

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 12 students of Senior Grade of the Moorhead State College from North Dakota. These students are under the direction of Mr. Bladow. They are our guests of the day.

We also have 45 students - - or I should say 45 young ladies of the 151st Girl Guide Group. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Taylor and Mrs. McKenzie. This group is from the constituency of Radisson.

On behalf of all the honourable members I welcome you here today.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions - Presenting petitions.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. A. R. (Pete) ADAM (Ste. Rose): I beg to present the petition of Orville Marvin Heschuk and Others, praying for the passing of An Act to incorporate Dauphin Golf and Country Club.

MR. SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports. The Honourable Minister of Highways.

TABLING OF REPORTS

HON. PETER BURTNIAK (Minister of Highways) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table two reports. One is the Annual Manitoba Telephone System Report for the year 1971-72 and the other is the Report of The Highway Traffic Act, the Motor Transfer Board and the Taxicab Board for the calendar year 1972.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other ministerial statements or reports? Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Oral Questions.

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 First Minister. It relates to a question yesterday in connection with the Winnipeg Art Gallery. I believe the President of the Gallery has publicly stated that the Premier received a request for a grant from the government from the Gallery, and I wonder whether the Premier can indicate any information on that in connection with the tax sale now pending with the Art Gallery building.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Minister of Tourism and Recreation did reply to that same question yesterday. Briefly stated, the situation is that the Art Gallery has incurred expenses and costs in building that were beyond original estimates and the province has on two occasions now made additional moneys available. We do not feel that we can go any farther without distorting provincial priorities, but the problem is not as critical as the implied sale, tax sale, would make it appear. I have indication that if the land in question, the Art Gallery site, is incorporated as part of the Centennial Centre properties, that the City of Winnipeg will not have any problem insofar as tax arrear problems are concerned. So this is a technical problem. We do not anticipate any substantive problem.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question. Did the Art Gallery request a grant, or at least request that they be exempt from property taxes? Did they make that request this month?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I think that the Leader of the Opposition will agree on reflection that the exemption from property tax is something which they would have to apply to the municipality, to the City of Winnipeg for, and my understanding is - and I repeat it is only my understanding - that the City is prepared to be reasonable in this matter, that there is need to perhaps formally include or designate the land in question as part of the Centennial Centre Corporation, and if the Art Gallery finds no problem in that approach then the problem is solved.

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) If there is a problem in the minds of the directors of the Art Gallery, then we will have to explore alternative courses of action. But I refuse to believe, Sir, that there is any kind of tax sale imminent largely because I am not aware of anyone who would be interested in buying it - that's one of the problems.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Urban Affairs. I wonder if he's in a position to answer - - the Minister of Urban Affairs - - I wonder if he's in a position to answer the question put to him yesterday as to whether the province has to or is delaying the approval of the form of municipal tax form to be sent out by the City of Winnipeg.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Education, and Urban Affairs) (Burrows): I can assure the Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition that the province is doing nothing that could be interpreted as a delay, but I took the question as notice; I'll have a more complete answer for him at a later time.

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

MR. I. H. ASPER (Leader of the Liberal Party) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, I think my question should appropriately be directed to the Universities and Colleges Minister. Could he confirm that there are approximately 2,000 foreign students attending the University of Manitoba and the University of Winnipeg, and approximately another 1,000 or so non-resident students attending those institutions at Manitoba taxpayers' expense?

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Colleges and Universities) (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I cannot give the exact amounts but if I add these two figures together as 5,000 - - well 2,000 and 3,000 he said - two and one - - I can't give the exact amounts. I think it's somewhat high but I have to take the question as notice.

MR. ASPER: Well, Mr. Speaker, going from there perhaps to the Minister of Labour or to the same Minister. Could he advise the House how many or what percentage of those students are employed during the summer in Manitoba Government - sponsored student employment programs?

MR. MILLER: Again, Mr. Speaker, I'd have to take that question as notice. I haven't got the answer offhand.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. I wonder if he can indicate what progress has been made by the task force study in the Kierans Report.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I believe I indicated in the House some several days ago that the composition of the tax force would be announced; the task force would be given terms of reference which would not be very complex, and that we would hope to have some set of recommendations from the task force in short time, much shorter than in the case of many important commission recommendations in the past. I drew the analogy of the fact that the Carter Commission was approximately ten years between its commissioning and when action was taken on it, and perhaps that's an exaggeration, more like eight years - - (Interjection) - - No, I think it was more than five years certainly - - eight years . . .

A MEMBER: You were still in school then.

MR. SCHREYER: 1963 to 1971, Sir, would make it eight years minimum, and we would hope to do that in perhaps eight months. So there's the ratio.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question to the First Minister and by way of a supplementary. Does the First Minister's weekend speech at the Labour Council indicate that the government has now adopted the Kierans Report as official policy?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, it would be an unwarranted assumption.

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

MR. ASPER: My question is to the Minister of Industry or perhaps to the Minister in charge of the Manitoba Development Corporation. Can he inform the House if there are any government loans, grants, subsidies or any other incentive aid from the Province of Manitoba or any of its corporations in favour of Assiniboia Downs, the racetrack.

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

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I believe that there is some participation but it's through the

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. GREEN cont'd) Minister of Tourism and Recreation. There is none that I am aware of through the Development Corporation unless there was an old loan for the creation which I am not aware of. But there is a public involvement through the Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

MR. ASPER: Would the Minister, then, of Tourism and Recreation, describe the extent and character of the public participation in Assiniboia Downs.

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

HON. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs) (St. Boniface): Well there is -- you're talking about -- the honourable member is asking about grants? Well there's no loans, there's a grant from the mutuel, there's a grant every year. This has been dating for quite awhile to help in the purse structure. And there is also, I think, a -- I can get all the proper information -- but there is a percentage that is remitted to Assiniboia Downs for collecting the tax also. It's over \$400,000 in all. It's over \$400,000 in the last year, yes.

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

MR. ASPER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister, while he's answering, indicate whether this is a new arrangement or it's a long-standing arrangement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. DESJARDINS: It is a long-standing arrangement that dates from the previous government, I don't say the same amount, and I can inform my honourable friend that there is a sub-committee of Cabinet that is looking in the whole idea of the racing industry at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party. Last supplementary.

MR. ASPER: Would the Minister indicate whether the grant, the annual grant from the government out of the pari-mutuel fund for the track, whether it's by negotiation annually or by written agreement or by formula? In what form does it ?

MR. DESJARDINS: It's been by both, by negotiation and formula also, based on a formula. It's not negotiated every year. There is nothing for this coming year, nothing decided as yet.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. I wonder if he'd indicate who the people are going to be put on this committee they're going to study the Kierans Report, and whether it's true that they are considering hiring Mel Watkins as one of those members.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I don't know if the Honourable Member for Thompson has a new fishing licence but he's obviously fishing. No, I'm not aware of any plans for hiring the particular individual that was mentioned. I believe that the Minister of Mines and Resources is to be indicating soon the more precise nature of the composition, terms of reference, etc.

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

MR. GREEN: In follow-up to what the First Minister said, may I say that in view of the nature of Mr. Kierans' recommendations it is probably considered that Mr. Watkins is too conservative to fit into a group to dwell on that subject. I indicated that the task force would be comprised of internal personnel involving the Ministry of Finance, the Ministry of Mines and Resources and the Ministry of Industry and Commerce. They are getting together on an informal basis for the purpose of suggesting terms of reference regarding the report and the studies are underway although there has been no formal declaration of the existence of the force.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Can he advise yet whether he has any information pertaining to the Hydro Report statistics showing a reduction from 1969 to 1972 of 239 industrial consumers?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

POINT OF ORDER

MR. SCHREYER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I thought that it was accepted that requests for statistical information emanating from general statistical offices or DBS is one thing, but a request for detailed figures and statistical data emanating from a report of a Crown corporation was to be taken up at the appropriate standing committee. Now my honourable friend is back at it a week later asking again for answers to questions which flow from a Crown corporation annual report.

POINT OF ORDER

MR. SPEAKER: The point is well taken. The Honourable Member for Riel may raise a point of order too.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the question I asked was taken as notice by the Minister of Industry and Commerce at the time.

ORAL QUESTIONS (Cont'd)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. JEAN ALLARD (Rupertsland): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Could he confirm or deny that he has stated publicly that if there was enough public support or pressure, Bill No. 21 that has to do with the election of a mayor at large, would be brought to a vote this session?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Selkirk): Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that the honourable member is confusing me with another member of the treasury benches.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. ALLARD: May I ask the same question of the Minister for -- what is he? -- Education? -- Urban Affairs. The Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I did indicate that I'd be willing to hear an expression of opinion from the people of the City of Winnipeg but at no time did I indicate that I would yield to any type of pressure.

MR. ALLARD: Question on the same subject, Mr. Speaker, to clarify the answer of the Minister. Did he just say that he did not indicate publicly that if there was public support for Bill No. 21 that it would be brought to a vote at this session?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. The question in that form is argumentative and out of order. Everyone heard the answer that the Honourable Minister gave. Everyone can place his own interpretation on it. There is nothing in the rules to state that a question should be asked for an interpretation of what the honourable member himself interprets. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. ALLARD: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister consider the 1,250 letters and over 2,000 signatures I received this morning in one mail as public support for a measure?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid I cannot comment on those letters; I haven't seen them.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Labour. Can the Minister of Labour tell us what is the number of workers affected directly by Versatile Manufacturing Company moving part of its operation to the United States?

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): No, Mr. Speaker, this is an internal operation in private industry and they do not have to report to the Minister of Labour?

A MEMBER: What's the minimum wage . . . ?

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

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary. Can the Minister tell us how many -- was there any personnel laid off as a result of this move?

MR. PAULLEY: No, Mr. Speaker, I can't precisely insofar as Versatile. I believe that under our free enterprise system management has the right of laying off providing they do so in accordance with the laws of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Riel was alluding to certain statistics regarding industrial customers. I can advise him that while I'm not prepared to necessarily discuss the details and contents of the Manitoba Hydro Report, we are looking into the matter via other statistical sources including Statistics Canada, and when I have the report I will make it to the House. I can indicate to the honourable member, however, that there seems to be a trend

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. EVANS cont'd) towards consolidation of industrial customers in many provinces of Canada and there is an apparent trend towards fewer meters rather than more industrial meters. However, when I get the complete report I'll be pleased to attempt to answer the question.

And while I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to answer the question posed by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition yesterday with regard to layoffs at CAE Limited in Winnipeg, and he wanted to know whether we were aware of these. I can confirm that our department is aware of certain layoffs that have occurred or may occur and we were advised in advance by the officials of that company. I can also advise the honourable members of the House that we have been working very closely and constantly with CAE in obtaining viable long term work with the company, and I could go into considerable detail in this respect but, Mr. Speaker, I think this is more a matter for discussion during the Estimates.

The honourable member also asked a question with regard to the proposal to expand the facilities of CAE to handle certain types of new jet aircraft and whether we were at all - - that is the department was at all involved in a presentation to Ottawa. I can advise him that CAE did make a presentation to Ottawa which they refer to as their hangar modernization presentation. They advised us of the matter but not specifically request us to assist them in making this presentation to the Federal Government.

I would like to remind the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that on many occasions and as recently as a few weeks ago I've taken the opportunity to discuss the matter of the aerospace industry, including CAE, with at least two federal ministers, with regard to long term viability of the industry and with regard to CAE in particular, and while the Federal Government has lived up to the letter of its initial agreement which was signed at the time that CAE took over the base from Air Canada, it's our opinion that they have not lived up to the spirit of the agreement and we are pursuing this matter.

On the other side of the coin, Mr. Speaker, I should inform members of the House that while one company is having difficulty in laying off people there is at least one other major company that is looking for skilled help, and if my information is correct they could use 300 skilled workers like tomorrow morning if they could obtain them, but we are having difficulty in obtaining adequate numbers of skilled workers in the aerospace industry in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: I can appreciate that the honourable minister answered more than one question, but nevertheless I do believe they should be a little briefer because they do take up a lot of time.

A MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Industry and Commerce and relates to the information that was supplied to the House by way of an answer to the questions that were asked yesterday. I wonder if he can indicate whether the government is now prepared to publicly request and support the proposal of CAE for the modernization of the hangars and for ultimately the overhaul of certain new jets to be purchased by Air Canada.

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the Federal Government is well aware of our continuing support of the entire aerospace industry in Manitoba including CAE.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, by way of a supplementary question to the Minister, is the government prepared to publicly support the proposal?

A MEMBER: We have done.

MR. SPIVAK: No.

MR. EVANS: As I attempted to indicate yesterday, Mr. Speaker, this government has spent much time, money and effort in the whole question of maintaining CAE as a viable enterprise in Manitoba. With regard to the specific matter of modernization of the hangars, the company did not specifically ask us to support their presentation and their request, but obviously we stand behind them as we stand behind any Manitoba industry which has an opportunity to expand and give jobs to Manitobans.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question. Will the Minister of Industry and Commerce communicate with the Minister of Defense, the federal Minister of Defense, informing him of the government's position in this respect?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I spent two hours with the Honourable the Minister of National Defense, a matter of days before this House convened, and this was one of the major topics of discussion.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: There is perhaps some point of order here, Sir, I'm not certain. I would simply draw to your attention that implicit in the question was, I believe, an inference unnecessarily uncomplimentary and derogatory of the federal Minister of Defense. A commitment was given by the Government of Canada and by that Minister, the federal Minister in particular, and there is no reason to believe that they are unaware of their own commitments.

MR. SPEAKER: The point is well taken. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: On the point of order, the First Minister has indicated an inference as a result of the question that was put. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Industry and Commerce was asked whether the department was supporting a particular request that had been made, a new request, not an old request. The indication is they have now been made aware that that request was made to Ottawa, and the question that was put to the Minister was simply: Are you now going to act? Not whether they've acted in the past, this has nothing to do with the overhaul base issue; this is a new issue as to whether there will be new opportunities for Manitoba, and all that the government had to do was indicate that they are either going to support the new proposals - not the old proposals - the new proposals of CAE or not, and all that was asked was for direct information as to whether . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable gentleman is not addressing himself to a point of order. The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable the Minister in charge of Manitoba Development Corporation. In the light of the First Minister's assurances yesterday that members are entitled to at least as much information as shareholders and private corporations, would the Minister make available as they are received, either tabled or make available, the annual reports of companies in which MDC has equity positions.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I indicated that such reports would be made available at the Committee on Economic Development. And, Mr. Speaker, let me then indicate so that there's no misunderstanding, the Crown is a shareholder in certain companies and as a result receives what a shareholder would normally receive. The Crown has a right to attend shareholders' meetings which is what is done with respect to private companies; the Crown has a right at those shareholders' meetings to ask questions, although I don't think that that is a problem since the Crown is also represented on the Board. When the Committee on Economic Development meets, my impression is that there will be no difficulty in having the statements, the financial statements, profit and loss and balance sheets presented to the honourable members. The honourable members will then ask the chairman of the Development Corporation questions relating to these balance sheets; the chairman will answer as the representative of the shareholders who has the right to receive this information from a private corporation.

The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party asked yesterday with regard to the CFI in which we are not merely the shareholders but which we are the 100 percent owners. You know, that is a legal question but it is being operated by the receiver entirely on behalf of the Crown, and at the meeting where that information is being dealt with my indication was that the Crown would not only - - that the members of the Legislature would not only get the amount of information that would normally be supplied to shareholders but probably more, and that there is no difficulty in this connection.

MR. MCGILL: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister not agree that shareholders normally receive annual reports well in advance of the annual meeting so that they . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The question is argumentative. Order please. Let's not have a debate on my rulings. If a question is put which states an opinion which may be debated, then it's argumentative, and I'd like to have someone analyze it any differently. Order please. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources.

MR. GREEN: I would just like to indicate that the situation is exactly analogous. The shareholder, mainly the Crown through the Manitoba Development Corporation, has received the statement that the honourable member is referring to; the members at the Economic Development Corporation will receive it from the representative of the shareholder and will be entitled to ask questions on that basis; but the shareholder has received the statement or

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. GREEN cont'd) would have received the statement in the normal course in which it would be sent to other shareholders.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Universities and Colleges. My question relates to the series of questions I asked earlier on student employment for non-residents. In view of the Federal Government's announcement that non-resident foreign students will not, or likely not be given work permits in order to give Canadian students summer employment, does the Government of Manitoba have any policy with respect to giving preference to Manitoba students in the student summer employment programs?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, this whole question of foreign students in the universities of Canada has been discussed and is being discussed with the Federal Government; the ten provinces of Canada took a position which they've presented to the Federal Government. I believe it's one of the factors from which flowed the federal decision that people without permits would not be permitted to work in Canada, and certainly the policy now is that people without work permits should not be permitted to work in Canada, then obviously the Manitoba government will abide by it.

MR. ASPER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. Is the Minister indicating that there is . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I cautioned members in that instance before.

MR. ASPER: Does the Government of Manitoba which operates the STEP program exclusively without federal aid, does the Government of Manitoba have a policy which gives preference to the employment of Manitoba students in the STEP program, or are there non-resident students who receive jobs in the program that would otherwise go to Manitoba students?

MR. MILLER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the term "non-residents" and "foreign students" are quite different. Non-resident students will be students who are in Manitoba taking a post graduate course from another province because they need their graduate studies, they need their doctorate or their Masters, which they cannot obtain in their own province. We have them here just as Manitoba students have to go to Ontario in many cases to get their graduate studies, and there's no imposition by any of the provinces to prevent students from taking jobs anywhere in Canada if they are Canadians or landed immigrant students. Preference is given to those students as against the foreign students who are in a different category; if they're not landed immigrants then they are classed as foreign students, but there is a difference in a landed immigrant student and a foreign student, and there is that distinction which has not yet been resolved federally and which the Federal Government is now studying.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID R. BLAKE (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation. I wonder would the Minister inform the House what action, if any, he has taken or undertaken to encourage the federal Post Office Department to continue the operation of the Post Office at Wasagaming during the tourist season.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I must confess that I know nothing about this situation; it was never brought to my attention.

MR. BLAKE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if he would undertake to exert some pressure on the Federal Government to see that . . . Post Office.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable First Minister on a point of order.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the point of order is that in some cases, in some problem area there may be two aspects one of which is federal in jurisdiction, the other provincial, and so it may well be in order to ask the question here; but in this particular case, Post Office federal in jurisdiction, Wasagaming, in the Riding Mountain National Park, in both its particulars it is federal in jurisdiction.

MR. SPEAKER: The point is well taken. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Accepting what the First Minister has said, it is also a responsibility on the part of the Department of Tourism and Recreation to ensure that the greatest accommodation can be made to tourists who come to this country. Provision of post office facilities at that particular point are important to that department and it was on that basis . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The honourable member is debating the point. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. J. WALLY McKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable the Minister of Public Works. I wonder if the honourable minister can advise the House if the No. 1 hard wheat which was spread on the front steps of the Legislature yesterday was treated with some form of poison to destroy our pigeons.

HON. RUSSELL DOERN (Minister of Public Works) (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I too am a fancier of pigeons, but I understand that there are times when they are a nuisance to the building and the monuments around it and that as a general policy over a period of years that pigeons are in fact poisoned.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Would the Honourable Member for Lakeside like to stand up and say what he wants to say out loud? The Honourable Member for Roblin. Order please. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Honourable the Minister. I wonder would the Minister explain to the House this pigeon-aside plan and the formula that's been utilized to exterminate the pigeons?

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I can only repeat that this is a policy that has been carried on for a number of years. It was not instituted by myself.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development. Could he consult with the Minister of Public Works and see if we just couldn't distribute some birth control medication . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question is facetious. The Honourable Member for Rhineland. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding, notwithstanding the fact that this practice has been going on for some several years it is something which we would be quite prepared to look into, because we share with those on the other side a solicitude for the welfare of pigeons.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. Are any of the credit unions in Manitoba availing themselves of the deposit insurance available under the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation Act?

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Colleges and Universities. I'd like to know when we can expect the final report of the post secondary task force of education.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding they're working on it and are still meeting with various groups and institutions. I can't give an exact date at the present time; I hope the report will be finalized soon.

MR. GIRARD: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister is under the impression that we could have it before the termination of this session.

MR. MILLER: If the member will tell me when the session will be terminating I might be able to answer.

MR. GIRARD: Some time in June, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MILLER: If it's some time in June, I think the report may be ready.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder if he can advise the House, has the Saunders Aircraft received a U. S. certificate of air worthiness?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines & Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe this subject has been canvassed on various occasions. The day to day dealings of a corporation in which either the Crown has equity or in which the Crown is the total shareholder will be dealt with more specifically at the Committee on Economic Development. I'm not saying that that doesn't mean a question cannot be asked from time to time, but this question has been asked on various occasions and I believe answers have been given.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, I asked a very simple question - yes

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) or no. My question is: Can this plane be sold in the United States?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, apparently my answers can't be quite as simple as the simple Member for Assiniboia would like to have them.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable the Minister. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Brandon West. Will the Honourable Member for Wolseley state his point of privilege?

MR. ASPER: My point of privilege is that the Minister has stood in his place and insulted in terms which are unparliamentary the Honourable Member from Assiniboia by referring to him as simple. Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: There is nothing unparliamentary about simple. If the honourable member can find a citation I'll accept it. The . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, whether it is unparliamentary or not, I would apologize for the remark. I would only indicate to the honourable member that he cannot tell me when he gets up to ask a question that my answer must be yes or no. That is just as insulting. But, nevertheless, I will apologize to the honourable member for using the phrase because it's not becoming of me and it is not accurate of him.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister for MDC. Has the Minister in his possession annual reports for companies where we have equity positions which have not yet been made available to members of the Economic Development Committee?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would presume that in my capacity as Minister to whom the corporation is responsible that the corporation would have such statements as have already been prepared and have been sent on to them. I have recalled seeing some of them; I have not seen them all. But the fact is that those statements which the corporation is entitled to receive, I would presume that they have received, and they will be dealt with when the corporation makes its report to the honourable members at committee.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Would the Minister make these available to the members of the Economic Development Committee in advance of the committee meeting.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I indicated that I see no reason why the reports will not be available to members at the committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Minister of Agriculture. Could he inform the House as to how many, if any, slaughtered hogs have been shipped to Japan this week?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, that information is probably available at the Hog Marketing Commission if the honourable friend would avail himself of contacting it.

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

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister who's also Minister of Finance, and I don't intend to be offensive or derogatory or infer bribery, but how many votes does he expect to buy tonight?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, that question is offensive because I rather suspect - I can check this, but I think that my honourable friend was one of several on the other side who have been complaining for a couple of months now that we could afford tax cuts and weren't doing it. Now if that were so then my honourable friend, I assume, would be getting up and saying why we didn't have tax cuts. Now if there are some - and we don't know that yet, do we - and if there are my honourable friend will be saying well then, why have you got these tax cuts? You see, Sir, it all makes a bunch of nonsense - the whole process - doesn't it?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question's to the First Minister. In view of the fact we're in the third year of the '70s I wonder if the First Minister could indicate when the Guidelines for the Seventies will be tabled in this House.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, today being Tuesday, I would hope by Tuesday next.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question's to the First Minister, Is it now government policy to refuse to have questions answered in the House other than in the Economic Affairs Committee on all matters dealing with companies in which the MDC has an investment? Is that government policy?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, that question in various forms has been asked over the past few days. The Minister of Mines and Resources has answered that on at least three or four occasions and, in addition to that, I would refer my honourable friend to various citations of Beauchesne. Now just to refresh his memory, perhaps the Minister of Mines and Resources could edify him once more.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I really do believe that the answer has been given three or four times. I would suggest the Honourable Member for Wolseley take a look at Citation 181, and look at it and then he would know what answers have to be given or don't have to be given and in what context. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer because it is a fact that some people have greater difficulty at comprehension than others and have to have things repeated for them, and I think it should be repeated. The honourable member says it is the policy of the government not to answer questions until the report of Economic Development Committee. I indicated, Mr. Speaker, that although such questions could be put by honourable members, that in general with regard to the day to day operations of a commercial enterprise, I didn't intend to be supplying answers.

Secondly, that I wasn't going to comment on the health or otherwise of an ongoing commercial enterprise, because to do so is dangerous.

Thirdly, that details would be available at the Committee on Economic Development but that all of these things do not preclude a question that a member may want an answer to and which, for reasons which accrue to ministerial discretion, I would answer.

MR. ASPER: Well, Mr. Speaker, then in view of the answer to that, or the statement just now made by the Minister, would he simply answer a question that has nothing to do . . . ?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The honourable member is not entitled to debate, he's entitled to ask a question. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Does the Minister regard it as a matter of security, harmful to the company Saunders Aircraft, to be able to tell us in this House whether or not the aircraft we're building does or does not have a certificate of airworthiness in the United States? Is that a matter of security?

MR. GREEN: No. No, Mr. Speaker, it is not a matter of security as far as I'm concerned.

MR. ASPER: In the light of that answer, Mr. Speaker, will the Minister tell us the answer to the question?

MR. GREEN: . . . that question was asked, Mr. Speaker, I indicated that it had been asked on previous occasions and that answers had been given. The honourable member doesn't - - (Interjection) - - Mr. Speaker, this session, that is my recollection. The honourable member is sometimes not here, sometimes on occasion not here and therefore misses these answers. My impression is that the question was asked and the answer was given.

POINT OF ORDER - OBLIGATION OF GOVERNMENT

MR. SPEAKER: . . . the Honourable First Minister state his point of order.

MR. SCHREYER: My point of order, Mr. Speaker, is Citation 181 of Beauchesne, and the insistence of one who has not been in parliament long enough to know the rules and practices and usages of parliament, to waste the time of this House with insistence on that which he has no right to insist upon, Sir. And Citation 181 is in the rules and it should be enforced, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Mr. Speaker, with respect to the particular situation that has just arisen, it appears that the Minister did answer the question at one time. I'm led to believe that that's the case and I guess that question's been answered. But with respect to the general principle, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Would the honourable member state his point of order?

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The object of the Opposition is to ask questions of the

POINT OF ORDER

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) government. The government has an obligation to answer.
SOME MEMBERS: No, no.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, the government has an obligation to answer and, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. The honourable member is debating a particular point of view he has. He has not stated a point of order. Citation 181 does indicate clearly that there is no necessity to answer. Now let us get together and understand Citation 181, and I'm not going to debate it with anyone in the House. Would everyone kindly sit down and let's relax for a moment. We're going to have a long day. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, speaking further to the point of order and the point made by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, I am not familiar enough with Beauchesne to know whether there is a reference in there to hypocrisy or not but, Sir, if there is any suggestion that we are refusing to provide information which this House has been over the years accustomed and entitled under the rules to receiving, Citation 181 notwithstanding, I would now like, Sir, to draw to your attention that that can hardly be the case; given the fact and within minutes I could have the actual quotations of previous government spokesmen on the question of divulging of information. The Leader of the Opposition would have one believe that the government is refusing to provide information hitherto previously made available. And, Sir, the very opposite is the truth, that information of the most elementary kind was not made available relative to MDC operations in the past, and Hansard from 1964, 65, 66, 67 will prove that. We are now making annual reports of the MDC, quarterly reports, referring them to the Standing Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I cited and I agreed that the point of order raised in regards to Citation 181 was well taken when the First Minister raised it. I indicated the Honourable Leader of the Opposition was debating the issue and not stating his point of order. I think we should proceed from there. Orders of the day.

Will the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party state his particular point of order?

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the point of order raised by the First Minister was directed at the question I asked and his point of order ostensibly was based upon Citation 181 of Beauchesne, I think the record should show that there is virtually nothing, not a word in Citation 181, to prevent me from asking the Minister of Mines the simple question: is it a matter of security? not to give me the answer.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. Before we get into a further hassle that question was answered. There is - - Order. There is no need for repetition of questions. Now if we are going to have an afternoon of procedural debate I'll welcome it, but I shall insist that I be spelled every so often so that I can have a breather. Otherwise I shall not feel responsible for the conduct that may accrue out of the Chair because, after all, the members elected me, they must also realize that I am one of them so I am human too, and there's a limit to how much I can take. So let us get together and get on with the work of the House. Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

ORAL QUESTIONS (Cont'd)

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of Health and Social Development. Could he inform the House how many day care centres in the province have received financial assistance from his department, and also if the government is considering extending the financial assistance to allow the day care centres to stay open longer?

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health & Social Development) (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I haven't got the answers to the questions asked by the Member for Portage la Prairie. I'll be bringing some of the answers, well, most of the answers to the questions during my Estimates.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to answer two questions that were posed of me, one from the Honourable Member for Thompson who is not in his chair but he will read it in Hansard. It's in regard to a different procedure, mode of payment, in regards to abortions and D and C procedure. There is a discrepancy in the cost between the D and C procedure being 36.40 and abortion 60.75, because the procedure is not necessarily the same. In the early stages of pregnancy the procedures are comparable but in advanced stages of pregnancy

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) abortions are much more complicated with various risks involved. The differences in fee recognizes a greater degree of responsibility and care involved in the one case and not in the other.

As to the other question posed, the difference in length of hospital stays for abortions is a matter of professional opinion, not a matter for government policy.

Another question posed of me was from the Honourable Member for Rock Lake, who is not in his chair. This is in regard to expenditures at Ninette, the Sanatorium in Ninette. In the past twelve months no government money has been spent on renovations to Ninette Sanatorium; in 1971/72, \$16,818 was spent on the Sanatorium as part of a winter works program, not on renovations but on building maintenance such as roof repairs, heating and water lines and floor tiling.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Education. I'd like to know when we could expect the legislation on teachers' retirement be introduced in the House because people in the school division areas are waiting for that kind of legislation.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, there's nothing to prevent the honourable member from expecting legislation right now.

MR. GIRARD: Mr. Speaker, I didn't quite get the answer from the speaker. I wonder if he'd like to repeat that.

MR. HANUSCHAK: The honourable member may expect whatever he wishes at any time he wishes to expect it.

MR. GIRARD: May I rephrase my question, Mr. Speaker? Should the people of Manitoba expect the legislation changing the Retirement Act, the Teachers' Retirement Act, at this session?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that if the honourable member were to reread the Throne Speech, which makes excellent reading, he would find the answer to his question therein.

MR. GIRARD: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister would indicate whether he has noticed that the need for introduction of this legislation at this time is already apparent.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we were aware of the need for this legislation long before the honourable member raised it in the House, hence reference to it in the Throne Speech.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable House Leader.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - BILL NO. 23

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, would you call Bill 23, please.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable First Minister. The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, one of the -- I want to keep my remarks confined primarily to the financial matters contained in the bill at hand, Bill 23, and to the general terms of the 1973-74 estimates.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most difficult aspects of examining either Interim Supply or examining the estimate book is the continuance of any sort of a standard form of bookkeeping that the government might use, or the lack of continuance of a bookkeeping technique that they might use from year to year, and it becomes extremely difficult to in fact be able to compare this year with last year and the year before, and to go back even further than that, into the former government. And of course the only way that the people of Manitoba can get a true picture of what is happening to the fiscal affairs of the province is to have some standard form of accounting technique so that they can tell whether the expenditures -- at what rate the expenditures are going up and at what rate they're going up in certain departments.

Mr. Speaker, if we look at the departments listed here, for instance, we find that grants to Education between 1970 and 1974 would appear to have risen by 101 percent. Now that's all told in Education. On the other hand, if we look at the Department of Highways we find that the increase would appear to be between 1970 and 1974, only 14.6 percent. Now if 14.6 percent is the actual figure on the same basis of comparison for 1974 as it was for 1970, then we would be

ORDERS OF THE DAY
BILL 23

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) able to say that the Highways aspect of government expenditure has been lower than normal. It would be an average over the four years of something like three to four percent, three and a half percent, whereas on the other hand if we look at health costs other than salaries and expenditures, the cost has gone up from 28 million to 94 million, or an increase of 233 percent over the same period. So it's very awkward and very difficult, Mr. Speaker, of telling whether in total we're adopting the right or an acceptable split on the expenditures of the province when we're asked to approve the Interim Supply, namely a quarter of the total expenditures for the year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this has been discussed before and has been a matter of issue in the provinces. The questions that we want to -- that are pertinent but are difficult to get the answers to are: have there been shifts out of current expenditures and into capital borrowing in the Highways Department to the extent that it would show an increase in four years of only 14.6 percent, or have there been reallocations of costs out of Highways and into some other department?

Now the same applies to Education. Have there been shifts out of current, such as university buildings which at one time were paid out of current costs, current expenditures, have they been shifted into capital borrowing so that in fact the grants to Education are really much higher than what are shown by comparing 1970 and 1974. So there's an important point here, Mr. Speaker, and that is: what shifts have taken place from current into capital borrowing that where money formerly was paid out during a given year for a capital expenditure but now may be amortized over a 20-year period and we're paying only amortization payments, principal and interest combined. It's an extremely important matter to be able to include this in any accurate bookkeeping technique.

Now some provinces in Canada have adopted this technique in a standard form but it's impossible in Manitoba to tell at this point how much shift has taken place from current into capital and therefore we have no real means of comparing the expenditures from one year to the next, no real accurate means. We have for this year, for instance, a supposed increase in the budget of 6.8 percent, but Mr. Speaker, how does this account for the projected \$28 million rebate system on Education which is now shifted from one year into the next? If that \$28 million is attributed to this year rather than to the following year, then we have an accurate picture. If, on the other hand, the government expenditures do not show the reduction in the amounts of money that are received from the Federal Government by way of income tax and this comes off first, we see a reduction in revenues rather than an increase in expenditures. So is the 6.8 percent increase that we are given by comparison, by comparing this year's estimates with last year's estimates, accurate and to what extent does it include the new arrangements from an income tax point of view that would see a deduction at source rather than it coming in to the expenditure book. Now if they are included, then we can say that this year's at 6.8 percent is a substantial decrease in total expenditures, a substantial decrease over the 10 to 15 percent range of increase that was predominant during the previous three years of this government's administration.

So these are the sorts of questions, shifts from current into capital and then the shifts from expenditure into a reduction in revenue that might also be there. So how do we compare this year with last year and the year before, and is it not possible, can the government not tell us whether it's not possible with relative ease to shift into a national standard code, if you like, of bookkeeping that has been adopted by some jurisdictions so that comparisons can be made from year to year rather than the more difficult way of getting at the true picture.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I also want to make comment here about the new technique that has been used, it has been brought in by the government, for the financing of education. I think that the Member for Rhineland would be particularly interested in the concept that the government has adopted for financing of education. As I understand it, Social Credit philosophy and Social Credit creed is that interest-free loans should be made from a central banking system to the people and the citizens of the country. Well, Mr. Speaker, if that's the case, if my interpretation is correct, you could conclude that the system that the government is using here is exactly the inverse. What they're doing is asking the people of Manitoba for an interest-free loan by paying their tax bill in June and collecting the money back from their income tax nine months later in April or May.

BILL 23

(MR. CRAIK cont'd)

Well, Mr. Speaker, if that's the case, we have in our system of school financing now a technique which is really a case where you have a nine-months delay in financing and during that nine-months period you have interest-free loans being made by the property taxpayer to the Provincial Government for the payment of their what is first of all a Provincial Government responsibility, namely the financing of the public school system. So, Mr. Speaker, the government has presented this as a boon to the property taxpayer, a relief from those money-grubbing municipal and school board people in their local communities, a relief from these people, but if you look at it in its true light, who set up the school system in the first place, who created the school boards and who created the municipal authorities, you can't help but look at it when you boil it all down that the technique of forcing a property owner to pay taxes and then ask for his money back out of his income tax nine months later, is really little more than an interest-free loan system that provides the government from the taxpayer with interest-free money for a period of up to about nine months until they get their money back out of their next year's income tax bill. So that, Mr. Speaker, I think has to be underlined, that when it's completely boiled down we have a very inefficient system that has been brought in by the Provincial Government for the curtailment of extra high property taxes, a rebate system that would work far more effectively. If the government's objective is to bring in a changed scale of income tax rates based on income paying ability, why did they not simply introduce a sensible Foundation Program, Mr. Speaker, a program which was once referred to by the present Minister of Colleges and Universities, not as a foundation program, but a subterranean program.

Mr. Speaker, when he called this a subterranean program it was paying for 80 percent of what was considered the basic cost of a sound education system in Manitoba. That same program under his administration is paying for 50 percent or less, through the Foundation Program, through the Foundation Program. Mr. Speaker, the Minister or his back-up Minister can give us the actual figures; he has them, but with no changes having been made in the Foundation grants. With no changes having made in the Foundation grants basically since 1967, there's no question that that original 80 percent has now dropped probably to 50 percent or less, and, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Colleges and Universities four years ago on this side of the House referred to our 80 percent program, not as a foundation program but a subterranean program.

Well, we have to ask him now if it was a subterranean program in his estimation then, what is it now? And, Mr. Speaker, if the government wants to do an adequate job of financing education, why don't they simply do what the Minister wanted to do on this side of the House, which he spoke to at length and with authority, Mr. Speaker. Having been both a former school board member and a mayor of a municipality, he spoke with great authority on the matter and was listened to, and he said that at that time an 80 percent Foundation Program was inadequate and could not even be called a Foundation Program, could not even be called a Foundation Program because it was in fact less than that. It was in the depths greater than a foundation, it was worse than that.

Mr. Speaker, we're talking about now a Foundation Program that doesn't represent 80 percent of the costs of a basic education but represents probably somewhere of the order of 50 to 60 percent.

Now let me come back to the main point. In order to get around changing the Foundation Program they've brought in a school rebate system that rebates to the citizens of Manitoba a scaled amount of money varying between \$50.00 and \$140.00 based on their so-called ability-to-pay. And, Mr. Speaker, again I repeat it is very little more, when you boil it down, than a system of borrowing from the people for about a nine-months period on an interest-free basis, because that is essentially what's been done, it's just shifted the money flow back out of phase by about nine months. And I say that again, if you back up and look at it, if the government's real objective was to get at the higher income group by scaling from \$50.00 to \$140.00 on rebate, they could have done it more effectively by scaling their Manitoba income tax regulations to scale above and below the 42.5 percent of federal tax that would have effectively done the same thing, Mr. Speaker, would effectively have done the same thing. It would have established an ability-to-pay principle, if that is what they're after, without going through this bassackward system of having a property taxpayer, many who are retired people who have never paid taxes in their life - in their life, Mr. Speaker - and very many who have not paid taxes for 15-20 years, 10 years if you like, and are scared to now get back into the business

BILL 23

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) of paying income tax, could have left all these people who are in their position of paying their property tax as they required but reducing the amount they had to pay, and then just simply have them not have to fill out an income tax form.

Again I come back, Mr. Speaker, to repeat that the government - - all the government has achieved in this very awkward system, which is just a little more awkward, Mr. Speaker, than what the Conservative Government had in the mid Sixties and which they threw out because it was an awkward system - the rebate system - it's just a little more awkward because it's now based, to some extent it changes a little bit the ability-to-pay principle. And again, to repeat, if the objectives of the present government is simply to alter the ability-to-pay principle on income tax, why did they not just change the scale of taxation and forget about the business of paying a tax in June on property, going around until April and asking for a rebate? All the bookkeeping facilities, all the administrative overhead introduced, for a crazy arrangement where the government was responsible in the first place by the statutes of the BNA Act and everything else for setting up the educational system, for financing it, Mr. Speaker, responsible for financing it in the first place, so they ask the people of Manitoba to finance it for a nine-month period until they can get their money back nine months later in the next fiscal year. An absolutely ridiculous program for the financing of a government operation when you really boil it down. It might be a short term solution but it is very little more than a poor excuse for a Foundation Program that has got into such disrepair that the government has now had to try and bail it out with a band-aid technique of introducing a rebate system, a rebate on something that they were responsible for from Day One and which they did not keep up with.

So, Mr. Speaker, Bill 23 offers an opportunity for pointing out what has become a patch-work process of financing the public school education system in Manitoba. In the final analysis, Mr. Speaker, the basic point is whether or not the government is paying its fair share of the education public school dollar in Manitoba. We'll get at those answers when the Minister, when the Minister's estimates come up. Perhaps the government has gone as far as it can go, but the main point that we're attempting to make here and which we've attempted to make before but as time goes by the nonsensical approach becomes more evident and more aware to the people of Manitoba, particularly as the government spends these massive amounts of dollars to advertise this program and it's still coming over the radio every day; if you want to know how to get your money back which you shouldn't have paid for in the first place, come and ask us. That's exactly what they should say. "If you want your money back which we shouldn't have taken in the first place, come and see us." That's in effect what we said. If you want your money back that you contributed to us, interest-free, to pay for a public school system which we are responsible for financing in the first place, come on back and we'll be nice to you. That's what the government is effectively saying in their paid advertisements in the massive bureaucracy they set up in the Zenith number phone calls that are by the hundreds, I presume, or thousands that have been made in Manitoba for people to try and get their money back. All of this because the government could not see fit to follow the words of advice that were given by the present Colleges and Universities Minister when he was sitting over in the House on that corner and spoke so effectively four years ago. It's hard to believe, it's hard to believe that he would bring in a program or condone a program of one of his junior Ministers to come out with, condone a program such as that when it wouldn't have lasted five minutes without his calling it things worse than a subterranean program - things much worse, I'm sure, than a subterranean program when he was sitting over on this side of the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with the total costs on financing our public school system now at the \$191 million mark - roughly \$190 million as far as you can determine - the \$14 million that the government has announced will represent something less than a 10 percent increase in provincial grants to the public school system. Again, it would appear that the \$14 million is probably about the natural growth increase of the public school system costs for this current year. We haven't heard specific reference to this by the Minister or by the government but it is not a substantive program which was indicated in the press release brought out by the government. It is a program which probably keeps up with one year's escalation of costs in the public school system, and I mention it because at \$190 million it is extremely important and occupies a third of the total provincial budget. The health costs, on the other hand, represent just as large an amount and the escalation of the health costs are probably much more of concern than the escalation of the education costs.

BILL 23

(MR. CRAIK cont'd)

What the people of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, are looking for and what they're concerned about is not so much the patchwork programs that look after the cost increases from this year to the next year, or last year to this year, they're looking towards government and the parties that are aspiring to government, and asking the question as to which one is going to bring into control the spiralling cost of government. And I think they realize that when government costs are rising at a rate of 10 to 15 percent per year that it far exceeds the rate of growth that has taken place in any other sector of the economy. It exceeds by far the growth in the gross national product. Mr. Speaker, even when you use the statistics given by the First Minister, which are given in the most glowing terms between '69 and '73, when you consider the agricultural component in it and the good years and the bad years, the gross national product, even in the glowing terms presented by the First Minister, do not in any way, shape or form keep pace with the rate of growth the government costs over the same period of time. And these are the answers that people want; not whether you're going to get us by from June until October, until September, or through until April with an interest free loan on a fictitious rebate system, but whether or not the government is prepared to put the controls on government spending that is going to bring it into tune with the natural growth of the Manitoba economy. These are the basic questions, and from all indications the amounts that are given to us in the estimates for 1973/74 still exceed by a substantial percentage rate the ability of the Manitoba economy to sustain on a continuing basis this rate of increase of government expenditure.

Mr. Speaker, those are the few words I want to make on this. I think it comes down to that basic point - the different positions of the government as to who is going to trim government costs to the extent of keeping them in tune with the natural growth rate of the economy. I can only say that this government is still well above the natural growth rate of the economy in the rate at which they are expending money.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. ALLARD: Well, Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 23 gives me an opportunity to do a couple of things. One of them is to commend the government - and I just pause for a moment to allow them to all spring to attention - to commend the government on the efforts that they have been making in the north specifically in terms of northern transportation, notwithstanding the quality of the present winter which was really an act of God. I want to commend them on their efforts and what they have done to build winter roads which it allowed quite a number of private firms to bid on the shipping and to have achieved results like bringing down the cost of shipping fuel from Winnipeg to Island Lake from 64 cents last year to 39 cents this year, and I think this is the kind of result that many northerners are happy to see.

I see that the Minister is not in his seat and the reason, of course, is that he is up north looking in the transportation setup at the moment and the problems that arise out of the aforementioned acts of God, which is really all the heat we've been receiving since January and what it has done to some of those roads, I want to commend the Minister for being up there and the government for having seen that his presence is up there. In commending the government, I would like to ask them to very seriously consider, not only seriously consider but I think it's almost imperative that those areas that have, through no fault of their own and through no fault of the government, been denied the opportunity of receiving their goods by winter road, that some means of subsidizing the extremely high cost of air transportation, some means of subsidizing these costs are going to be found.

I remember some years ago going into God's Lake, God's Narrows, and at the Hudson Bay seeing a turnip on the shelf for \$1.12, and seeing 10 lbs. of potatoes for \$3.18; these are the types of costs that are incredible, and the people of God's Narrows are going to be facing a similar situation this winter, and I think that this should be taken into account and I think that in view of the fact that the economy of the province is in reasonable shape and that we're not in a serious deficit situation apparently, that we would have some dollars, that the province would share the difficulties caused to the people of the north by the aforementioned act of God.

Having dealt with my comments that have to do with commending the government in the north, I now turn to another matter, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Bill 23 asks us to pass the Bill of Supply . . . for various needs. A certain amount of this money is going to go to the City of Winnipeg. I think that the Council of the City of Winnipeg needs to know what its future structure is going to be, to be able to come to the best decision so far as the spending of these funds are concerned.

BILL 23

(MR. ALLARD cont'd)

There is before this House, and it's intimately related to this bill, a bill that would make the election of the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg one of universal suffrage for the years to come - the next election and the ones after that. Mr. Speaker, this morning I received 1,250 letters containing some over 2,000 signatures supporting this measure. Yesterday I received 125 letters with 200 signatures. Tomorrow I expect to get some more. I can only say that it has been a private effort on my part, it's of limited strength, and I think that it's just beginning to catch on. I can only say that this sort of a movement that can yield this kind of results at its very beginning is certainly a very popular one, it's one that has the support of the population at large and the active support. We all know how difficult it is to get any form of support for anything that we propose. If a Minister brings in some measure and he received ten letters in support of it, he knows that he's got something going for him. I would suggest that when I've got 1,250 in this morning's mail that there certainly is a massive public support for this measure.

People want the Mayor of Winnipeg elected at large for many reasons. One of them, of course, is that the mayoralty race creates a great deal of interest in the election itself. Otherwise you end up with a great deal of apathy and I can only point out the fact that when there is no mayoralty race in a civil election, there's very little interest in it. I'm glad, Mr. Speaker, that the House Leader, the Minister of Mines and Resources, is coming into the House; I may have something to say to him in a few moments. I can only regret that in this question of the mayoralty race I believe that the First Minister finds himself caught in a bind between what his position is and the position of the majority of the members of his caucus who represent the City of Winnipeg. It is my conviction, and I'll document it later, that the majority of those members who hold an overwhelming power in the caucus are against the election of the mayor at large. I see the Member for St. Matthews smiling at me. I'm sure that he recognizes himself as one of those who would never want to see the mayor elected at large.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Matthews state his point of privilege.

MR. WALLY JOHANNSON (St. Matthews): I have never stated that particular position and I would ask the member to withdraw that statement. I assume he's interested in conveying the truth to this Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. ALLARD: Mr. Speaker, I have been misled then. I would ask the member to tell me, then, whether he does support the election of a mayor at large, whether he does support this bill.

POINT OF ORDER

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines on a point of order.

MR. GREEN: Unless the question is completely rhetorical, Mr. Speaker, I presume that it's out of order. Unless he's merely asking it to hear it asked, it is out of order.

MR. ALLARD: Not at all, Mr. Speaker; I think that we have a right, that the people of this province have a right to know what the position of their members is on any particular issue, and that is exactly what I am asking and I'll ask the Minister himself what his position is on this issue and whether he intends to respect the freedom of choice of the people of this province.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I would suggest to the honourable member that he is transgressing our rules because he cannot make questions to members and expect answers during his debate, that's contrary to our rules of debate. And if he's going to conduct himself in that manner, I'm going to have to ask him to cease and desist. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland, The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: . . . referred to myself. If he misrepresents my position in the House, as he has done outside of the House, I will also rise on a point of privilege as did quite correctly the Member for St. Matthews.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: I have a further point of order, Mr. Speaker. Notwithstanding Citation 329 of Beauchesne, which is the one I've referred to perhaps too often in the last few days, the Member for Rupertsland has been addressing himself to two subjects, one of which involves expenditures by the Crown - that is northern transportation, etc., and I suppose in that sense he was proceeding quite conventionally in accordance with the rules although with broad interpretation, but that's all right. But then, Sir, he is now relating his remarks to a

POINT OF ORDER

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) question which admittedly is a matter of public policy but does not involve, as I understand it does not involve any greater or lesser expenditure by the Crown, therefore it has nothing to do with Supply, with Supply to be granted to Her Majesty, Sir. It is something which is important and which should stand on its own merits.

MR. SPEAKER: The point is well taken. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. ALLARD: On the point of order then, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the City of Winnipeg is involved indirectly in the spending of funds that will come out of this Supply, and certainly the question of whether the Mayor is elected at large determines to a certain extent how the funds will be spent.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The honourable member is now again straying from the particular point of relevancy that's before the House. Would the honourable member state his point of order and cite the Citation he wishes to refer to.

MR. ALLARD: Mr. Speaker, my point of order is that money comes from this Legislature to the City of Winnipeg and how those funds are going to be spent are influenced by the structure of that council and how it is set up. That is my point and I believe it's a valid point.

MR. SPEAKER: That's an opinion, for the honourable member's edification. Does the Honourable Member for Morris wish to discuss the point of order?

MR. JORGENSEN: On the point of order, an Interim Supply Bill is requesting that one-quarter of the total Supply to be granted to Her Majesty be passed. That encompasses every department of government; and on the Estimates, our main Estimates, Sir, on page 41 there is an item dealing with Urban Affairs, which involves the expenditure of \$1,785,000. Now, Sir, if that is going to form a part of the general revenue, which it does because it is in the Estimates, it's not in Capital Supply or anything else, then surely a debate on the question of how the City of Winnipeg Act is to be operated is a valid point of debate at this time. --(Interjection)-- Well, I wonder if my honourable friend would want to get up and I'd be interested in hearing that particular point that he is making so that we can hear, we can have the benefit of his knowledge, and I'll be happy to sit down to hear that because I want to know just what he is talking about.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J. R. (Bud) Boyce (Winnipeg Centre): Well to the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I thought the Member for Morris was going to make that because he's familiar with the rules more so than I am, that there is a bill before the House at the present time for consideration just on the point that the Member for Rupertsland, you know, is introducing himself so therefore he's guilty of repetition and considering it at an improper time the point that he wants to make.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Now that, Mr. Speaker, is a valid point of order and perhaps it is far more valid than the one raised by the First Minister. It is a legitimate point of order that I think Your Honour wants to consider in whether or not the honourable member would be permitted to continue on debating second reading of a bill that he himself has introduced.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. ALLARD: Well, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the Department of Urban Affairs is one of the departments that is being funded by the Supply that we're raising, and on that basis I am continuing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: If the rules permit it then there is no problem, but the Member for Morris, the Member for Winnipeg Centre, have taken note of the fact that Bill 21 is on the Order Paper. It has to do with precisely the same subject matter. I don't have the particular citation of Beauchesne before me but I'm rather confident that there is a citation to that effect in here in Beauchesne.

MR. SPEAKER: The point is well taken. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland should note that.

MR. ALLARD: Mr. Speaker, I'll speak not speak on the matter of the bill itself and I'll discuss it that way. I will address my remarks to the questions of whether a bill should be passed or not and not whether the -- and not what the points of the bill should be.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Urban Affairs is responsible for the City of Winnipeg Act. I believe that if the people of the province want to see certain legislation passed he should

POINT OF ORDER

(MR. ALLARD cont'd). . . . see to it that it is, and I believe that at this session before the next election is the time in which the government should show its goodwill in this question because I'm convinced on the question -- on the question of this bill because I am convinced that the House Leader has no intention, I repeat, the House Leader has no intention of bringing Bill 21 to a vote in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member's attributing and inferring something to another member which he has no right to do. Unless that has been stated by the individual the honourable member is again imputing, which is contrary to our rules and he should know that. The Honourable Member . . . The Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources.

MR. GREEN: On that point that you raised, which is one thing, but on a more serious point, Mr. Speaker, the House Leader is involved in procedure of bills, he is not able without the majority of the members of the House to either bring bills on or not bring bills on, and therefore the honourable member's reference to myself certainly cannot be dealt with in a personal way because I don't act personally in trying to convene the House in accordance with the wishes of honourable members, and in which I cannot get the support of honourable members in a majority.

MR. ALLARD: Well, Mr. Speaker, I just heard the comments of the House Leader. It seems to me on the question of any bill before the House, including the one that is before the House and on which I am speaking, Bill No. 23, that he seems to display the same attitude on any one of those bills. His attitude seems to be: I know that's good for you. I know what's good for you; I'm elected to decide; I will decide; and I think that this is the position that he has taken in committees before, in the Committee of the House . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I don't know why the honourable member feels that he for some reason has to characterize me in the way in which he is doing, but Mr. Chairman, what he says is entirely against parliamentary procedure and is an insult to every other member of this Chamber. It is also an insult to myself.

MR. SPEAKER: The point is well taken. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. ALLARD: Well, Mr. Speaker, what I'm saying is my opinion -- you know, the opinion I come to after listening to the member in committees of this House when we sit in Room 254 . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I would suggest that the honourable member is entitled to an opinion but he must also have an opinion about the rules of this House and he should really consider them while he is expressing his opinions. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

BILL 23 (cont'd)

MR. ALLARD: Well, Mr. Speaker, getting back to the topic, I've dealt with two subjects and again I'd like to go back to the original subject I touched upon, and that was one of commending the government for their interest in the north. I think that it's regrettable that very often the First Minister finds himself caught in a position that is rather untenable. It's one of those situations that he's been in before --(Interjection)-- the Minister of Mines and Resources put him in it once by getting on his feet and resigning from the Cabinet and opposing him on a measure the First Minister brought before this House, and defeating the First Minister on it. Now, if that's not an embarrassing position, I don't know what is. I don't know if the House Leader recognizes himself as the man who did this; certainly it can't be a very interesting position for a First Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister shall be closing debate.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the honourable members for their rather extended contribution to the consideration of Interim Supply. It seems, Sir, that this year there has been not very much attention paid to that particular citation of Beauchesne which states as an assertion that is normal for an Interim Supply to be dealt with extraordinary dispatch. It hasn't happened this year but I am not bitter, Sir . . .

MR. JORGENSON: I'm just wondering, I know the First Minister was not in the House when I dealt with that particular subject and I wonder if he had read my remarks dealing with that particular citation which I made in this House on Friday.

BILL 23

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm familiar . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland,

MR. FROESE: The Member for Morris interjected, so maybe I can do the same thing. The bill wasn't even called yesterday; I think they could have called it yesterday.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, in any case the Member for Morris is quite right he does have and has expressed himself to the following point of view that the rules of the House and the Citations of Beausheerne were written up at a time when Parliament and society and the economy was quite different from what it is today; the nature of government programming far different from what it is today and that accordingly the many, if not all, at least many of the Citations of Beausheerne ought not to be read as literally, or taken as literally, as they could have been say 40 years ago. I accept the validity of that observation but at the same time point out that we do have other occasions, such as consideration of the main Estimates, department by department, and other opportunities.

Let me, Mr. Speaker, go into the substance of what honourable members had to say. The Member for Rupertsland made two major observations, one of which I will not comment on, Sir, because I really believe for one it would be transgressing the rules, that is having to do with the question of the City of Winnipeg Bill.

The other point he made, Sir, I on the other hand treat with great interest because I regard the Honourable Member for Rupertsland, the Member for Thompson and one or two others, as being men who have a direct personal understanding of the north and the communities of the north the problems encountered in the north, and the sort of practical logistics problems -- I can think of no other way of expressing it -- the practical logistics problems that are being encountered in trying to live and open up the north country. The Member for Rupertsland was good enough to acknowledge that extra effort is being made to try to bring the cost of transportation of staple goods, and all other goods, down so that the people living in the remote northern communities will be able to realize significant savings; and of course, as the member has pointed out quite properly, this year to a large extent those that have been involved in this exercise of reducing freight costs to the north were victims of abnormally and unseasonably warm weather; but that's just a stroke of fate, providence, and we have to live with it.

Nevertheless I simply say this, Sir, in leaving this topic that there is sufficient evidence now to indicate that there is no doubt whatsoever, it is a matter of complete confidence, that if we proceed in future years as we started this year, then the cost of freighting staple goods into northern Manitoba communities that the ones accessible by winter roads, or by air only, can be reduced in the order of 25, 30, 40 percent over what has been paid for freight costs in the years gone by. And that, Sir, is a matter of very dramatic and very important change.

Well, of course as the member well knows he is one, and some others are, who just put their big boots on and their parkas and to just go out on the site and have a look, and there have been problems encountered with some of these northern bush roads this winter because again the unseasonality of things. But we have back-up capability now, Sir, because of the construction of winter -- of landing strips, and so we do not regard there to be any sort of crisis situation as would exist if we didn't have at least elementary kind of air strips in all these communities. I want --(Interjection)-- Yes, a question?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. ALLARD: I'm wondering if the First Minister could indicate whether there would be some support for communities like God's Narrows if very little freight gets in at reasonable reduced costs and has to be brought in by air at twice and three times the normal transportation costs, more than previous years certainly, much more.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, of course if this is the case it is a matter which we would have to consider, but I would point out that if each jurisdiction were completely jealous of its -- and concerned only about its own responsibility then we would never have made progress this winter towards the kind of new arrangement in northern transportation that we did manage to bring about. The fact is that the Province of Manitoba is not the jurisdiction that contracts for the freighting of certain volume of supplies into the northern communities. To the extent that the province improves transportation access, the main beneficiaries are -- of course in the ultimate sense we hope the beneficiaries are the people themselves, and certainly would be true in the case of foodstuffs they have to buy and so on. But the Federal Department

BILL 23

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd). . . . of Indian Affairs probably saves a dollar for every dollar that the province spends extra, and so there is need for acceptance by the Federal Department of Indian Affairs of the principle or argument that if Manitoba is going to spend \$100,000 more to improve transportation, which means that they can get rates quoted to them of 100,000 less, then we expect some kind of reasonable common sense --(Interjection)-- sharing, yes. And we have not been able to get that accepted yet, but I must say to be fair that at least the regional director of the office here in Winnipeg has taken a very reasonable approach, but one understands that he has to get acceptance of recommendations in Ottawa and at least he has got acceptance in part, so it's a start.

I go on now to refer to the Member for Riel. When he was referring to the Foundation Program for the financing of education in Manitoba, I was wondering if he and I were -- you know, if he and I were thinking of the same program, because his analysis and interpretation is so much at variance from my understanding of the Foundation Program in Manitoba, that I really believe we were talking about two different things. He would have us believe, and in fact he stated, that the Foundation Program no longer covers much of the cost of education and far less than it used to cover and only a small fraction, 40 or 45 percent I believe he said. The facts are, Mr. Speaker, that the Foundation Program has been increased each year in its totality and the province's share has been increased each year in its totality, to the point where as of this point in time the Foundation Program in Manitoba is \$150 million; now let's compare that with the Foundation Program in 1968 when my honourable friends were in office; at that point in time the Foundation Program was \$101 million; it is now 150 million. So if it's inadequate today you can imagine, Sir, what it was in those years.

He would have us believe that the province is making an inadequate contribution to the Foundation Program. Well I note that the province is making a contribution of \$120 million towards this \$150 million program, whereas in 1968, the last year they were in office, they made a total contribution to the Foundation Program of \$65.5 million. In other words, Sir, the Foundation Program has been increased 50 percent in five years and the province's contribution has increased 100 percent, close to 100 percent, 92 percent. The local share --(Interjection)-- Yes.

. . . continued on next page

BILL 23

MR. CRAIK: I would ask the First Minister if he would table his references so that we would have something to work from other than the Estimate book.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't mind providing this material. I have a lot of hand written notes on it, but I will get a clean copy and make that information available.

So, without taking too much time of the House, Mr. Speaker, make only this point for emphasis sake that if the Foundation Program is inadequate at \$150 million which is what it is, then at 100 million five years ago it was at least as inadequate. If the province's contribution at \$120 million is inadequate today then when it was -- in 1968 when it was half as much, 65 million, it certainly must have been inadequate then too. And when my honourable friend would have us believe that the province's contribution towards the cost of local government and education is inadequate, I merely point out to him that in 1968 the Province of Manitoba provided roughly 55 percent of the cost of education, public and elementary and secondary school levels, in other words total public education, 55 percent, today it is more in the order after rebates, etc. of 75 to 77 percent. There's been an increase in provincial support to local government costs, both in general municipal and school, of a rather dramatic kind. So I must tell my honourable friends that it just doesn't wash; it just doesn't wash for them to try to imply that we are providing less support to local government costs and education costs than when they were responsible, because in fact we are providing more, not only in dollars in absolute amounts, that's obvious, many millions more, but in actual percentage terms, Mr. Speaker, and that's the rub, there's the rub, even in percentage terms we have increased the contribution and support to local government of both general municipal and school.

I won't dwell on that further, I go on now to note that the Member for Riel thinks that we are changing the format of the Estimates and that we are, in addition to changing the format, we are transferring from current to capital certain items that hitherto were treated as current expenditure items only. Well I say to my honourable friend that the format of the estimates has changed, yes and it's changed in the past, in the decade of the 60s, it's changed two or three times, and also as I recall in 1962-1964 not only some but all of the spending for the Department of Highways was shifted in its entirety from current to capital and two years later back to current. So if my honourable friend wants to make much of that point I would wonder why. I would indicate to him that we have not made any transfers of the percentage magnitude that was done in the decade of the 60s in treatment of estimates. Now the other point I would agree with him on is that some day I do hope that it will be possible to go over to a standardized national account system and for that matter, Sir, although it's not a matter of high priority, I think it is a desirability that it be done and hopefully in the not too distant future. I believe that that really deals with the major part of the Member for Riel's comments.

The Member for Rhineland expressed himself at length the other day and really three main points came out of his speech. One of his points was to express concern and alarm at the possibility, the looming prospects of drought in the southern part of the Pembina area, Pembina triangle, this summer. I just think, Sir, that despite the fact that there's been very little runoff and the water tables are certainly not improving, that nevertheless it's far too early to come to any conclusions of as definite a kind as the Member for Rhineland suggests. If out of --(Interjection)-- Well I hope so. I share with my honourable friend the hope that it will not come to any condition of serious drought, and of course if it does then people as individuals, as communities, as municipalities, the Crown will have to stand ready to try to minimize any of the adverse effects.

Which raises the, I suppose, the related point which the Member for Rhineland wanted to get to all along, and that is what is the attitude of Canada and Manitoba relative to the construction, proposed construction of the Pembina and Pembilier Dams. I'm sure the Member for Rhineland can familiarize himself with some of the remaining problems of analysis connected with the Pembina-Pembilier project. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has submitted a report that is being considered now; there has to be comparison made of U. S. Army Corps of Engineers report with that of the International Joint Commission Cost-Benefit Report, etc. Some day one hopes that it will be possible to proceed but we cannot do so in the face of insufficient advice and inadequate cost information. But is not as though, and I think the Minister of Mines and Resources must have dealt with this, it is not as though the matter is being held in silent and passive abeyance. There is a procedure, a process of action going on and this during the next 90 days will be certainly proceeded with, at which time hopefully we'll be closer to a

BILL 23

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) decision. But it involves Federal Governments in two countries and it is not a simple matter.

Then the Member for Rhineland expressed concern about the level of government spending and the level of debt load. I know that the matter of debt is one that preoccupies my honourable friend. I would point out to him however that a realistic analysis of debt amounts really is one that has a ratio expression that relates the level of debt to the level of per capita income, and if one wants to be very sort of precise about it and hardnosed and accurate about it, one should take levels of per capita income, discount them for the inflation effect, say from a base year like 1949 or 1955, squeeze out or discount out the inflation factor, take your constant dollar per capita income and put it as a ratio to your debt load, and then we'll see whether or not our debt is becoming an increasing problem or one that is in fact receding or declining as a problem. I am not the ultimate Keynesian but certainly I am enough of a Keynesian, Mr. Speaker, to suggest to my honourable friend that levels of debt are not and should not be as much of a preoccupation to governments today as they were in the 1930s, 1940s, early 1950s. In fact I can tell my honourable friend, and here I'm doing so informally, Mr. Speaker, that the province's net direct provincial debt position, particularly if related to per capita disposable income, is the lowest in history. The province's net debt, net direct debt position, is such, Sir, that if you take into account our sinking funds and our cash balances that technically sometime during the month of March we are virtually at the zero point of net direct provincial debt which reminds me that in British Columbia in the early 1960s they had a bond burning ceremony on Lake Okanagan and if it warms the cockles of my honourable friend's heart to think that we are similarly in a no direct provincial debt position then we could arrange to have a bond burning ceremony some place around Altona, Winkler or Halbstadt, or one of those places. But I don't want to make much of it, Mr. Speaker, because frankly you see what is happening in Manitoba is not unlike what has happened in British Columbia. The amount of our net provincial direct debt is very low and in British Columbia they've brought it to the technical point of zero at which time they burnt all the redeemed bonds. But what is happening is that concurrently guaranteed liabilities and obligations debt is increasing very substantially. Now that is debt that has to do with the creation and construction of assets which will generate sufficient revenue to be self-redeeming, at least one hopes so, and in terms of our energy resource I have no doubts about that whatsoever looking at it in the long run. So it is not as though we don't have debt-servicing of policy to follow, and it's not as though we don't have any problems. There are some problems but they are the normal kind of debt-servicing decision-making things that have to be done and I just don't want to create any great feeling of euphoria in the province that because we have the net provincial direct debt position down to something so low that our sinking funds and cash balances cover it all, that we have arrived sort of at the new Jerusalem, or whatever the expression is.

Net debt today, Sir, frankly just doesn't mean that much; it doesn't mean that much because presumably with debt you are able to pay for necessary physical and social and educational services which go to enhance the quality of society, the quality of life, and so on. Anyway in a few words, Mr. Speaker, --(Interjection)-- Well there's nothing to shrug off, Mr. Speaker. The fact is that the net direct provincial debt is lower today than it was say in 1964-65-66. Only in '67 was it starting -- did they start to bring it down. But I can assure you it was about \$195.00 per man, woman and child in and around 1964-65. It's a lot lower than that today, Sir, and that's why I say that we can't regard it as a problem. In the meantime per capita income, real after discounting and squeezing out inflation has increased to quite an extent since the mid 1960s. So there we have our debt position. It is nothing to be concerned about; and if we are concerned today, Sir, we should have been positively alarmed around 1964-65.

Now then the Member for Lakeside in his comments, and I have some notes, dealt primarily with high cost of government: in our time attributing government activity to the presence of inflation and suggesting that perhaps the solution, if there is such a thing as a static solution, would be to reduce the activity of government, roll it back to the days when the philosophy of government was that it should be a more passive instrument, looking only to law and order and a few extras, and that that would be a desirable course of action for Manitoba to follow nowadays. Well that, Mr. Speaker, is the very antithesis of the attitude of this government. We do not believe that the interests of the majority of the people are served by going back to the days of laissez-faire government, by going back to the days when as government - when it didn't concern itself with

BILL 23

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) this set and that set of social and economic problems, that this would be in any way desirable. I suppose I would have to concede, Sir, that in the 1880s and 1890s and the first half of this century, that with passive governments that a small percentage of the people did indeed enjoy great, a great degree of freedom, meaningful freedom with the accompanying economic means to enjoy that freedom. I am sure that this was the case. I am equally sure that for the large majority of the population those were miserable years indeed. And so we have arrived at this point in the history of civilization where we depend more on the instrumentality of government and because we do there is for more people a more meaningful freedom than this earth has ever seen before.

The question is, whose ox is being gored? Whose ox is being gored when we talk about government being too involved, about there being impingements on freedom? I suppose the ox of those who are in very high income brackets, their oxes are being gored to some extent; but should they begrudge that if it means that for large numbers of people there is for the first time on the horizon not only equality of opportunity, but on the horizon the sense of equality of condition of life and living standards themselves.

Well that's really the whole reason to be of this government. We dedicated ourselves to use the instrumentality of government in order to do a lot of things that in years gone by were felt to be too mundane or too egalitarian or too socialistic to want to do. There are communities in this province that have more recognition, more of a sense of excitement and activity than in most of the years of the earlier part of this century.

So I do not apologize at all, nor do my colleagues apologize, for the fact that government expenditures have risen. But you see, Mr. Speaker, here comes a fine point of illogic, illogic. My honourable friends say that government spending is at too high a level, it should be reduced. And I suppose consistent with that they say taxes are too high, they should be reduced. So they would then go with a standard five or six or ten percent reduction in taxes which means that for somebody at the four or five thousand dollar a year the tax reduction would be something in the order of ten or fifteen or twenty dollars. For those of the \$15,000 a year level the relief would be around \$200.00, \$250.00, \$300.00. At the \$20,000 a year level twice as much, and so on up to scale. Well that, Mr. Speaker, is anathema to us and we don't pretend otherwise, and we don't try to serve two masters. Those on high incomes realize that tax levels have not been onerous; they've been high but not burdensome in relation to their ability to pay.

And so if there is a revenue -- if the Crown is in a revenue position then we take the view that any surplus or available revenues ought to be used for redistribution in tax cuts all right but tax cuts of a kind that have equal meaning to the citizens, not just whether they be at 4,000 or 10,000 or 15,000 a year. But to do that, Sir, means that you must take the revenue in for redistribution through transfer payment tax cuts. So my honourable friends will try to make much of the fact that expenditures are higher. If \$50 million is used for a particular kind of tax reduction, and it's done in a way that increases on the accounts, on the province's accounts, it has the effect of increasing the expenditure by that much. But it's \$50 million going directly back to the people, to their pockets, as opposed to their way which would show 50 million less of spending because it would be \$50 million less of revenue, but doing it that way, Sir, means that those on high incomes get the benefit of a standard percentage tax cut, and we have no intention of following that course of action. So there is a clean line of demarcation then between the political parties in this respect. Maybe that is good, that will give the people something upon which to choose.

The Member for Morris made comments much to the same effect as the Member for Lakeside except the Member for Morris added in I suppose what had to be I'm sure a half-bantering intent, his reference to our winter works programs. He said that our winter works programs reminded him of the pyramids of Egypt, of the Pharaohs of Egypt and the pyramids which they built. And I don't know in what sense he meant that because I always thought that one of the things which determined just what got built under Winter Works programming was the criteria that it had to be socially useful, of use to the community, and in most cases the decision --(Interjection)-- and in most cases, Mr. Speaker, the decision as to what would be built was made by the locally elected municipal councils. They decided what they would apply for and so my honourable friend the Member for Morris is not doing any courtesy, or any credit, to the many locally elected councillors in Manitoba when he says that our Winter Works projects stand out like the pyramids of Egypt. Because in most cases it is locally elected people, or

BILL 23

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) local volunteer community people, who made the decisions and we dealt with their applications. Now I think the analogy, Sir, would be that perhaps the Honourable Member for Morris was right in setting the context of all this somewhere in Egypt, but not the pyramids, Sir. I'm thinking now of the sphinx; the sphinx stands in Egypt too, incomprehensible. It has been there for centuries. --(Interjection)-- Immutable, inscrutable and incomprehensible. That, Sir, I think describes the Member for Morris - inscrutable and incomprehensible. If he sees any analogy between our Winter Works projects; the construction and repair of agricultural society fair buildings; the construction and repair of community recreation facilities, curling club facilities, etc.; if he sees some connection then I'm sure he would understand and not be offended if I see some connection between his attitude and the attitude of the Sphinx of the Nile, equally inscrutable and unintelligible as to what they intend to say. The only difference being that the one is quite silent and the Member for Morris quite the opposite, however to equal effect, Mr. Chairman.

I don't want to prolong discussion further. There were no technical points raised beyond the one raised by the Member for Riel. Oh yes, the Member for Souris-Killarney also made reference and participated in this Interim Supply debate and if I could summarize his comments it had to do with whether or not the small towns in his constituency were in better or worse shape, in terms of local commercial activity, than in the past. I won't hazard any comment on that now, Sir, except to point out that that very afternoon that the Member for Souris-Killarney was speaking that I later left this Chamber and was walking through the rotunda and was greeted by an elderly person with a Scottish burr who said that so and so had a lot of nerve given the fact that there was more activity in the Towns of Killarney and Souris than in many a year, so from this I can only conclude that one's impression of activity really depends on the eyes of the beholder and on what one wants to see.

The Member for Assiniboia seemed to be preoccupied with the question of out-migration and the province's population. I know this is a matter of considerable preoccupation to him mainly because he always forgets -- that's the trouble with the Member for Assiniboia -- he always forgets one fundamental fact and that is that the amount of out-migration from this province is a factor of economic activity in other parts of the country, the continent; it is a phenomena which has been going on for at least a quarter century, and I would say in substantial measure since the 1930s really, since the 1930s. Prior to the '30s there was in-migration of a big scale and since the depression. I mean when you go to Toronto or Montreal or Vancouver, Minneapolis, one is amazed at the number of people one can meet who were born in Manitoba, or who lived here for many years and subsequently remigrated or who were born here and simply migrated to other parts of the country. But I can tell my honourable friend that it is not as though we are offering any excuse. The level of out-migration isn't also a direct function of the extent to which the province's economy is moving along, and here my honourable friend simply cannot escape the fact, and I don't see why he should want to escape it, he cannot ignore the fact that Manitoba's economy has grown as much in the last four years as in all the years of the 19 -- the first nine years of the 1960s put together. In other words, the 9-year period from January 1, 1960 to December 31, 1968.

The quantum of increase in the provincial gross product was approximately 1 billion, 400 million dollars in those nine years. The quantum of increase in the gross provincial product has been about the same, 1 billion, 450 million in the four years from 1969 to the end of this current calendar year on current projection.

And I should also point out that it is not as though we are losing population. I say this -- I know, Sir, it sounds a bit repetitious, but what can you do? Every time it's mentioned I have to repeat the fact that the population of Manitoba has been increasing at a modest but steady rate and that the only two years in this century that we have lost population was in 1965 and 1966, and only these two years, when there was an aggregate net loss of population. --(Interjection)--

So the Member for Assiniboia should take note of that fact and he should couple that with the fact that in the Province of Saskatchewan, which shares some of the characteristics of our economy - some of them, not all - that in the years when it was blessed with a Liberal administration in the 1960s that it succeeded in losing more population than all of the rest of the provinces of Canada put together, including Manitoba by the way. And I don't know whether the present administration of the Province of Saskatchewan has succeeded in stemming the tide but I rather suspect, I rather suspect -- I will check this as soon as I have a chance now,

BILL 23

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) Mr. Speaker -- but I rather suspect that the population loss in Saskatchewan between 1965 and 1971 was in the order of 60,000 net loss. And I am quite confident that in Manitoba's, or in the case now of the present administration of that province that the population loss, if there is one, is practically brought to parity or zero, and in 1973 I don't think they are anticipating any loss whatsoever.

So what will my honourable friend the Liberal member, the Member for Assiniboia, make out of all this. I think the only thing he can conclude from it is that it is most unfair, most misleading, and certainly completely unprofessional in terms of economical and statistical analysis to suggest that Manitoba has a population out-migration problem that is somehow unique, and somehow occurring for the first time in our history, because, Sir, the opposite is true. Our problem is not unique, it has been shared by Saskatchewan, and furthermore it is a problem which has existed for at least a quarter of a century and with particular heaviness in the middle 1960s - 1965 and 66.

Having made these responses, Mr. Chairman, I would thank honourable members nevertheless for their observations, for their suggestions. Thank you.

MOTION presented and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I would now move that you now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider Bill No. 23.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole with the Honourable Member for Logan in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
INTERIM SUPPLY - BILL 23

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. (Sections 1 to 5 were read and passed) Section 6(a) -- The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: I wonder if the Minister would give us an explanation of Section 6. I am curious about the words "land acquisition" that are contained in this particular section, and I wonder if he would care to give us some explanation of what this section is all about.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, or, Mr. Chairman rather, the only thing that is different about Section 6 is that we are asking for an Interim Supply pertaining to a vote which will be entirely recouped and as such the main estimates will not show any unrecovered expenditure. This relates to one of these many programs that the Member for Morris I am sure is aware of under the general heading of ARDA, ARDA and FRED. I remember the Member for Morris when he was in the Federal House suggested with great solemnity that the ARDA and FRED programs should be discontinued and substituted by a program to be referred to as "GERDA" for a greatly expanded rural development act. Now we haven't got quite to that point yet but it has to do with rural rehabilitation and development and with sums of money to be made available for land acquisition, the kind of land acquisition that will complement the program of trying to get more rationalization of agricultural lands so as to make it easier for younger farmers and farmers period, in their efforts to try and establish a better, more viable operation. Now if there's further detail perhaps the honourable member could specify his concerns and we'll try to answer.

MR. JORGENSON: . . . if the particular item referred to here would be what has been commonly referred to by the Minister of Agriculture, both federally and provincially, as a "Small Farms Development Program".

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the amounts here are not relative to agreements that have yet to be entered into and therefore they would not relate to that particular program. It would be my opinion, and I don't know for certain that these amounts here would represent, or could represent, expenditures in two departments at least - Mines and Resources and Agriculture - depending on location and project. The alternative Land Use Program under Mines and Resources has certain sums of money, and whether this applies to that program or not, I can't indicate at this point in time. When we get to my Estimates, Mr. Chairman, we will be able to pinpoint where ARDA moneys are used for land acquisition within agriculture.

BILL 23

(MR. USKIW cont'd.) Nothing to do with the Small Farms Development Program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Well I was going to ask the Minister he mentions, or the First Minister mentions using this money for assisting young farmers say in acquiring land. I am wondering, are there any cases in the Minister of Agriculture's department whereby the security -- does a young farmer have to have any security in order to get say 10,000 or 20,000 dollars?

MR. USKIW: I'm of the opinion, Mr. Chairman, that the members are confusing the item here with perhaps programs that are not related.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Are there any unused appropriations under this particular item that we are discussing now, and that we're just adding to it, or is there nothing at the time?

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, ARDA is a five-year arrangement so that whatever is not -- the budgetary amounts not used in one year are transferred into another year. You know, you may have a stacking of the program within a given period, within the five years, depending on how soon the program gets off the ground and what kind of acceleration takes place within the five year period, so that you can have an intensive program for two or three years of a five-year program and expend all of the money, or you can have a slow start in the program and not expend all your money till the fifth year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (The remainder of Bill 23 was read section by section and passed) The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Yes. We passed a bill before on a voice vote. I trust that by not having any recording of the vote as such that certainly it is not implied that we agree with all the various departmental estimates by agreeing to this advance at this particular time. I take it that we're just advancing money now to carry on the government for the time being, and on that basis I have given my support.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill be reported. Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered Bill 23 recommends it to House and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Point Douglas that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader. The Honourable First Minister.

THIRD READING - BILL NO. 23

BILL No. 23 was read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister. The Honourable House Leader.

SECOND READING - BILL No. 2

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you'd call Bill No. 2, please.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, this is somewhat of a surprise but I have not too much to say on it, and I rise not to oppose the bill. The former Minister of Education is smiling. I guess he knows that's usually the case in my case but it's fairly short. But I would like to say this that while the Member for St. Johns, or the former Minister of Finance, did mention in his speech that he felt that this was probably just a house-keeping bill; I am inclined to think a little bit different.

Although I do not rise to oppose the bill I think I would like to bring out a few points but I would like to hear the 400 or 450 service station operators and garage people to hear what they have to say. Perhaps the intention of this bill is maybe better than the wording of the bill itself. I have a feeling that if a few amendments, or if a few changes, can be implemented into the bill perhaps this bill can be of use to the average public, or to the motoring public, and perhaps with these changes it can be accepted by most of us.

I am especially aware that the Automotive Trades Association is also concerned with the

BILL No. 2

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd.) effects of this bill but I did not feel that again with the few changes that they were really of a controversial nature.

And I do think, Mr. Speaker, that it will be in the best interests of the service station operators and the garage people to make sure that steps are not taken to side-step the intentions of this bill by imposing, for example, harsher regulations of their own, such as asking for larger or a large deposit, or requesting that more detailed conditions be met such as a more detailed financial arrangement. I hope that they will not change their procedure, that it will make the motoring public unhappy because I think this would hurt not only the people that will need these services but also the garage people and the service station people.

I believe though that the Automotive Trades Association are fair in requesting to retain the idea of an arbitration board that was set up in 1969; this seems to have worked out quite well, and I think it is in their interests that with the three different groups involved that they are going to be concerned that they handle these cases as well as possible, because after all their credibility is at stake also.

And I think another problem that was mentioned, perhaps one of the members, I didn't happen to be here that day, but there is some possibility of waste of time and money that the practical application of this bill in its present form, they seemed to assume that the garage keeper is in any case prepared to fight that case. If this is the case no less than four attendants to the court by the motoring public, or by the individuals, and at least three by the garage keeper or by the service station attendant or service station operator, and I think this is true whether the amount involved is a 50-dollar deductible or perhaps a 1000-dollar general overhaul job. And it becomes rather complicated and perhaps as I mentioned before we could take a closer look at that part or that principle of the bill.

Now I would like to put on record two of the amendments they are suggesting, and I wish to read them so that they do get on the record, and they suggest an improvement would require the customer who files the complaint not only to make a deposit covering the garage keeper's claim, but a reasonable amount to cover the legal cost that his action makes necessary. If the customer is successful he should not only receive a refund of his deposit for cost but also costs up to the amount of that deposit to be paid by the unsuccessful garage keeper. It is submitted that the costs involved should be ten percent of the amount of the bill in dispute with the minimum of \$50.00 in any case.

And then of course the problem comes in where this bill does not mention any requirement of time; it says it can be taken to one court or the next, and it does not define the time element, and I think it should be. I believe that there should be other than very peculiar cases, there should be a time element involved because I think anyone that has studied some of the conditions that will result from regular day operations know that we have perhaps over 95 percent of the motoring public of the most honest citizens that we could wish to deal with, but there are always those, in the case of somebody picking up a vehicle and not bothering at all, because he probably has a high enough mortgage on the automobile and he doesn't even intend to bother of the repair bill, and in the meantime he may take this automobile out with perhaps a normal deposit, but something that might not cover that car's expenses. For example, if he took it to the next province, or he took it to another country, damaged the car completely, and I think that something in that respect should be looked into. While I admit that those cases are very few and quite rare --(Interjection)-- but they do happen. So, Mr. Speaker, after we've heard what the service station operators and the garage keepers, and the motoring public for that matter, have to present after second reading, perhaps a few amendments will be in order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, my comments will be very brief indeed. I have heard other members speak on the bill and also heard, I think I heard the introduction of it. I am just concerned with one matter and that is when the payment is made into court is there no time stipulated as to how soon the moneys have to be paid out? Certainly I think there should be some time element placed in the bill so that we would know, and also the people concerned would know, when the moneys would be paid out.

I just wonder how wide a distribution has this bill received, and whether the people who are actually concerned and will be concerned with this legislation are knowledgeable of it that this is before the House and is being considered. I do hope that the Minister in charge will

BILL No. 2

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) . . . see to it that the associations of these type of businesses are notified of it and so that we can get some consensus of opinion from them at the time of the Law Amendments Committee meetings so that we know what the objections are and if there are none so that the bill then can be passed.

QUESTION put and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Would you call Bill No. 20, Mr. Speaker.

BILL No. 20

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I should be thanking the Attorney-General, he's providing a way and a means for me to become very involved with an education in legal affairs.

Mr. Speaker, this bill really boils down to being a service to the people of Manitoba, which is desirable, and it's basically extending the services if there is people who desire to have a divorce, but it does not make it easier to have a divorce from the point of view of law or requirements to have a divorce. What it does do is make available the services throughout Manitoba more readily than they are at the present time.

Presently the divorce proceedings must be heard by a judge of the Court of Queen's Bench, and he is a circuit judge, and dates have to be set and many times there are long waiting periods involved in these proceedings. This bill changes it so that a County Court judge, which is a federally appointed judge, will be able to hear the proceedings regarding the divorce of a couple in that particular area so that they will have closer liaison with the attorney and not have to leave town or have a long waiting period.

So, Mr. Speaker, frankly this bill is certainly --(Interjection)-- Thank you. This bill is certainly -- no objection from this side, in fact it is making legal services more available and I understand that the lawyers have been asking for this for a long time in the rural areas to be able to give people these services and also the -- although it does not have the sanction of the Law Reform Commission at this time because they are studying family affairs more thoroughly, they do agree with this procedure being put through at the present time. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, just in case I overlook talking to my neighbour on my right, I want to put on record hoping that someone in his department will bother to look at the debate on this, that when the definition of "matrimonial cause" comes up, in the third line there's reference to "restriction of conjugal rights" -- I think that's not quite what was meant, I should think they would want to have said "restitution of conjugal rights". I don't think they would want to restrict them in that case --(Interjection)-- but I just thought it's just as clear to record that restriction of conjugal rights should be the last thing that any of us would want to agree to.

QUESTION put and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Would you call Bill No. 18, Mr. Speaker.

BILL No. 18

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour. The Honourable Minister.

MR. PAULLEY presented Bill No. 18, an Act to amend The Employment Safety Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I consider this an important bill because of the fact that the Employment Safety Act is under the jurisdiction of the Workmen's Compensation Board, and that from time to time the inspectors of the Workmen's Compensation Board have found deficiencies in the provision of safety appliances and the application of these appliances in construction particulars. Just recently during the building of quite a large structure in the

BILL No. 18

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) . . . centre of the City of Winnipeg the concrete work collapsed and at that particular time one of the inspectors of the Compensation Board asked that the work be stopped until such time as such scaffolding, etc., of a nature that would facilitate the safe operation was installed. There was some confusion, and there was some question as to whether or not the inspector had the legal right to order - introduce a stop work order.

The purpose of this legislation is to make it clear that an inspector acting on behalf of the Compensation Board can issue a stop work order which would have the effect similar to an order being issued by the court. The reason for this is because sometime delays take place in the interim and more employees may be injured as a result.

There is of course contained within the act, Mr. Speaker, provisions for an appeal within 24 hours to a judge of the County Court for a variation of the work stop order and the contents thereof.

Another feature of the bill, Mr. Speaker, is to require that where a municipality issues permits in connection with construction works, that the municipality be required to inform the Workmen's Compensation Board weekly of the issuance of such permits. We have found in the operation of the Employment Safety Act, Mr. Speaker, that from time to time the Compensation Board is not knowledgeable of construction going on until such time as there may be a mishap or an accident in the work or the construction. This was the case a year or so ago honourable members may recall, one or two employees died as the result of cave-ins on the installation of sewer and water facilities in the municipality. And as the Employment Safety Act charges the responsibility to the Workmen's Compensation Board there are occasions when they are not knowledgeable of construction going on, so we are requesting amendments to the act, Mr. Speaker, that the municipalities as a requirement be instructed to advise the board once in each work of such undertakings or works. There is a provision that the board may exempt a municipality from advising certain classes of permits issued by the municipality, and the reason behind this, Mr. Speaker, I think honourable members will realize that if there's a permit say for a relatively minor alteration to a private home, or something of that nature, it is not a requirement to notify the board, but where there is such things as sewer excavations for foundations in a home we feel that the board should be made knowledgeable of these issuance of these permits in order that they may from time to time visit the site and inspect the appliances and to make sure that such things as cribbing and scaffolding is erected so that there is protection for the employees and of course, Mr. Speaker, when I say protection for the employees. I also mean protection for the construction industry itself so that they are not forced - possibly confronted with suits.

That basically, Mr. Speaker, is the reason for the introduction of this bill and I recommend it for the consideration of the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move seconded by the Member for Roblin, that the debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if there'd be any objection to us now calling it 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? (Agreed) I will therefore leave the Chair and return to the House at 8:00 o'clock.