation attributed to some members of the group opposite - "the clear intention" of the bill was to take control of municipal assets and surpluses and while reserves and surpluses would be seized, all deficits would be charged back against the community. The members opposite know, or once again, Mr. Speaker, they should know, that this is not the case. Well you know, my members know this - but these are remarks which are being attributed to the members opposite in one of our local papers. But they should know that this is not the case. In respect of all municipalities except Winnipeg and St. James, the only effective power which existing legislation has placed in the hands of the Minister for Municipal Affairs on the question of municipal finance is in his powers to require an overexpenditure of municipalities annual estimates to be approved by him and to direct the disposition of the overexpenditure and to stipulate how the overexpenditure is to be recovered.

Secondly, reserve funds may only be created and expended with the approval of the Minister. It is fair that all the municipalities be treated alike. In other words, we don't want the city of Winnipeg treated in one way, the city of St. Boniface treated in one way, the city of Fort Garry treated in one way, St. James-Assiniboia treated in another. So that what this legislation is asking is that we set up a uniform manner of handling this transitional period. But, Mr. Speaker, no municipality, I would repeat that no municipality except Winnipeg and St. Boniface may now expend from a reserve without permission of the municipal office and the Minister of Municipal Affairs. If an expenditure is permitted it is usually on the basis that the municipality will levy a sufficient sum in the following years to recover the cost of this particular expenditure. But the Minister has stated that the municipalities have given the government the assurance they won't depart from established practices and I would hope that municipalities would exercise responsibility in respect of budgetting in 1971.

The proposals in respect to municipal finances which are contained in Bill 9 are, I think, responsible, both from the point of view of existing municipal governments and from the point of view of the provincial government. Surely no member of this House can object to legislation which will assure that if there is a new city government in the year 1972 it should enter into office in the best financial position possible. If for some reason, a municipal council in the year 1971 substantially overexpends its 1971 estimates, it would be the taxpayers in Greater Winnipeg who would be picking up the deficit in the year 1972. It is fair to the taxpayers of Metropolitan Winnipeg if one of the municipal councils in the year 1971 decides to reduce its mill rate by using its reserves.

The proposals in respect to finances contained in Bill 9 are equitable in that they put all municipalities in Metropolitan Winnipeg on exactly the same basis, a position in which they do not now find themselves. I would repeat again, that all municipalities in the Metro area are not on the same basis specifically if you take into consideration the relationship between the taxation areas pertaining to the city of Winnipeg and the city of St. Boniface, vis-a-vis the other municipalities. The intention of this bill is quite clear, that there is to be no . . . This is rather hastily drawn together, Mr. Speaker, because having been at the convention . . . but the intention is quite clear. It is in the best interests of all the citizens of Winnipeg that the municipal councils in the year 1972 adhere as closely as possible to established budgetary practices. All Bill 9 proposes is that this be enunciated in legislation which puts all the municipal units on exactly the same basis for 1971.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the report of the Free Press mentions that the retroactive nature of Bill 9 is unnecessary. Now the members opposite should once again know that local authority election act requires that each local authority, and that means municipalities, do appoint an enumerator, a revising officer and a returning officer, not later than February 15th, 1971. The municipalities in the Metro area have complied with this -- oh my gosh, Mr. Speaker, I lost my place. I'll have to go back.

That sentence didn't make sense when I read it. -- (Interjection) -- Well, you know, when the Member for Fort Garry starts looking through his books, I could read the phone book to him again and he wouldn't make any difference I suppose but, what I was saying, maybe if I just don't try and read it, I can make more sense. That the Local Authorities

(MR. BOYCE cont'd.) . . . . Election Act spells out certain responsibilities for us to fulfil, we would have to make this bill retroactive and the Leader of the Opposition I am sure is familiar with this.

The members of the Opposition should know also that the fiscal year of the municipality is from January 1st to December 31st. It is necessary therefore, that if an enumeration is to be carried out on a Metro-wide area, and if a degree of budgetary control is to be given to the Minister of Urban Affairs, that the legislation must be retroactive to January 1st in order to relieve the municipalities of their obligations under the Local Authorities Election Act and in order to be involved in the budgetary processes of the municipality for the beginning of the year.

Simply put, Mr. Speaker, relative to the enumeration part of Bill No. 9 we must act, and relative to the financial aspects of Bill No. 9, it is but a matter of tidying things up and making it equitable for all municipalities within the Greater Winnipeg area.

Mr. Speaker, may I close with just one, almost a plea I suppose, to the Leader of the Opposition, and his colleagues, that if we are to have a debate on the reorganization of the Metropolitan area, which I hope we will, and I hope as a result of this debate that we will be able to hammer out some meaningful legislation for the reorganization of the Metro area, that we restrict our debate to that legislation when it was forthcoming, because I would suggest to the members opposite that as I started out, I think it is the responsibility of an opposition party to oppose but not to obstruct and I would suggest to the members opposite that picking this particular bill on which to delay proceedings is nothing short of obstructionary tactics.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Will the member permit a question? Has the member any information that any of the various local governments have not submitted their budgets for the parental approval that you say is necessary under this bill?

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, I really can't answer that question too well because, maybe I could get the nod from the Minister of Municipal Affairs, because at the moment the lines of responsibility between the municipality and the government are through the Department of Municipal Affairs, so that these correspondence, these budgets would have been submitted to the Department of Municipal Affairs.

MR. GRAHAM: I have another supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would it not be advisable to have the people who have been familiar and done the process of enumeration many times, would it not be advisable to have them proceed with that job under the various local governments, with the government paying the cost of this?

MR. BOYCE: It is my understanding that all existing facilities would be used in any enumeration which would be carried out under Bill No. 9.

MR. GRAHAM: I have one more supplementary question. Would the member recommend to this government that the Provincial Government pay for the cost of enumeration in all municipalities throughout Manitoba in 1971?

MR. BOYCE: Well specific to the bill under consideration, it is my understanding the government wants to co-ordinate this specific enumeration. If the member would like to discuss with me outside the House his point about taking over the cost of all enumeration, if he will recall during the debate on the Local Authorities Election Act last year I believe he was a member of that particular . . . I think that was one of the suggestions that I made before committee at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I have three questions for the honourable member, if he will submit to them. First, I wonder . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Before the member proceeds, I should like to say, and I would like to apologize, the last question was out of order and the Member for Winnipeg Centre did point out that it was. As I said, it was my error. I certainly hope that a question period, after a speaker has spoken, will be to points of clarification in his speech and not to opening up the debate again. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: My first question to the member is, is he aware of the fact that the enumeration has been commenced by some municipalities, and in fact is almost completed?

MR. BOYCE: I am not personally aware of this, but I have heard that it has started in some areas and it is the intention of the government to co-ordinate this with their other municipalities which haven't started it.

MR. SPIVAK: My second question to the member is: I wonder whether he can indicate where it would be impossible for the government to take the enumerations made by the present cities and municipalities if it decides to in fact introduce a different ward system.

MR. BOYCE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I really am at a loss to understand the question. I don't need you to explain the question, but I'm at a loss to understand why you would ask such a question, because this surely takes a great amount of organization and what is implicit in Bill No. 9 is the type of organization which will carry this forward to a conclusion.

MR. SPEAKER: I think I have been lenient up until now and the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is trying to introduce more debatable matter. We are discussing the principle. I think the member's speech was quite clear. If he wants another point of clarification on the speech, yes. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: I assume that the answer given is the answer by the honourable member. I wonder whether he can indicate to the House whether he has seen the uni-city bill.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question is no, but may I suggest to members if they have any more questions, that if we could just pass this bill on second reading we could go into Committee of the Whole; and, you know, the Press may appear -- interpret this as a grooming of this backbencher as the future Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. The questions are getting long too. Are you ready for the motion to adjourn by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, seconded by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye?

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

MR. SPEAKER: Does the House Leader wish to proceed in order?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may on behalf of the House Leader, the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs is not here. I wonder if we could now go to the adjourned debate on Bill 15.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, I'm not entirely opposed to lotteries as such but I do appreciate the opportunity of expressing my opinion with regard to the contents of this bill. When I say that I am not opposed to lotteries as such, I'm thinking in terms of the local community efforts in raising funds in this way in order to improve community facilities, which such an effort provides. I think of raffles and lotteries, if you like, that have done so much over the years, and I feel I could do no better than talk of the community which I represent and it's a pleasure to report that the Lions Club, some nineteen people over a period of two years, through selling tickets on car raffles, as it were, raised something in the neighbourhood of \$25,000 for the Retarded Children's Home which we have. The Curling Club complex was developed to a large degree in this manner over a period of some 10 or 15 years, and they have a complex there now in the neighbourhood of \$150,000. The Rotary Club sponsored and built a Children's Park. The Legion have been in this business of raising funds by selling tickets, and they support Air Cadets and Veterans and so on and so forth. The Rotary Club also have raised funds to send students to United Nations and elsewhere for the well-being of our youth. The Senior Citizens Home in our area has benefitted in this way.

And so it goes, Mr. Speaker, throughout the valley, in our towns and villages, and I'm sure there are members in this House that can duplicate what I've said in their own particular areas. I admire the initiative and the work of the people behind these schemes. I have yet to hear of any wrong-doing in the handling of the funds derived from that purpose. I believe nothing, Mr. Speaker, should be done to disturb this local enterprise. The answer might be that nothing will be done in this regard. The bill, Mr. Speaker, does not say so in any direction that I can find, and in my opinion the opposite is the case, for with the passage of this bill and the development of regulations that will be drawn up by the Licence Commission, anything can and will develop. That is, these things can happen to suit the administration of the day. I don't need to tell the House what happens in the framing of regulations, I need only read paragraph 13 of this lottery bill, Mr. Speaker, which authorizes the development of regulations, and here they are and I read them into the record:

(a) prescribing the form of lottery;

(b) prescribing the amount and value of each prize to be awarded;

(c) prescribing the money or other valuable consideration to be paid to secure a chance to win a price;

(MR. BILTON cont'd.)

(d) the manner in which the lottery tickets, if any, are to be sold to the public;

(e) restricting the amount of money to be realized from the conduct and management of any lottery scheme.

Mr. Speaker, I would refer you to those last three words "any lottery scheme". Need I say more? The writing is on the wall, Mr. Speaker, as the future of local lotteries will go, and in the vein of passing out of the picture the furtherance of local sports, charity, churches, parks and a score of other enterprises will go. For the information of this House, Mr. Speaker, I should say that the machinery is already in motion. Recent months have seen government instructions going out that organizations, all organizations planning a raffle or a lottery must first apply for a licence number for each effort through the municipal office. This licence number, Mr. Speaker, when it has been given, must be printed on each ticket and any printer, Mr. Speaker, who fails to carry out this regulation is liable. The obvious need for allotting a licence number suggest, in my humble opinion, that this in due time will see the government bureaucracy move in and excuses of all kinds will be made to stifle local effort, and ultimately, Mr. Speaker, the government will hold the monopoly in the field of lotteries.

Confirmation of what I am trying to say, Mr. Speaker, one need only refer to the Attorney-General's remarks in introducing this lottery bill, and I refer you to Page 109 in Hansard of April 15th in which he says: "Now the establishment of a provincial lottery will in a large part reduce the number of organizations who wish to hold separate lotteries for fund-raising purposes for their own particular organization or projects they have in mind. I hope that, Mr. Speaker, through the introduction or the continuance of the provincial lottery in a responsible manner that we will eliminate the extensive proliferation of lotteries that otherwise might take place. I understand, Mr. Speaker, that the proceeds from the provincial lotteries will go into the General Fund to be dispersed by way of improving the cultural aspect of the province and the sports."

It is not my purpose, Mr. Speaker, to thresh old straw. I feel that my colleague from Brandon posed some very important questions. These questions must be answered by the Ministers on the front bench. I would remind the First Minister that the government's period of fun and games of which he spoke last year are over. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the passage of this bill will initiate a scheme of things for the raising of taxes which is improper. There is only one way in my humble opinion, Mr. Speaker, in the collection of taxes and that is direct. These tax monies, Mr. Speaker, are collected and held in trust, or should be, until the House agrees or approves how and where it will be spent. The revenue from these so-called government lotteries will be a floating amount of money over which the Cabinet and only the Cabinet will have the authority of spending and directing it to where they please - and I am not merely referring to the present administration but future administrations, Mr. Speaker, that will be governed by this particular law. All this can take place without any reference to the House. This I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, is improper and is a system of raising money loaded with opportunities for abuse which will in turn have far-reaching effects as the years go by. I do not believe that the government should enter into this field. England, we are told, Mr. Speaker, possibly leads the world as the population of gamblers yet the governments, the several government down through the years have never seen fit over there to enter into this field of activity and I often wonder why.

I would sincerely hope, Mr. Speaker, that before the final vote is taken that everyone in this House will take the opportunity to express his or her opinion on this, something which I feel is a very important matter. I well remember, Mr. Speaker, the Ministers of Labour, Mines and Resources and others on the government side, speaking out against government lotteries last year. I recall that the First Minister approached the Centennial lottery with a divided opinion. I would like to hear his views on this occasion. History teaches us, Mr. Speaker, that those who think that the stakes are high, those with the least worldly goods, in the interests of getting rich quick will gamble their last dollar, and I say to the government, surely you're not encouraging more welfare dollars to be spent in this way through a bill that I do not think should be before the House at this time.

With these few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I believe I leave the thought with you that I cannot personally support this bill.

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

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Virden, that the debate be adjourned.

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

. . . . . continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Youth and Education. (Bill No. 14) The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MCGREGOR: Mr. Speaker, I took the adjournment on this bill basically. . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder if you would mind calling Bill No. 13 standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sorry, I skipped one. The proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Education. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this debate on behalf of my colleague, the Member from Emerson, who would like to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to see that the Minister of Education in anticipation of this debate has seen fit to attend very conscientiously to the debate and I hope that we will not disappoint him. I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that my conscience bothered me a little over the last few days. I could hear the echo of the Attorney-General's voice on Thursday and on Friday, and how I wished at that time, Mr. Speaker, that I would have been able to make my contribution to this bill and help out the Minister of Education in bringing about an end to this debate and a passing of this measure. However, of course I was unable to do so and I do regret it.

This bill has two main changes in the form of allocation of grants and this is really the meat of this particular bill. There are a few other comments I would like to make, a few other items, but the meat of the bill rests with two major changes that are made in the allocation of grants to schools.

First of all, there is a change in the method by which textbooks are provided to the students of Manitoba both in public and private schools. In the past, students were provided with these textbooks by the government, by the schools ordering them from the Textbook Bureau, and regardless of numbers the province took the bill and paid it in the name of those schools for those students. The change simply allocates a given amount - and this year I understand it will be \$12.00 per student - to the school division, and instead of being paid entirely by the province the limit is set at a given amount, and, like I say, this year it's \$12.00. This might seem quite a significant amount, but I would like to point out to the Minister that it need be a very flexible amount. The amount expended for those textbooks in the past few years have ranged from \$9.50 approximately up to approximately \$11.90 per student in the last four years, and I'm suggesting to the Minister that it would be grossly unfair if his Curriculum Branch for instance decided that there should be a change in a particular course that is given in our public schools which will require in turn a whole new set of textbooks and will not be accompanied by an increase in this particular grant. I'd like to suggest to him that it's very important that the Textbook Bureau allocation and the curriculum people work hand in hand so that each year the allocation might be a reflection of the kind of changes that are planned in the Curriculum Branch.

There is another matter which I don't agree with, Mr. Speaker, in respect to this allocation. I am now under the impression that the grant of \$12.00 will not in fact be a grant of \$12.00 given to the schools but rather will be a credit note given in the name of the schools to the Textbook Bureau, and this will have the effect, Mr. Speaker, of compelling school divisions to purchase their textbooks or library books or whatever is to be paid by this \$12.00, through the Manitoba Textbook Bureau. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that there might be occasions when school boards would like to purchase directly from a publisher, for some reason or another bypass the Manitoba Textbook Bureau and they should have this freedom to do so. I think that advertising this as an outright \$12.00 grant for a student is a little misleading if that kind of condition is attached.

I also would like to suggest to the Minister, in spite of my agreement with this kind of measure, I'd like to suggest to the Minister that I don't appreciate the impression given to the public that this is resulting in an outright grant to the people, to the school division, because in fact, Mr. Speaker, it's not. It's simply, it's simply changing the system of administering this particular expenditure. In the past, school textbooks were paid directly by the province on the order from the school division and this year seemingly it will change nothing except the limit of \$12.00 being established, and if the \$12.00 is not totally expended then the school division may use this for other textbooks. I think it's really misleading to call this a \$12.00

(MR. GIRARD cont'd) . . . . grant which did not exist in the past because it did exist in the past.

The other change that is imbedded in the Act is the changing of the Foundation Program so that 75 percent of the Foundation Program will come from the provincial consolidated revenue and 25 will come from the general levy. To fully understand the implication, Mr. Speaker, maybe it would be a good thing to review the philosophy and principles on which the Foundation Program was first established.

In 1966, after a considerable study, the Department of Education adopted a new Foundation Program, and after reviewing this Foundation Program I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that it's the best possible foundation program in Canada. There are a variety of different programs from province to province but ours happens to be a particularly good one. I'm suggesting that it has been suffering very serious pains of late and the reasons for this is that the provincial government, both the past and the present, have totally failed to upkeep the Foundation Program, have totally failed to provide it with the funds that were required because of increased costs in education. The Foundation Program as set in 1966 established in a way to provide a minimum kind of education to all the students of Manitoba. It was almost possible, Mr. Speaker, in 1966 to operate a school division within the grant structure as set out then. As it was set out then, school divisions were provided with enough grants to give a minimum kind of education, and should they have wished to have frills, have supervisory personnel, have teachers above grants, have a more adequate library and so on, they were given authority to do so, but the money they had to raise for this kind of frill had to come from the special levy. This is the basic principle on which the Foundation Program was set and it's a sound one. The only problem was of course the increased cost of education was born as a frill. It was born as a frill because the Foundation Program contribution from the Provincial Government remained stationary and for four years, Mr. Speaker, the change in the Foundation Program was almost nil as far as provincial contribution was concerned. Special levies have therefore become unbearable in Manitoba in certain school divisions, and I say this knowing full well the meaning of "unbearable," Mr. Speaker. I'm suggesting that special levies have become, in some divisions, unbearable.

This year the government decided to do something about it, and I want to congratulate them for doing something about it but I can't say much more than just "something" because what they have done, in my view, is hardly significant. I did a little bit of research to find out what has transpired in the education costs in the past few years and I find, Mr. Speaker, that the increase in costs of Education in Manitoba per student, excluding capital costs, in the past four years have been approximately \$251.00 per student. In the past four years the increase per student in education costs has been approximately \$251.00 excluding capital expenditures, and Mr. Speaker, this government is planning to update the system by granting \$18.00 per student. I say to you, it's hardly significant. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the increase in per pupil cost of education in the year 1967 was \$71.00 per pupil, not counting capital expenditures; in 1968, \$31.00 per pupil; in 1969, \$56.00 per pupil; and in 1970 a projected increase of \$44.00 per pupil and so on, and I'm suggesting to you, Mr. Speaker, that the contribution of \$18.00 is really not significant when you consider the increase in the total cost of education excluding capital costs.

There is another matter which has been mentioned in this House on previous occasions, and especially during the last session, and which in my view needs reiterating frequently because it's probably the most important issue in educational finance, and that is the fact that we have in Manitoba very inequitable kind of school financing. We have this because of the failure of the Provincial Government to having upkept the Foundation Program. We have, for instance, school divisions in Manitoba that will bring three times as much revenue per mill rate of special levy, three times as much revenue per pupil for every mill that they levy, and the converse is also true, Mr. Speaker. We have some school divisions that will have to levy three mills or more in order to obtain the same amount of money per pupil on the special levy than other divisions. But there is one just levy, one equitable levy in the Province of Manitoba and that is the general levy, because the general levy is levied on everyone in Manitoba equally, be it farm or residential or other. -- (Interjection) -- That's another matter, Mr. Speaker.

If we assume that the assessment is just and fair then the general levy is also just and fair, Mr. Speaker. But what this government has done in the past and what it is still doing is wanting to reduce this general levy. They want to reduce the general levy, the only equitable levy we have in the province, and they want to do so by increasing the special levy without

(MR. GIRARD cont'd).... saying it. Whether they like it or not, Mr. Speaker, if the provincial contribution is not increased as education costs are increased, the net result is an increase in special levy and an increase in the inequality of educational financing in the province.

I don't understand the Minister in his actions when he does this kind of thing. I was under the impression that he understood education financing. I was under the impression that he realized the inequity, that it did exist. I even thought he was going to remedy this after the last session when he finally realized that maybe we were right when we were saying that decreasing the general levy was the wrong thing. But this, Mr. Speaker, I'm convinced that his attitude in that respect is wrong. What he wants is greater inequity and he's going to say later on, "Well, we evened things out by paying \$18.00 per pupil," - which happens to be about half the increase in education costs in the first place and I call that encouraging inequity rather than remedying the situation.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to mention also that in changing the system under which grants were paid in the past the Minister is introducing a new concept, and that new concept is paying out money in terms of grants on a per pupil basis. I have no strong objection to this kind of thing provided it doesn't go too far. I have no strong objection. I do think though that it is undermining the present Foundation Program. I do think though that it does make more meaningless the Foundation Program's contribution to one area or another. And I can understand full well why the Minister is doing it. First of all, I think he likes a little opportunity to tell the people of Manitoba, "We're paying you \$18.00 per pupil in grants." That's good politics, Mr. Speaker.

I think, secondly, he likes to dodge the issue of teachers' salaries and he's done it admirably well. By increasing the grants where the grants are the least sufficient, and that is in the area of teachers' salaries, by increasing the grants the way he should have, he would argue that the teachers' salaries would have the net result of being increased and I'm suggesting to the Minister that his fundamental grant in terms of teachers' salaries is so far below the salaries paid to teachers now that it would not make a significant difference anyway. I think that I would prefer that the Minister had stayed with the Foundation Program and upgraded it the way it should have been. However, I have no strong objection, Mr. Speaker, to that particular move.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Youth and Education.

MR. MILLER: Would the honourable member be happier if the money was paid out in teacher grants so that teachers' salaries would go up rather than the present method which has been suggested?

MR. GIRARD: Mr. Speaker, I don't think that my suggestion is that the \$18.00 should have gone to teachers' basic grant only. That's not what I'm suggesting. I'm suggesting to you, Mr. Minister, that the Foundation Program was set in a way that it apportioned grants for administration, grants for -- (Interjection) -- Right. Now I'm suggesting to you that those grants fell by the wayside because they were not upkept, and what you should have done is not pay \$18.00 per pupil and make an issue of it at the by-election, but rather you should have upgraded the Foundation Program because it is a good one provided it is kept up. Whether it goes to teachers' salaries or administration or transportation or whatever, I'm suggesting that your \$18.00, if continued too much, will have the net effect of destroying the present Foundation Program.

I was a bit amused, Mr. Speaker, during the year because I happened to be involved in a study that was prepared by the Manitoba Teachers Society and this study is a very considerable document and has in it a great deal of information, and when the Minister was asked what he thought of our document - and I can't let him get away with this - he simply replied, apparently, "It's quite unimaginative." I'm suggesting to the Minister that that's the wrong thing to say because you must not have read the document or you must not have understood it, one of the two. That document deals with a great number of practical things, but I suggest to you it also has its share of imaginative suggestions and I don't mean this humourously.

It would have been very interesting, Mr. Speaker, if within the Bill No. 13 we could have had clarified once and for all whether this contribution of \$18.00 per pupil will apply to the pupils who are now in private schools. I understand it will not, yet we are told at times by the Premier that we will contribute and the next time we won't. I'm suggesting to the Minister that those people who are operating private schools are as interested as those who are operating public schools in knowing what kind of financial encouragement they will get from the province. It's spelled out simply in a negative way, Mr. Speaker. Bill 13 simply says it will

(MR. GIRARD cont'd) . . . . apply to public schools. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, in unitary divisions. What about those who operate private schools? Are they just supposed to be guessing? Are they supposed to be -- (Interjection) -- in other words, they are now told that there will be no financial contribution by the province. I think it would be interesting to have - and we might have before the end of the session - a definite move by the government saying that they will or they won't and leave the issue settled for once.

There's one -- (Interjection) -- well, I think that as far as the life of the government is concerned, if, Mr. Speaker, if the government says this government will not be granting aid to private schools, we'll take it as an answer.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I don't think that part is part of the principle of that Bill at the present time.

MR. GIRARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Just one other item I'd like to point out. I find it very interesting that in Article 531, Section 531 that the Minister has decided to remove the differentiation set by statute of 24 mills. That is, there is now in the statutes a restriction that says there will not be greater differentiation between the mill rate paid by farm and residential and that of other, mainly industry, than 24 mills, and I wonder what the intention of the Minister is, Mr. Speaker, because as I interpret this move, it would empower the Lieutenant Governor in Council to establish a general levy that would be paid entirely by industry, and as is it would be impossible to have this kind of thing because there is a differentiation of 24 mills. I'd appreciate very much having more explanation on this and the motive for that kind of section. I think that it is a seemingly harmless kind of measure on one hand and yet, on the other, I think that if abused, could be disastrous.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. In this debate I want to say first that the two members of our caucus who have spoken have so far indicated the concern that we have on this side of the House with the principle that the Minister is using here of using penny ante methods to cure a major problem.

The Foundation Program, we feel - and we cannot reiterate it too strongly - has to be updated. Everything else is being updated today and yet here we are trying to finance a department system with a schedule of payments that is six years old. If the Minister was willing to bring in changes in the Act here that would tie the updating of the Foundation Program to a cost of living or to a percentage of the total costs so that the Foundation Program became a constant factor every year, a constant percentage every year of the total cost of education and truly reflected the willingness of the government to pay the major cost of education, then many people in this province would rest a little easier.

Mr. Speaker, the question of the fluctuating mill rate that the Minister has used -- and here we have to admit that many people are not too familiar with mill rate and assessment. We use an actual assessment, we use an equalized assessment in municipal affairs, and we use a balanced assessment in school affairs, and the question of the playing around with assessment while we reduce the mill rate doesn't really mean too much. The one thing that does concern the taxpayer is how many dollars is it going to cost me on my piece of property, and the taxpayer today is finding out that every year, even though the Minister is making grants and various other schemes, that the cost to the taxpayer is increasing every year at a rate that is alarming to say the least. We have seen evidence, actual evidence in some portions of Manitoba, where there has been some agitation on the part of some organizations to actually withhold taxes because of the concern of people over the skyrocketing costs that are occurring today in education, and here we find the ministers trying to use a one shot method of a gift of \$18.00 when probably \$180.00 would have been more appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, in the question of the \$12.00 on textbooks, I think my colleague from Emerson has expressed very well our concern, that while it may cover the cost of textbooks this year it may not cover the cost of textbooks next year. But, Mr. Speaker, it points out another problem that quite often while we in our collective wisdom think that we can improve matters, sometimes we do not improve them, and I would like to cite an example here, when last year through central purchasing in the Department of Education the province purchased the buses, the extra cost to the taxpayers in the Province of Manitoba was thousands of dollars because of the delay and the uncertainty in delivery of the buses, and the extra costs that the school division had to support, even though it wasn't in their budget, because the buses were not available when they should have been available, and on short term notice the school divisions had to make

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd)....do, improvise, do whatever they could to transport the pupils, and the expense was far greater than any saving in my opinion, and sometimes I wonder whether the department is well advised in some of their decisions.

The same thing I think might hold true with the textbook problem, because here I think we'll have a greater flexibility with the internal financing in the division unless the suspicions of the Member for Emerson are correct and all the division gets is a textbook credit. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that such is not the case.

Mr. Speaker, with the change in the Foundation grant structure, we find in this bill that the Minister has changed it this particular year from 70 to 75 and from 30 down to 25 respectively, but he has also placed a clause in there which may permit him to fluctuate lower than that, but in the same clause there is no provision made that once he has established maybe a lower rate, there is nothing there that says that he cannot change it back up to the 25 again and it could cause considerable concern to those people who are charged with the responsibility of establishing a budget and estimating as accurately as they can the amount of money they expect to raise from the already over-burdened taxpayer.

We have seen some movement, Mr. Speaker, on the part of some people in the municipal field of administration who have expressed great concern over the financing of education, and in fact, Mr. Speaker, I have heard some municipal people openly advocate that the payment of school taxes probably should no longer become the responsibility of the municipal people but that the taxes should be paid directly to the school division office. We find that this no doubt would cause some problems, but I believe that the divisions would have to be given some guarantee of the right of tax sale of property if taxes were unpaid for a certain length of time. If this did come about, Mr. Speaker, then the taxpayers would, I am sure, express their opinion about their feeling about the way that education is being financed.

Mr. Speaker, when we are changing the financial structure of the cost of education, I think we have to look at the entire picture in the cost of education. At this particular time, and I realize that we have various scales, there are those in the private school field that I believe, Mr. Speaker, are the actual yardsticks of our educational system. With our public school system we have created a large monopoly, almost uncontrollable and the benefits that we derive from it sometimes are questionable.

Mr. Speaker, the private school system offers us that yardstick to measure our achievements. We find out of our private school system that we are getting students who are making the maximum of their capabilities, and in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, we are getting a better class student through the private school system than we are through our public school system, and if this is the case, Mr. Speaker, then there is more reason than ever that we should take a serious look at our entire public educational system. If we are to use the private school system and the dedication of its teachers who have the need of the individual student at heart, I think to a greater degree than the public school system, then I think we have a responsibility to provide them with some form of financial assistance. This question has been discussed in this House many times, Mr. Speaker, and I don't think that we can delay much longer a decision, because the cost of education, if it continues at the present time, will very nearly take half our provincial budget.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen many conflicting statements coming from the government and many of us on this side of the House, and indeed the citizens throughout Manitoba, are asking questions about what direction we are taking in education. We have the First Minister stating just recently when he was on the hustings that he felt there would be some form of assistance given to the private school system, and then we had the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources who took a different view, and I would like to ask the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources if his opinion is still the same today as it was a year ago when he expressed his opinion. And I would like to ask some of the other members on that side if their opinions have changed or if the policies of this government have changed towards the aid that is so necessary in that field. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is serious if we find that the First Minister of this province is not expressing the views of the government of this province. If we cannot believe the words of the First Minister then who can we believe?

We also find in this entire bill in fact, that in the same excursions of the First Minister into the rural areas of Manitoba that he said the purpose of this bill was to reduce the amount of taxation on the local taxpayer, in fact to shift some of the burden off the local taxpayer, and yet after the by-elections are over we find the Minister of Education, when he is speaking to a meeting of the Manitoba Teachers Society, giving us an entirely different opinion. Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote, as reported in the Winnipeg Free Press of April 12th, the comments of

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd).... the Minister of Education when he said "the grant of \$18.00 per student to all school divisions is to encourage the school divisions to innovate and experiment with new programs." Now is the Minister expressing the true purpose of this change in taxation when he wants us to go out and innovate and experiment with the public school system, or was the First Minister correct when he said the purpose of this bill was to shift some of the cost and to hopefully be able to hold the line on the tax dollar, because Mr. Speaker, it seems in my opinion that there is a very different set of circumstances here, a very different expression of opinion between the First Minister and the Minister of Education. When we are spending the large sums of money that we are spending, I don't think that we can be too frivolous in our innovations and experimentation.

Mr. Speaker, while we have some doubt about some of the sections in this bill, we realize also that we have a responsibility here to see that the matters of municipal government are not held up. We realize that municipalities cannot pass their budget until this matter of Bill 13 is approved in the House because it means a change in the budget. At this time we have just debated the principles involved, and at this time I think I would be quite happy to see the bill go to committee where we can get into the clause by clause discussion. With no further words, Mr. Speaker, I'll.....

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

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina, that 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 Minister of Youth and Education. (Bill No. 14) The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MCGREGOR: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this bill on account that part of my constituency is unitarian, the other part is not -- unitary. In my own municipality it is split half and half, and some weeks ago - I have a clipping here from the Virden Empire Advance - "Council Requests Unitary System for Schools," and basically they are the taxpayers, they are the ones that have to pay the bill. Since I took the adjournment I have made several phone calls and it seems to be decided in favour of this bill at the moment.

Just to read parts again in the Virden Empire Advance, "because of provisional grants the division would only need to raise 227,999 and some cents by special levy." That's if the division was unitary, but under the non-unitary system they will have to raise 522 thousand and odd dollars and cents again, so this makes a huge difference. I think while the people voted against it before - and it's rather strange to look at that vote - where the vote was favourable before it was in areas where there was commercial buildings and the taxes would have obviously gone up, and yet in the outlying areas, the farming area and the residential district, the vote was against it. It sounds strange but people like their own personal thoughts and I think they are a little concerned of things getting too big, but today with the dollar and cents showing up very plain, I would have to be in support of this bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Youth and Education. You'll be closing debate?

MR. MILLER: If I speak I'll be closing debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Member from Swan River, that the bill be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. (Bill No. 18) The Honourable Member for Lakeside. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I note that the Honourable Member for Lakeside is not here, and may I suggest that the matter stand in his absence unless someone else wishes to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion -- oh, the Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. WILLIAM URUSKI (St. George): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is my first opportunity to rise in this House in the form of debate during this session and I would like to say that it is appropriate, or I am very happy to rise on this occasion in speaking to Bill No.18

(MR. URUSKI cont'd) . . . . because of the need and the hardships faced by our farmers today and the apparent consent and agreement by the opposition in respect of the principle of this bill but not agreement with respect to the procedure.

I have done some checking through the department and various departments in the government and I have found out that the procedure that was formulated with respect to the Estimates for the new year were already being prepared and set and arrangements were in the process of being made with the printers. As a result, there was no provision in the 71-72 estimates for this kind of payment. The main estimates which were brought forth last week before this House will have no reference to this special emergency relief to the farmers of this province.

As a result, the interim supply bill which will be brought in later, and which I understand by the longest kind of custom simply provides the government with spending authority for a portion of the main estimates, would not provide authority to spend this particular money for the farming community. The government could bring in a supplementary supply bill for this \$4 million which would have the effect of adding it to the main estimates and the government would still want to have, and it has, a special bill for providing this agricultural assistance, so that in effect the opposition, if the opposition would have had its way to consider the main estimates, a supplementary supply bill, an interim supply bill as well as this bill that is before the House today, would have to be dealt with in order to provide this type of relief. Surely no one really needs to emphasize the fact that it is much simpler to go through one item through the House rather than four. In other words, we can make this bill go through the House now, the bill that is before you, or else do as the honourable members across the way suggest, go through these four procedures.

I am also told that the computer program for the issuance of the cheques to the farmers has been ready and the cheques are all processed and they could be in the mail upon the passage of this bill. There are some 30,000 farmers registered with the Wheat Board in the Province of Manitoba and these cheques could be mailed directly. There are an additional amount of farmers who do not have Wheat Board Permits and these number approximately 2,000, give or take a number, and this would take a little longer -- their monies would take a little longer to process as they would have to make a direct application to the Minister.

The process being asked for by the opposition will simply, in my mind, delay the issuance of these cheques by probably at least two weeks in view of the timetable before this House. Now I ask the honourable members, which way do you want it to go? Do you want it to be done now in an easy, quick fashion so that the farmers of Manitoba who are getting ready to either seed, purchase fertilizer, fuel or whatever have you, while they're getting ready for their spring seeding, so that they can have this money in their hands - and believe you me, in speaking to many constituents in my area, they drastically need it. Which way do you want it? Do you want it to go your way, and I honestly feel that from the remarks of the Honourable Member from Morris that your party wholly agrees with this government's move, but yet I don't think you could make any of the farmers in Manitoba understand why you're holding it up. I would hope that the members take my remarks on the investigations that I have made, take them to heart and let this bill go forward. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed that the matter stand in the name of the Honourable Member for Lakeside? (Agreed) The Honourable . . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, if there is a chance that the Honourable Member for Lakeside will be here this evening -- the Leader of the Opposition is shaking his head - I thought that we could call it 5:30, but if that's not the case then we'll let it stand in his name as suggested.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion -- Second Readings - Government Bills. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. GREEN: We'd like these bills to stand, Mr. Speaker. We are up to the . . . .

MR. SPEAKER: If it would be of assistance to the House Leader, I will call it 5:30. I'll return to the House at 8:00 o'clock.