

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, February 20, 1974

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 15 students Grade 11 standing of the Rosenort Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. Bjarnason. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Morris.

We also have 90 students Grades 4, 5 and 6 standing of the William Osler School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Perkins, Miss Greenberg and Miss Lambert. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for River Heights the Leader of the Opposition.

We also have 25 students Grade 6 standing of the Robert Browning School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Carruthers. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

On behalf of all the Honourable Members I welcome you here today.
Presenting Petitions. The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. DAVID BLAKE (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Hazel Vellam and Others praying for the passing of An Act to incorporate the Minnedosa Foundation.

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

TABLING OF REPORTS

HON. IAN TURNBULL (Minister of Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services) (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the Fourteenth Annual Report of the Public Utilities Board.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other ministerial statements or tabling of reports? Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Questions. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Official Opposition) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister. There were questions taken as notice by the Minister of Health -- I'm sorry -- the Chairman of HESP with respect to Concordia Hospital --(Interjection)-- by the acting Minister? All right -- by the Acting Minister with respect to Concordia Hospital. I wonder if the government is in a position to make some statement in connection with this matter?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, the questions were taken as notice. The information is being brought together and brought forward. I would expect that when the Minister of Health returns, which we anticipate will be tomorrow, he'd be in a position to reply at that time.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, my question to the First Minister. In view of the fact that the Chairman of the Health Services Commission has in fact made public statements in connection with this outside this House, is the government not in a position to make at least a general statement to this House with respect to the matter and the government's involvement with respect to the issue of an investigation?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, the information is being brought together and should be available by tomorrow. It's 24 hours, I would think by tomorrow it could be done.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and Environmental Management. I wonder if he can indicate to the House whether there are any changes in the management of the Communities Economic Development Fund?

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is referring to the management. I know that the Chairman is now on holidays. I'm not sure, I haven't kept track of each staff change, so I couldn't answer that; I'll take it as notice.

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

MR. I. H. ASPER (Leader of the Liberal Party) (Wolseley): To the same Minister in charge of the Manitoba Development Corporation, Mr. Speaker. Does the government have or has it commissioned or approved a feasibility study to be made relative to the expansion of production facilities at the CFI project at The Pas?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, there is a request for such a feasibility study on my desk and it will be considered.

Mr. Speaker, before I sit down I want to indicate I took a question from the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition as notice relative to whether members of the Board of Directors of the Communities Economic Development Fund receive remuneration. I'm informed that my answer that civil servants do not receive a per diem fee is correct and my information is also to the effect that people on contract with the Department of Northern Affairs do not receive remuneration from the Fund.

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

MR. ASPER: A supplementary. --(Interjection)-- Do you want to go on this?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. If there is a supplementary I'll entertain it. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On the same subject matter to the same Minister a supplementary. Can he indicate whether the firm to be selected for the feasibility study should it go ahead, that he's got on his desk now, will be a Manitoba firm or a Canadian firm at the least?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, we'll seek the firm that will give us, in our opinion, the best information vis-a-vis the future of the Fund.

MR. ASPER: Does the Minister not have, or does the government not have any policy that favours Canadian or Manitoba firms over non-Canadian or non-Manitoba firms?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, other things being equal we would favour a local firm.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister. Can he advise whether there are any actions planned by himself or in conjunction with the other provinces prior to the April 1 expiry of the present freeze on western oil prices?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, up until very recently there was every indication of a meeting to be held in Ottawa, a meeting of First Ministers approximately around the 24th and 25th of March, and now we have some indication that this may not take place which will give us some reason to see what alternative course of action should be taken.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the First Minister could indicate whether there are any indications that the present freeze will be changed, extended or otherwise by April 1st?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, as the Honourable Member for Riel may know, as a result of the last Energy Conference of First Ministers that there was an indication then that April 1st the present domestic Canadian freeze on oil prices would be lifted and that prices would be allowed to go up to \$6.00 per barrel approximately. That is the most definitive information to date.

MR. CRAIK: A final, Mr. Speaker. I wonder in view of the present question mark regarding further meetings or conferences before the deadline, whether the government here might consider taking a more pro-active role in initiating and presenting Manitoba's vulnerability before anything happens April 1?

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, this is a national problem of course. Manitoba's vulnerability exists but so does it exist among the other provinces. That is the reason why a Dominion-Provincial Conference was held, is the reason why representatives were made as they were made and of course it's possible to make further representations but I don't believe that there is any likelihood of a course of action taken that is materially different from that which was agreed upon at the last conference.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Has Mr. John Vandeweerd resigned as Director of the Government's Advertising Audit Bureau?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Speaker, I have received a copy of a letter from Mr. Vandeweerd indicating that for family and personal reasons he has tendered his resignation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the government made any decision as to a replacement for him?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Speaker, I am advised that some of the staff presently in the advertising audit office are the best in the country but apart from that I have not given any consideration to a replacement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does the situation reflect any change in approach or attitude or function with respect to the work of the advertising audit bureau?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Speaker, I do not see how any civil servant's resignation would entail change in direction of any particular department or division. In this case there is not in my mind any intention to change the direction of the advertising audit office or its functions as they are presently carried out.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, back to the First Minister on the government initiatives in the energy problems. Does the government plan to make a submission to the National Energy Board hearings in Calgary on April 2nd in respect to the export of oil?

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

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Brandon East): Yes, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member had read the papers, newspapers carefully, over the last several years he will note that, particularly the last year, that whenever there is a hearing of the National Energy Board which will have a bearing on the price of petroleum products or other forms of energy having a bearing on consumers in Manitoba, the Province of Manitoba does make representation through legal counsel backed up by research staff.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, having read newspapers very carefully, can the Minister then answer whether in fact the province is planning to make a submission to the National Energy Board hearings in Ottawa concerning the advisability of building a Canadian pipeline . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The question is a slight variation of the first question. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Let me rephrase it. Going back then to the question of government initiatives in the energy field, is the government considering making a submission to the National Energy Board hearings concerning the advisability of a Canadian Pipeline going from Winnipeg to Montreal as opposed to the Sarnia extension?

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

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, without debating the point I would say yes.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: You are planning to make a submission then?

MR. EVANS: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR (Virden): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the Minister of Highways. What action or program is under way by his department regarding or in place of rail abandonment? And No. 2 part, what action is planned in conjunction with Ottawa as the cost figure is astronomical be it federal, provincial or municipal.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. PETER BURTNIK (Minister of Highways) (Dauphin): Well, Mr. Speaker, I would first of all like to thank the honourable member for giving me notice of this question. I would like to say in answer that I am just as concerned as anyone else about rail line abandonment, I over the period of a few years ago was very much involved in this kind of thing and I certainly hope that the year 1975 or some time in the future none of the rail lines are abandoned. But I would also say to the honourable member that regardless of whether there are any abandonments of rail lines or not, this government and this Minister, meaning me, have been looking at the possibility of upgrading our roads in the Province of Manitoba to carry greater loads than the 74,000 pounds as at present in existence. We have a pilot project on right now on the Trans-Canada East as well as West as well, not to 90,000 pounds but 80, and we are also working with the federal government at the present time to try and upgrade as many of our roads as possible to carry the larger truckloads throughout the province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON (Gladstone): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address my question to the Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management and ask him does the government know that the practice of jacklighting and other illegal activities are threatening to wipe out the deer population in Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, we are aware that there is a serious problem of jacklighting in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Will the Minister make an effort to step up surveillance by game wardens and police officials to end this cruel and inhumane slaughter of deer by nightlighting or jacklighting by natives as well as those white men responsible for this practice?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, within the constraints of fiscal capacity and the constraints of the difficulty in enforcing game laws no matter what province you are in, the department intends to try to enforce the laws of the province. The honourable member in his question indicates that with regard to Indians and white people - the member knows that with regard to Indians there are different laws with respect to the practice that he's referring to.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Mr. Speaker, my question will be directed to the Honourable Minister responsible for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation. I wonder if he could inform the House when he'll be tabling the Annual Report of the Public Insurance Corporation for the fiscal year ended?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. BILLIE URUSKI (Minister responsible for Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation) (St. George): Possibly tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BOB BANMAN (La Verendrye): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Honourable the Minister in charge of the Manitoba Development Corporation. Can the Minister confirm that Mr. Henshaw, the Vice-President of Saunders Aircraft, is now in England recruiting labour for Saunders Aircraft?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I can neither confirm it nor deny it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BANMAN: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister confirm that

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. BANMAN Cont'd) there are now 40 to 50 people from England employed at Saunders Aircraft?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I can neither confirm it nor deny it, but I can tell the honourable member that my father came from the Ukraine and got a job in Canada. (Applause)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia. Order, please. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye have another supplementary?

MR. BANMAN: Last supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister confirm then that these people are hired by contract and not subject to Canadian income taxes?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I can neither confirm it nor deny it, but I can tell the honourable member that the Canadian income tax laws are made by the Federal Government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney-General. Does the government intend to formulate new liquor control regulations for Indian Reserves on the basis of direct decision making by Band Councils.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. HOWARD PAWLEY (Attorney-General) (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is asking for a question as to future policy and he'll have to wait any statements as to that.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Attorney-General and it's a repeat of a question I asked last year. Can the Minister indicate what changes and what improvements have been made in the Land Titles offices throughout the Province of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, this is a question which ought to be dealt with in detail during estimate review.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: My question is to the Honourable the First Minister in the absence of the Minister of Labour. Can the First Minister investigate and advise the House as to whether six foremen or indeed any number of foremen have been released from Saunders Aircraft employment within the last few weeks?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the question should be directed to me since the company is under the surveillance of the Manitoba Development Corporation and I can neither confirm nor deny the question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister undertake to report to the House as to whether Canadians are being denied advancement opportunities at Saunders Aircraft?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would think that advancement opportunities in Saunders Aircraft are made without reference to race, creed, colour, religion or nationality.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to direct this to the Minister of Labour. In the light of the questions that have been asked about Saunders Aircraft, would the Minister of Labour assure this House that the present unemployment totals in Manitoba are being tackled from the perspective of trying to direct Manitoba workers into job opportunities at places like Saunders Aircraft rather than recruiting outside employment?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman prefaced his remark or his question to me that in view of the questions that had already been asked, I regret very much that due to the importance of certain labour legislation and its application to people I had to leave the Chamber a moment or two ago, but I do want to assure my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, that as far as I am concerned

ORAL QUESTIONS

(HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY Cont'd) Manitobans come first in employment in any industry be it Saunders or anyone else.

I do recognize, I do recognize, and I'm sure my honourable friend does, that in certain areas there may be shortages of qualified craftsmen but every effort is made notwithstanding the large number of unemployed, to employ Manitobans first. That was one of the reasons of course as I've indicated to this House of my concern in the garment industry as well.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister in the absence of the Minister for housing. Does the government plan to instruct the Land Titles Office to expedite the application of the 300 unregistered lots which now have construction proceeding on them in order to avoid the risk of bankruptcy or financial failure of the housing companies which are forced to build upon these unregistered lots?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, that is a question which can be taken as notice and I would ask the Attorney-General to take it as notice.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister undertake then to meet with representatives of the House Builders Association in order to find a way of overcoming this very serious crisis in the supply of housing lots in the City of Winnipeg at the present moment?

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the First Minister. Has the government since the June election issued any new instructions to civil servants with respect to their active public involvement in partisan politics?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, as the Minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission my Premier suggested I could answer that. The answer is no. We didn't find any violation of the Civil Service no complaints that I'm aware of have been directed either to myself or to the Civil Service of violations, except one I heard the other day in this House pertaining to Swan River.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister of Labour then confirm that this means that civil servants are still expected to observe the longstanding practice of refraining from active public involvement in partisan politics?

MR. PAULLEY: I would suggest that civil service personnel, Mr. Speaker, as well as all Manitobans should adhere to the law.

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

MR. ASPER: Yes. Then, Mr. Speaker, will the Minister of Labour or the First Minister, in the light of his answer, investigate and report back to this House on the circumstances and the authority for an address that was made to the NDP Annual Meeting in Fort Frances by Harvey Moats, the Executive Director of the Human Rights Commission on the 23rd of November, 1973.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, the restraint on civil servants only pertains to during an election and I'm not aware of any election that is taking place in Ontario or Manitoba at the present time.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, do I understand the Minister to be saying that the restraint on civil servants participating actively and publicly in partisan politics is only during an election but during the rest of the time they're free to publicly participate as partisans in politics?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully suggest to my learned friend, who I understand has a degree in law, that he takes a look at the present Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the First Minister. In view of the questions facing Manitoba regarding the energy situation, would the government consider having the Manitoba Energy Council appear before either the Public Utilities Committee of the Legislature or the Economic Development Committee as soon as possible so that we can deal with the problem quickly?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend is seeking information it is

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SCHREYER Cont'd) open to him to ask questions of the Chairman of the Manitoba Energy Council or to submit questions in writing or Orders for Return or whatever and I would hope that his curiosity could be satisfied in that way.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, my question would have to be then to the Chairman of the the Manitoba Energy Council in the form of the Minister of Industry and Commerce, as to whether or not his council is not empowered to present itself to either one of these committees so that the members of the Legislature can specifically deal with their particular interests that they represent on this council.

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

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Chairman, as I explained to the members of the House, and as the Member from Riel very well knows, each one of the members of the Manitoba Energy Council is a senior civil servant and we have the benefit of their advice. But as the Chairman of that council I take full responsibility for it. I am a member, or I hope to be a member of the Legislative Committee on Economic Development and on the Legislative Committee on Public Utilities. I mentioned earlier that we will be submitting a report on the energy situation in Manitoba, rather detailed report, and if members so wish to discuss it in the Economic Development Committee, I would be very pleased to discuss it with them, as Chairman of the Energy Council.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, in that connection, can the Minister advise what reports we can expect before April 1?

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that in a matter of a couple of weeks or so we will have a rather complete report, an appropriate report on the energy situation in Manitoba. As soon as it's available for printing it will be made available to the members.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable the Minister in charge of the Manitoba Development Corporation. Can the Minister advise the House whether mill and bush workers at the Columbia Forest Products plant at Sprague went on strike today?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, members of the media confronted me this morning with the position that that is so. I haven't received direct information from the corporation but it's possible, because I was in Cabinet all morning. But I gather that the media are correct and that they are on strike.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister advise whether there are plans for any immediate resumption of negotiations?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I don't think that there has been any break-off in negotiations as far as I am aware but the existence of negotiations does not guarantee the services of the employees nor the opening of the plant. But I do not, at least I'm not aware that there has been an indication by either side that they are not prepared to consider discussions. That is not my information, however I will look into it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Highways. Has his department received a petition with some 4,000 signatures on it asking for changes or construction to take place at Roblin and the Perimeter where 12 people have lost their lives.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. BURTNIAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MOUG: Will this project have priority of government participation over McGregor Overpass or St. Vital Bridge, Osborne Street Bridge?

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Speaker, I'm not in a position to answer that question at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture and ask him if he could advise the House to what extent consumption of fluid milk in the Province of Manitoba exceeds production of fluid milk in this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, I don't

ORAL QUESTIONS

(HON. SAMUEL USKIW Cont'd) have the precise figures on that particular point; I believe there is some concern in that particular area and it's been that kind of a problem for some time. I recall discussing this particular situation with the Milk Control Board, or at least the Chairman of the Board on a number of occasions as to ways and means of dealing with the problem of fluctuating milk production because of the cyclical nature of milk production.

MR. JORGENSON: I gather from the Minister's reply that there is a shortfall. I wonder if he could advise the House how that shortfall is made up in order to meet consumption demands?

MR. USKIW: I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker. I gather there is some evidence or some discussion in the media about powder milk being used as a substitute for fresh milk but I can't confirm at the moment. I could get the information for my honourable friend.

MR. JORGENSON: I wonder if the Minister could advise the House whether or not powdered milk is used in conjunction with fluid milk or is it used and sold separately?

MR. USKIW: I believe, Mr. Speaker, there is some allegation to the effect that it is being used as fluid milk without distinction, and that is being checked out at the moment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney-General advise the House on what survey or data the decision was made to remove the sale of hard liquor from the government liquor store on Portage and Ainslie location?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, this question was actually asked in a somewhat different manner about a week ago, in which I'd indicated to the House that the store in question was not of such a size that it was capable of expansion to a self-serve type of store and thus it was being converted to a specialty store. There was also parking problems and the volume sold at this store was considerably less - and the figures were given in the House at that time - volumewise than in the other stores in the St. James area.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, in view that there's only one other store serving some 80,000 people in St. James-Assiniboia area, is there planned for another outlet in the St. James area?

MR. PAWLEY: I would have to take that question as notice and refer it to the Commission to ascertain whether or not they foresee the need for another store in view of the sale volume.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the other day the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge asked a question with respect to automatic sprinkler systems and policy with respect to construction. The question was taken as notice and the reply is as follows in summary: That such equipment is not a requirement of the National Building Code. All accommodation under MHRC constructed complies fully with all provisions of the National Building Code, regulations of the Provincial Fire Commissioner and the appropriate municipal by-laws. Fire safeguards in senior citizen accommodation include one-hour fire separation rating between all suites and public corridors, metal fire doors on all stair shafts, smoke and heat riser detectors in all laundry rooms, mechanical rooms and storage areas, fire extinguishers in all laundry, mechanical and communal storage rooms, fire department standpipes, fire-hoses on all floors, automatic door closers on all doors opening into hallways, keyed elevators provided for use of fire fighters, all elevator doors one and a half hour fire rating, a fire alarm call system provided on all floors, emergency call systems and communication systems provided from each suite, emergency power supply for lighting and elevator operation in all buildings over 60 feet in height, and other requirements as amended from time to time upon the requirement of either the National Building Code, Provincial Fire Commissioner's office or municipal by-law changes.

I might add that it also goes without saying that from time to time consultation takes place between MHRC, the Provincial Fire Commissioner's office and those federal authorities that are responsible for the National Building Code as to possible desirable additional changes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to begin by thanking the First Minister for his research and information on the subject. I would just ask him to, in light of his answer today,

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. AXWORTHY Cont'd) confirm his statement of yesterday that MHRC will still plan to investigate the feasibility of implanting automatic sprinkler systems in existing and proposed new senior citizens' high rise apartments.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, that really flows from the concluding sentence of my reply, that there would be consideration given the feasibility of, desirability of additional fire safeguards which might be proposed from time to time. But this is not something that will be done unilaterally, it would be done in consultation with those involved with the National Building Code, CMHC and Provincial Fire Commissioner's office, and municipal authorities would be consulted as well.

MR. AXWORTHY: Just one further question. Would the Minister take under advisement if consulting authorities and sources other than those he mentioned who have done independent assessments of fire safety standards in high rise buildings such as the Manitoba Safety Council and the Insurance Consultants' Report that was released two weeks ago.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, naturally their views would be helpful but decision of this kind would not be taken in isolation of all the other interested groups I've referred to.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the House Leader. I wonder if he can indicate to the House whether it will be the government's intention to call the Public Accounts Committee as soon as possible to deal with the Auditor's Report and the presentation by the Auditor?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the matter is now under active consideration.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture. Could he advise us whether he has had an opportunity to look into the question of the alleged destruction by members of his Department of a departmental pamphlet referred to in the question period yesterday dealing with futures marketing in flax and rapeseed?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I did discuss the matter with the Deputy Minister for the department who had no knowledge of it but requested whether or not I could get additional information from the Leader of the Liberal Party with respect to a specific instance or example which we may be able to trace back.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to announce that the Public Utilities Committee will meet on February 28th for presentation of the Telephone Committee Report, and on that day we will be proposing the dates in committee in an attempt to get agreed on dates for subsequent meetings of the Public Utilities Committee. --(Interjection)-- February 28th at 10:00 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker. My question's to the House Leader, and it really relates to the answer given with respect to the Public Accounts Committee and the fact that the matter is under consideration. I wonder if the Minister can indicate whether it is the intention of the government to call the Public Accounts Committee before the Budget is presented?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the problem that I have is that I am not able to say the date of presentation of the Budget, but I indicated to the honourable member that it is under active consideration. Perhaps tomorrow we will be able to announce a date for the first meeting.

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

MR. ASPER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege. There appears in the Winnipeg Tribune of today's date, page 9, a story under the heading, "NDP Owes Debt to CUPE: Enns." The first few words are, "Deputy Conservative Leader Izzy Harry Enns charged Tuesday the government . . ." Mr. Speaker, I would simply like the record to show that the name "Izzy" is not a common name and it might well be mistaken for these comments haven't been made by me and I wish to say that I know no Izzy Harry Enns. I don't

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. ASPER Cont'd) like Izzy Harry Enns if I do know him. I think it's an inappropriate name, it's my name and it doesn't belong in this story, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, if that was allowed as a point of privilege, and I suppose it's just as well that it was, one can appreciate my honourable friend's problem, I would like to also take this opportunity to rise on a somewhat similar point of privilege. And that is namely that last night I was quoted on one of the news broadcasts as having promised a swimming pool to a particular city in the province and, Sir, while the latter part of that particular announcement was correct in that the Mayor of the City of Thompson confirmed what the actual procedure and understanding was, the first part of the broadcast needs to be corrected, Sir. There was no swimming pool promised. What was involved was a statement be me that under the special municipal loan fund, forgivable loan fund, that a municipality could apply for funds for any municipal public works which were approved by the municipality.

MR. SPEAKER: On a matter of procedure, let me indicate that both these areas were matters of explanation and they're done at the indulgence of the House not because of the rules that I try to preside over. They are not matters of privilege but I can entertain them if the House has no objection they come forward. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister responsible for the MDC. Mr. Speaker, does the Prairie Foundry Limited Company have a loan from MDC?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Could the Minister inform the House as to whether or not there's a padlock on the door of Prairie Foundry at the moment?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware as to the physical condition of the door of Prairie Foundry. I do know that the Manitoba Development Corporation has put a receiver into Prairie Foundry to protect the assets, to protect the security on the debenture on a loan which was given by the previous administration.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister care to inform the House what the estimated losses to MDC are on this transaction?

MR. GREEN: No, Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't care to do that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Highways. I wonder if the Minister of Highways is giving consideration to restoring the Conservative formula on the maintenance and grading of provincial roads?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. BURTONIAK: Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to say what the Conservative formula was but I can assure the honourable member that our formula is a good one and we expect to maintain that.

MR. WATT: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May I say that the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Question please.

MR. WATT: A supplementary question then. Is it not correct that the formula for maintenance and upgrading of provincial roads was cut in half by this government as compared with that established by the Conservative Government?

MR. BURTONIAK: Mr. Speaker, when the honourable member said it was cut in half it is absolutely incorrect.

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

MR. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The honourable gentleman wish a supplementary? The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Well the Honourable Minister says it was not cut in half. How far was it cut?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Would the honourable member not debate but ask his questions.

MR. WATT: Well I'm asking a question. How far was it cut then? How far was the downgrading?

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Speaker, I don't know exactly what the honourable member is trying to get at, but I suggest I don't think it was cut, if anything it was increased.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Does the Minister intend to release to the House the Review Report made on the Manitoba Seven Regional Development Corporations?

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

MR. EVANS: Actually, Mr. Speaker, I believe we have sent copies to each of the Regional Development Corporations for their consideration and we hope to have discussion with them. If members are so interested we can obtain copies for them.

MR. BANMAN: Would the Minister table the Review?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I have indicated such.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Development Corporation. In view of his government's oft-stated claim to open government would he inform the House as to the size of the loan that Prairie Foundry has from the MDC?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the size of the loan would certainly be available to honourable members and I'll take the question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education. Would he care to confirm to this House the fact that the Department of Education have cut by 75 percent the proposal by the Winnipeg School Board for the improvement of the unicity schools of Daniel McIntyre and Sargent Park Collegiate?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Education) (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, there has been no reduction in the support that is offered by the Public Schools Finance Board to any school division in the construction or renovation of any of their school buildings.

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

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if you would please proceed with the second reading of bills in the order in which they appear, following which we would make the motion to go into the Committee of Supply.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

GOVERNMENT BILLS - SECOND READING

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 4. Proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Could we have this matter stand, Mr. Speaker? (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 5. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

BILL NO. 5

MR. ARNOLD BROWN (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I see that the government intends to take some action and amend The Garnishment Act so that it will be easier for deserted mothers and deserted wives to claim maintenance. Now huge sums of money are spent by the government every year for the maintenance of these unfortunates. Unwed mothers and deserted mothers claim a large portion of the taxpayers' money spent by the Department of Social Development every year and I believe that legislation is long overdue and fathers must be made responsible for their families.

The Government in Bill No. 5 is attempting to make it easier for deserted mothers to claim maintenance for themselves and their children through The Garnishment Act. Most deserted mothers even though they have access to free legal aid and they have the vehicle of The Garnishment Act, would still be very hesitant and reluctant to take legal action against their husbands. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, a much more humane approach would be for the government to take legal action against the husband. This would ensure that the husband would not try to place undue influence on the mothers and this would ensure

BILL NO. 5

(MR. BROWN cont'd) . . . that in no way would the father shirk his responsibility towards his family. Now this of course would mean the co-operation of the other provinces in order for this really to be effective, but this is the approach that I would like the government to take.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Leader of the Opposition, Opposition.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 7. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

BILL NO. 7

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 7 is a piece of legislation which has prompted a very deep and profound examination in the caucus of the party that I belong to and that I speak for on this occasion in this debate, one, Sir, that we cannot concur in or agree with for a number of reasons. The Honourable Member for Swan River in an eloquent criticism of the legislation the other day urged us to keep the Civil Service out of politics and in that one appeal, Sir, I think he summed up the approach that our party takes to the legislation. In that one appeal he summed up the approach that our party takes to the whole concept of the Civil Service and to the whole philosophy of what a professional public service is meant to be and can be, and indeed in our province has been for a hundred years now. I might say that we could take the rallying cry of my colleague from Swan River and convert it or invert it into another appeal, and I will have one or two words to say about that later in the course of my remarks. That appeal, Sir, would be keep politics out of the Civil Service; not only should we keep the Civil Service out of politics but let us keep politics out of the Civil Service.

There are countless examples and my colleague from Swan River and then again yesterday my colleague from Lakeside offered them, of individual public servants, civil servants at the provincial and the federal level in this country and other western democracies who have not been inhibited in any way, Mr. Speaker, in their ambitions ultimately to enter active political life. And it's not my purpose to repeat the arguments advanced by those two members or the examples that they offered of persons who have found it perfectly possible, perfectly reasonable and within the limitations of the demands that politics places on all of us, relatively easy to enter active political life notwithstanding their origins at the public service, the civil service level.

So that the approach that members opposite, that the government and that the Minister of Labour have taken which argues that this type of legislation is necessary to free-up the civil servant and open the vistas of political opportunity to him meets with complete rejection on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, and I suggest meets with complete rejection in logic. It meets with complete rejection in history. Any examination of the professional experience of many of our outstanding public men and women of the past, as the Honourable Member for Swan River and the Honourable Member for Lakeside pointed out, will reveal very quickly. Sir, that there is no such inhibition or limitation on the civil servant and that it is completely possible and completely practical for a public servant to make the move uninhibited and unencumbered into the political arena if he or she so chooses to do. So the argument advanced to defend the Bill on the grounds that it does open that opportunity up is, as I've said, Sir, a smokescreen that begs the greater question at issue here and that successfully obscures the motives of the government which were, I think laid bare pretty dramatically and vividly in the remarks of the Honourable Member for Lakeside earlier this week.

Mr. Speaker, if one approaches it from the point of view of the citizenry, the public, when you look at our provincial elections and provincial election activity you have to conclude, I suggest, in all reason, Mr. Speaker, that the kind of legislation, the kind of permissiveness contained in this bill and advanced by the government at this juncture, is bound, Sir, bound to result in civil servants coming into the active political arena and publicly debating policies in which they are employed and obliged to implement. And I raise the question as to what kind of chaos, what kind of irrationality this situation injects into politics both from the point of view of the civil servant himself or herself, and from the point of view of the voter, the public. Because the logical consequence of moving in the direction advocated by the Minister and advocated in this Bill must be that, Sir; it must be ultimately a situation where a civil

BILL NO. 7

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) . . . servant is actively campaigning and competing against programs and policies that he has been up to that point in time employed to implement and serve. And the extension of that situation is a situation wherein that civil servant then goes back following an election campaign to continue, at least in terms of public posture, to support a program or a policy which he or she has found himself juxtaposed to in argument, in debate, in the political arena. And the tragedy of that situation, Mr. Speaker, is not so much that the civil servant himself finds himself in a contradictory and indefensible position insofar as logic is concerned, the tragedy of the situation is that it results in complete mystification, misunderstanding and intellectual chaos as far as the political public is concerned. How could the public, Mr. Speaker, have any confidence in a civil servant who is carrying out a program or a policy which he has just been out on the hustings publicly criticizing. So that we see, Sir, that the danger in the legislation lies not only in the difficulties it imposes in the Civil Service sphere itself, but in the greater difficulties it imposes, I believe, on the whole political process and the whole political public and the public's entire understanding of any given political situation.

I think the type of legislation envisioned here is acceptable in certain political spheres; I think certainly participation by civil servants at the municipal level is acceptable to me and I would suggest quite possibly to many of my colleagues. It might even be that participation by provincial civil servants in federal elections carries with it, implies none of the difficulties that I've suggested, but certainly participation by provincial civil servants in a provincial election, either their own or somebody else's provincial election, an election in a neighbouring province, can have nothing but confusing, destructive and potentially disastrous results for the public service and for the voting public itself, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, should the potential political activist from the Civil Service not be a candidate but should he or she rather be a money raiser or an organizer of some sort, the situation is no different. The situation, the potential for chaos and misunderstanding and contradiction applies with equal weight I suggest, Sir, across the whole spectrum of Civil Service involvement in politics at the provincial level -- speaking of course of the provincial Civil Service. It makes no difference whether that civil servant is actively campaigning for himself or herself or is campaigning for somebody else in an active way either from the point of view of organizing or raising money. Any one of those positions produces the same kind of contradiction and difficulty and disillusionment from the point of view of the public at least, with the political process and with the public service process. This probably is the salient danger in the whole situation. If we lose our confidence in our public service and in its ability and its willingness to act conscientiously and independently, in its willingness and its motivation to act in a non-partisan way in the best interest of the people and the province it is employed to serve, if we lose that and our confidence in that institution and that principle and that style of democracy, Mr. Speaker, then we've lost everything that all of us ever elected to this Chamber or any other democratic Chamber in this country have fought and worked for in our political campaigns, in our political terms of office, regardless of which party label we operate under.

I ask you to picture the situation of the civil servant who is in that position, Mr. Speaker, as well as picture the situation of the voter who has been placing his confidence in that civil servant. How could the civil servant himself approach the programs and policies of the province from that day forward impartially, objectively and independently if he has been involved at the organizing level in an active way or at the money raising level in an active way. So the whole spectrum of involvement is at issue in this legislation Mr. Speaker, and the whole spectrum of involvement is one which demands and has commanded our deep concern on this side of the House regardless of whether that involvement is as a candidate or as a worker for a candidate.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Mines and Resources in defending the legislation yesterday made reference to his experience in industrial relations and he said that any employer who tried to influence his employees in an industrial relations situation with respect to one particular union or another is acting to his own disadvantage. These were his sentiments and I think very closely his words, Sir: "Any employer trying to influence employees with respect to the selection of a bargaining organization, a union in an industrial relation situation is really acting to his own disadvantage." Well that may be, Sir, that reference was made in the

BILL NO. 7

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) . . . course of an examination and counter-examination of the current situation in the provincial Civil Service here which has attracted much attention from many of us in recent days both inside and outside this House. I refer, of course, to the organizing activities having been undertaken in recent weeks by the Canadian Union of Public Employees with the provincial Civil Service as its target. I refer to the conflict, of course, in direction and in ambition between that union, CUPE, and the Manitoba Government Employees Association. And it's really that area of conflict, of course, to which I was alluding, Mr. Speaker, when I said a few moments ago that the Member for Swan River was not only absolutely correct in his challenge to us to keep the Civil Service out of politics, but would similarly have been absolutely correct had he gone on to challenge, as I know he believes, had he gone on to challenge us equally to keep politics out of the Civil Service. And it's because we have a situation at the present time involving organizing activities in the provincial Civil Service that we got on to that aspect of labour relations and Civil Service activities in the examination of the bill earlier this week; and it's because we were preoccupied to a certain extent in recent days with that union organizing activity within the Civil Service and with that union organizing conflict, that the whole question of pressures and intimidation by government came up. And in that context the Minister of Mines and Resources made his assertion that any employer in an industrial relations situation trying to exert that kind of influence over choice of a union would be acting to his own disadvantage rather than in his own best interests.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the argument advanced on that level by the Minister of Mines and Resources I think falls largely into the category of the smokescreen embodied in the basic argument employed by the government where the bill itself is concerned. It is a slick and convincing, considering the source, entreaty. But the fact of the matter, Sir, is that we're not dealing here with a typical industrial relations situation, we're dealing here with a question of government and a question of welfare of the public - well of the public service and of the public itself, and a question really, Sir, of the common wheel. In a strict industrial relations situation, in a purely clinical situation of industry, I think that the Minister of Mines and Resources would find no argument on this side of the House for the assertion that he made. But we're not dealing, Sir, with that kind of a situation, we're dealing here with a public service that has established an unparalleled reputation in this country over the past one hundred years for selfless service to the people of Manitoba, and we're dealing with the subtle condition of a service who has to report to its employer and carry out its employer's wishes and programs and bargain with its employer for salaries and for livelihood while ministering to the livelihoods of all Manitobans at the same time. They're not dealing in one narrow area of activity, they're dealing with the whole common wheel as I have suggested; they're dealing with an employer who can change from time to time as is the natural result of the political process not only in personnel but in philosophy. So that there are subtleties and there are abstractions but at the same time very real influences involved in a situation like this, Sir, which don't crop up and don't occur in a straightforward industrial situation. This is a government situation, it's a public welfare situation, and it's not a matter of turning out a certain number of goods or products for sale in the marketplace to meet a manufacturing quota.

The Minister of Mines and Resources went on to say that employees should join the union of their choice, Mr. Speaker, and here I suggest that he skated onto a particularly thin area of ice in view of the whole situation in the public service that prompted those remarks of his in the first place. That situation being the one I've just referred to with respect to union organizing. Because we contend, Sir, that in that current situation the employee is not really being given the free and untrammelled opportunity to join the union of his or his choice. If there were no persons close to the Cabinet, if there were no persons close to the seats or the levers of government power involved in the activities that are going on of an organizational nature at this time, then perhaps it could be argued that employees in the provincial Civil Service do have a free and untrammelled opportunity to make their own choice. But the fact of the matter, Sir, is that there are persons very close to the decision making process, persons in Cabinet planning groups who are leading the organizational activities being undertaken by the Canadian Union of Public Employees to recruit members of the provincial Civil Service in majority into their union and away from their present organization, the MGEA.

So I suggest the Minister is inviting, inviting very acute criticism when he applies the argument that employees should be given the opportunity to join the union of their choice;

BILL NO. 7

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) for we argue that that's precisely what we feel is at stake and at issue at the present time in the organizing activity going on in the provincial Civil Service. Is the Canadian Union of Public Employees really the union of the civil servants choice? Or is the civil servant, Sir, being subtly pressured, being subtly pressured, into moving in a particular direction . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. SHERMAN: . . . because members of cabinet planning groups are involved in top level organizing activities and the rank and file civil servant doesn't wish to incur the displeasure or the opposition of people who are that close to the administrative process.

Mr. Speaker, a week or two ago during the Throne Speech Debate I asked the question of the Minister of Labour whether he did not feel that unfair and undue pressures and harassment of a subtle nature to be sure were being exerted on the rank and file civil servant in this province because of that fact. I cited, for example, that it was common knowledge reported in the press that there are several top level organizers for CUPE who are very close to the decision-making process in that they are members of cabinet planning groups. One has already been identified in the House in the course of this session, Mr. Gerry Fast, he's in the urban development group of the Cabinet Planning Secretariat. But there are others. There is one in the Economic Analysis Group of the Cabinet Planning Secretariat, there's one in the planning section of the provincial department of education, and as I pointed out ten days ago, Sir, there's another who's an official of the education projects area for Colleges and University Affairs. There may be more, Mr. Speaker, but it's common knowledge and press knowledge that there are at least those four who have been leading the organizational activities for CUPE and who at the same time sit next to and rub shoulders with members of the Cabinet.

Now I ask you whether even the Minister of Mines and Resources with his sophisticated argument and his political experience and his campaign ribbons from industrial relations disputes in the past whether he can argue in sincerity and expect us to believe that the rank and file provincial civil servant is really being given the freedom at this time to pick the union of his choice.

. . . .continued on next page

BILL 7

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd)

Mr. Speaker, in defending the bill and defending the Minister's position on the bill and attempting to rebut the arguments of the Member for Lakeside yesterday, the Minister of Mines and Resources used classic military strategy. He even referred to General Custer and the Battle of the Little Big Horn and that may have something of a Freudian slip, Mr. Speaker, that reference to the Battle of the Little Big Horn and to Custer because his own tactics were of a classic military type. The best defence in the military handbooks, Mr. Speaker, as you know yourself, Sir, is most times a good offence. When in doubt attack. And this is what the Minister of Mines and Resources did yesterday afternoon. Having been stunned, having been stunned by the arrows and the volleys fired by the Member for Lakeside and with no logical defence against them, Mr. Speaker, the Minister then jumped on his own horse, brandished his pistol and like that character from Stephen Leacock he rode off in all directions at the same time. --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. SHERMAN: At that time he fired bluster and bombast in all directions attempting to obscure and smokescreen the position that was articulated clearly and cleanly by the Member for Lakeside and which laid there, which laid there and laid open the whole purpose and the whole motivation for the bill itself.

Now that was an admirable parliamentary or military defence. There's nothing wrong with this, but I suggest that it was rather revealing when he did lapse into the analogy involving Custer and the Little Big Horn, because he was doing precisely that kind of thing himself, attempting to refute and rebut and obscure the logic of the argument on this side of the House by bombast and bluster, by attack, attack, attack which was not borne out really by sound philosophical position. And the reason I say it was not borne out by a sound philosophical position, Mr. Speaker - and I'm sorry that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is not in his seat at the moment - is that the whole body of the argument advanced by that Minister rested on one obvious implication, and that implication, Sir, was that the government is just another employer. If he weren't making that postulation and if he weren't starting from that premise he would never have got into the kinds of arguments that I described earlier, such as the one in which he said that employees should be free to make their own choice and that an employer is working to his disadvantage if he tries to influence them in any way.

What in effect the Minister was saying by drawing those industrial analogies was that the government is just another industry, just another employer. And this is the weakness of the position that he took and this is why I say that his attempted defence was a massive attack intended to obscure, to generate more heat than light, because he cannot win in this House or in this province. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, an argument in which he attempts to convince the public and certainly the Opposition and certainly the Conservative party that government is just like any other employer. He cannot foist off an argument in this House on this side and expect to get away with it, if it's an argument that says that government is just like another industry and in effect government employment is just like industrial employment in the private sector. We reject this view of government, Mr. Speaker, totally, unconditionally, and the Minister's argument betrays a philosophical hangup that I fear he can't escape or overcome, and it certainly betrays a philosophical position that we cannot in any degree accept. Perhaps his colleagues agree with him; I'm sure that many of them do. I'm sure that many of them operate from the basic premise that government and the process of governing is just another industrial activity, and that government and the public welfare can be run in a conveyer belt, machine-like assembly line manner. But we don't accept that premise of government, we don't accept that philosophy, Mr. Speaker, and that's why I say that the Minister's position was unacceptable to us and indefensible as far as we're concerned and that he, I think, knew it. He knew he was basing his argument on that one premise that government is just another employer and that relations between government and its employees can be handled in precisely the same philosophical frame and context as relations between any industry and its employees. But he knew that he was on a rather weak base with that kind of an argument and he knew that he was going to have difficulty ramming that kind of position in debate past this side of the House and so he resorted - and I admire him for it - to a furious verbal attack which tended to divert the attention of many members of the House to other aspects of the debate and away from that premise.

But that's what's at issue here, Mr. Speaker, is that philosophical difference in approach

BILL 7

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) to government and its responsibilities to people. We steadfastly reject the philosophy embodied in the position that the Minister took, betrayed by his tactics. We want a minimum of government, not a maximum, and as long as you're operating with that kind of an approach and that kind of a philosophy we could never subscribe to the view that government is just another employer. We believe that on balance, all things being equal, there's far too much of government acting as an employer in the present day and age. The Minister obviously doesn't and I suspect that many of his colleagues agree with him. So in addition to other areas of disagreement where this legislation is concerned the battle, as far as I'm concerned, is certainly joined on that plane too.

Mr. Speaker, there are those I think who think that the current organizing work being done by and for the government in the dispute between CUPE and MGEA at the present time is really the sort of, first step in the campaign to make the provincial Civil Service a thoroughly political stamp acting in the interest solely of the New Democratic Party point of view. I don't subscribe to that, I don't subscribe to that theory, although I think that in the long term this government certainly recognizes that its best interests would be served by politicizing the Civil Service as widely and as profoundly as possible, and that by ensuring that it is directed, run, controlled and influenced by those who are oriented to the NDP point of view. But I think really that what's happening here at the present time is in the nature of a hotdog poll or a hamburger poll, if I can use that term in this context, and that what the government is doing discreetly and subtly is putting up a strawman and testing the reaction of the public, and the opposition, and the press, and the Civil Service to a campaign which would organize the Civil Service along much stricter political lines.

I think that there is substantial evidence to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that really what the government is doing here is gauging the wind, is testing the feeling of the public. Would the public be outraged if the New Democratic Government currently in office attempted to organize the public service to its own philosophy, and restructure it to serve its own ambitions more closely. Would the press be disturbed? Would the opposition really recognize what was happening? Would there be any kind of opposition articulated by any of the four estates or would they be able to get away with it? Would the public service itself really realize what was happening? Would the labour movement really realize and appreciate what was happening? Those are all questions that the front benches on the other side, Mr. Speaker, are not quite prepared to answer yet, or they may be prepared to answer them but they're not certain of what those answers would be given a test of time. So that they've undertaken an exercise here which allows them to adopt a hands-off posture and sit back and watch what kind of reaction this CUPE organizing drive will have.

Nobody has to underline or reinforce the points made yesterday by my colleague from Lakeside with respect to CUPE's allegiance to the NDP and to this government. We know the extent to which CUPE follows this government, believes in it, supports it, actively campaigns and works for it and actively contributes funds to it. That's not at issue. What is at issue here is whether that union would work in the best interests of a public service whom it was representing and the best interests of the Manitoba public wheel should it be the bargaining agent. And what's further at issue is the question of whether the individual civil servant is getting the proper freedom of opportunity to make the choice on its own merits. Because of the activity that CUPE has undertaken on its own, the government has a heaven sent opportunity here, Sir, to test the wind to see what the reaction is in the public and in the public service and then to make the decision at some time in the appropriate future as to whether to move in much more concerted and direct organizational terms within the Civil Service itself. And the bill before us is all part and parcel of that approach and that philosophy. The bill before us is intended to make it possible for the Civil Service to become thoroughly politicized, of, by, for and under the NDP should the government decide that they can get away with it without outraging the press and the public. That's what the bill was intended to do, Mr. Speaker. And so we shall see, and the government shall see, what kind of reaction the current CUPE organizing drive and organizing activity has. And if the opposition and the press and the public and the civil service itself is sufficiently outraged, then I suggest the government may not press forward so militantly and so dogmatically with the bill before us and may be amenable to suggestions for softening the impact of some of the sections, and may be amenable to suggestions for some amendments which I believe, Sir, would improve the legislation enormously.

BILL 7

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd)

I'm not able to get into a clause by clause examination at this stage of the debate I know, Mr. Speaker, but I just want to say in closing that there are in all the clauses contained many flaws and pitfalls in the legislation and not the least of which is the extra burden that is placed on the civil servant himself by being in a thoroughly--by being put into a thoroughly politicized service and a thoroughly politicized situation; the extra pressure being the question that he or she must face daily in his job as to whether he co-operates all the way or only part of the way, and whether he can confide in certain people or not, and whether he enjoys real freedom of movement in his department or not, and whether he dares question policies in his department or not. These are all additional burdens that will be placed on the civil servant if the legislation passes in its present form.

But that's only one of the flaws and the dangers, Sir. Another one exists in the form of a kind of discrimination that is implicit in the legislation. There is discrimination against employees of government agencies which doesn't exist in the present legislation but which will come into effect should the new legislation go through in its present form. So the civil servant has to worry about encroachment on his freedom and about problems which this government hasn't even faced in the debate yet and the employee of government agencies has to worry about a discrimination against him which does not presently exist in the legislation that we live under now.

So these are all things that we will be looking at as we examine the bill further through the legislative process, Mr. Speaker, and there will be a number of amendments which we will want to introduce.

. continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J. R. (Bud) BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, the Member for Fort Garry was saying that somebody was adding bluster and bombast, and he was saying that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources' argument was not sound. The position of the Minister of Mines was that the government in this regard was just another employer, and the argument presented by the Member for Fort Garry - of course I suppose he doesn't realize it but it leads to the conclusion that he does not consider the government as just another employer and a logical consequence of that would be a pork-barrel perhaps.

But, Mr. Speaker, the other day when the Leader of the Liberal Party was speaking he asked the Minister a question - it's recorded in Hansard on page 564. "Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister a question," I'm quoting, "I take it that he would - and I believe he has in the past expressed -- I may be wrong, that he has not expressed, but I believe that he would consider it an impropriety -- if a person who is under contract or doing contractual supply business to the government were contributing financially to the party in power with whom he must bargain at arm's length, would he not consider it an impropriety or a conflict of interest for a party in power with whom he must bargain at arm's length, would he not consider it an impropriety or a conflict of interest for a party in power to be receiving financial support from a union with whom it was bargaining for the people of the Province of Manitoba -- for the people of Manitoba?" I added the word "province". Now I find that rather strange coming from the Leader of the Liberal Party because the structure of the Senate in Ottawa is such that the inter-relationship between the directorates of all and sundry companies in Canada are appointed to the Senate, many of us feel, as rewards for their financial assistance to many of the political parties.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I just want to make one point on this bill, but I just find that very strange that the Liberal Party who has for years been supported by people in business, who they have had to negotiate with, perhaps taking some exception to government -- this government receiving some contributions from unions. But here again I'm glad to say that the parliamentary process is still intact because I as one person on the government side was a little apprehensive about this bill and some of the nuances of this particular clause that was drawing much attention. But once again with the assistance of the Member for Swan River and the Member for Lakeside they have once again talked me into the government's position because of the presentation that they made. The Member for Swan River said that this has always been going on, and he named cases that people had been actively involved in party politics without the blessing of law, so perhaps it is a time that we rectified that situation.

But I wish to put on the record my personal belief in this particular regard, that I don't think it's going to do very much. I think at the same time that we enact such laws that we tell people that they have to learn to suffer the consequences of their own acts. Now I don't know what other people's attitudes are vis-a-vis their employees but nevertheless I for one would find it very difficult to have a very good working relationship with someone who was trying to undermine my position. I think it is rather incongruous - the Member for Sturgeon Creek made this point the other day when he was a salesman for Paulin Chambers - of course he would no more think of running around selling Christie Biscuits than I would. But nevertheless some people in their wisdom think that this should be the case that people should be allowed to become involved. One of the experiences I had in industry was in a sales supervisory capacity. The manager of the particular company asked me if I liked the product I was selling, and I said yes, and he said, well do yourself and the company a favour, if you should ever change your mind leave. Because if you're not convinced about the intrinsic value of the product that you're selling then you shouldn't be with the company. Now I wouldn't -- (Interjection) -- No, I'm sorry I'm not going to move over there because just follow my argument through.

I would like to digress just a moment and I hope to be able to tie myself back in to where I am at this point in time. When we are speaking about the civil servants, Mr. Speaker, many civil servants that in the past five years I have learned to respect, but these people I don't even know what their politics are; it's none of my business what their politics are. One of these people, Mr. Speaker, retired on February 28th. Frenchy McDonald who was the Deputy Minister of Municipal Affairs. Now here was a man that entered public service in a different capacity in 1936 and he retired in 1974. Now Frenchy was the kind of fellow that almost went unnoticed. I remember lugging him all over -- as he got closer to retirement -- all over

BILL NO. 7

(MR. BOYCE cont'd) . . . northern Manitoba with the Municipal Affairs Committee while the Minister was looking at reorganization of the local government districts, and our Clerk is smiling because he was being lugged around too, and we got snowed in and everything else. But this man he gave advice to all of us. I think everyone in this House would attest to this, that he would get asked a question and Frenchy would slowly stand up and he'd think of the answer, and he'd give it to you. Now there in my mind was a terrific civil servant. And I wish just in passing to pay tribute to Frenchy McDonald. I believe in giving people their roses while they're alive.

There are many other people in the civil service that I could say the same thing about. Regardless of what law we pass here in this regard I would suggest most of these people will not take advantage of it. But perhaps there should be some protection in the law for those people that so choose to do, that there is some protection in the law. Once again they shouldn't be that naive to think that if at some future point in time the government changes, the government changes and they cannot, they cannot make the philosophical adjustment that they in themselves can do a good job, they themselves should leave. If people can't sell the product they should do themselves and their company a favour and leave. The Member for Sturgeon Creek I'm sure would agree with me. If the managers of Paulin Chambers - now he referred to that himself - if the managers and stockholders of Paulin Chambers decided that they were no longer going to make chocolate puffs - and this is his biggest item, these chocolate puffs - and he says I can't sell this junk that you're giving to me now, I'm sure he in himself would say, well I'm sorry we have come to the parting of the ways. This new product that you're asking me to sell I can no longer sell; I will have to direct my endeavours elsewhere. And I think this is a matter of integrity. This is a matter of integrity. And I think the people of the Province of Manitoba have a right to demand that of their civil service.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, would the member entertain a question? Based on his statement that if a civil servant can't sell the product then he should get out. You're expecting people who have given 20 or 30 years' service, and have families and homes, that they should leave their jobs because there's a change in government? Because they disagree? So you're saying that 12,000 people who do not agree with the government should get out when there's a change.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, that is one of the difficulties in using parallels and analogs and metaphors. I was speaking specifically to the Member for Sturgeon Creek's argument in which he alluded to selling products --(Interjections)-- No. And maybe I didn't make my point too well. I said it's a matter of integrity, this whole thing. It's a matter of integrity. I'm not talking that they should go out and sell the philosophy of the government, not at all. In fact anyone that would tell me that they're -- you know I've known some of these people for years and they have been very quiet people; they haven't been involved in politics, and all of a sudden they tell me that they're going to get involved in politics I would be rather suspect in my own mind. I wouldn't make a demand on anybody to tell me his policy -- I know by the way several people in the government, who are quite high up in the government, and I'm not going to use the tactics used by the Leader of the Conservative Party or the Member for Fort Garry who just spoke just now and name names, I wouldn't do that. These people were quite active in party politics for other political parties prior to 1969. And a few of them thought their heads would roll in 1969 because some of them are in very sensitive positions, and I will allude to them no closer than that because if I said anything more they could be identified. But nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, these people are men of integrity and they've made their adjustments to work in the best interests of the government of Manitoba and the people of Manitoba. They have withdrawn from active political involvement but yet they have done their best to see that the policy of the government has been implemented, and that is the responsibility of the civil servant. That is integrity. It's not integrity for people who would try because the Cabinet sets a policy to sit back there and throw sand in the gears. I don't think that is operating in the best interests of the people. So that your 12,000 people, your 12,000 people - I think the people of the province when they change government if by some strange quirk of fate the people put the Liberal Party in, there would be that adjustment; put the Conservative Party in, there would be that adjustment, and I think this is reasonable to

BILL NO. 7

(MR. BOYCE cont'd) . . . accept, unless of course your leader prevails upon us to inaugurate the American system where governments change hands and everybody is turfed out, everybody, down to the local postmaster is turfed out, which is one of the other consequences of your leader's position.

But I just wanted to put on the record my attitude which, it may seem strange, it parallels considerably the Member for Sturgeon Creek. But nevertheless, nevertheless I think it is only fair, it is only fair --(Interjection)-- Well you read what you said and you'll see that there is a parallel between our positions in that one regard, that people have to be convinced of the intrinsic value of what they're doing before they can do a competent job. And if they're not convinced that what they're doing is in the best interests of the people of Manitoba, then they should do themselves and the province a service and direct their endeavours elsewhere.

But really I could close on this, Mr. Speaker. I don't know why but I think this was kind of lost in the shuffle. And people should remember, the civil servants who do become involved politically should realize that laws aren't going to change very much. You know if laws change people very much all we'd need is perhaps the original ten. The Leader of the Liberal Party asked the Minister when he was speaking - you know this question that he asked about bargaining with people that made contributions to the political process. The Minister alluded to this concept of integrity. Now every person in this House knows as I know, especially the second time round. The first time I ran it was rather difficult to get contributions; the second time round it's a little easier because people come to you and they want to give you donations. Some donations during the campaign - and my list is out there with the rest of them. Anybody that want to go take a look at the people that I got money from, go right ahead. But there's some contributions I turned down because I wouldn't take them, and I'll bet you there's many people can share this experience --(Interjection)-- The Member for Charleswood is shaking his head. He never turned one down. Well this of course you know draws to attention the difficulty that they're having down south, you know. The president --one aspect of it-- the president and the milk lobby, where there was a contribution of the milk lobby to the president's campaign. Mr. Speaker, everyone who is in politics knows this goes on. In fact here a few years ago the Federal Government filed that report on -- I would refer the Member for Fort Rouge to it; I've got a copy of it, I'll give it to him; it's on election expenses. I don't know if he has one or not, perhaps he's seen it. But it led to this latest bill which just was enacted in Ottawa here a couple of weeks ago. But everybody knows this goes on. You know, people make contributions to political parties and some people would like to tie threads to those contributions, some people would like to tie strings to them, some people ropes, and somebody would like to chain their politicians to them. It's a matter of degree and it becomes incumbent upon every politician to operate with integrity, because this is what is involved. Now either we get elected to this House and we operate with integrity or we don't

But I'd just like to close with this because I think this was missed. Quoting from the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources' speech on page 565, "And in the last analysis I think that the question could only be answered by integrity, and the people who think they can pass laws to deal with it, although they are very well-intentioned and many of them belong to my political party, do not think in the last analysis what this means, that there will be no way of effectively dealing with the fact that there are political contributions to a political party, and in the last analysis the men who are elected have to govern in the interests of the people and the question of where the money comes from has to be completely irrelevant."

Now I think that was a very profound statement and I think it was missed in the hubbub. In the last analysis it has to depend on the integrity of the people that are elected to this House, and in some instances as much as I disagree with the press--especially one chap that put as the last line, he had one line left over, he said, "Bud Boyce also spoke." But nevertheless it takes an alert press, because if you will recall, that whole Watergate thing down there got started by consistent, persistent analysis by some astute press people. So it takes a functioning of the total system to make sure that the system works. This law isn't going to do what the Member for Fort Garry suggests, and I'm glad that he has returned because I want to just share something with him. When he thinks that this Cabinet here isn't just another employer, I would suggest he should ask the members of his group who were Cabinet Ministers. Because when I, as a backbencher in this government, albeit a Legislative Assistant to the Minister of Health and Social Development, tried to get a pencil sharpener out of these guys, you know,

BILL NO. 7

(MR. BOYCE cont'd) . . . they won't give you anything. They're just like another employer. And I would expect him, if he was on this side, when he's functioning and I suppose if he was on this side he'd be in the Cabinet also, that if he was on this side that as far as this particular aspect of it he would in fact operate just as another employer.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Assiniboia, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 12

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 12. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes that's allotted to me today I doubt if I can finish some of the comments I would like to make on Bill No. 12. But I was rather intrigued, Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Agriculture presented this bill, and the words that he used as recorded in Hansard to me seem a little bit amusing. I would like to quote, Mr. Speaker, from some of the things he said and just wonder to what extent he really means what he says. He says, "The important aspect of this bill has to do with the increase of government support to the Veterinary Services districts." And he goes on and said, "I would like to reflect on the program for a minute or two."

Mr. Speaker, I believe that in my constituency one of the earlier veterinary clinics was set up in the Shoal Lake area, and I well remember, Mr. Speaker, the problems they had at that time. The government had set a maximum, I believe, of \$30,000 on a veterinary clinic and they had a great deal of difficulty, Mr. Speaker, in establishing that clinic with the amount of money that was allocated by the Province of Manitoba. To my knowledge the Minister has not indicated in this bill or at any other time, to my knowledge anyway, whether additional moneys are available to those that establish veterinary clinics, and yet we find that costs are increasing every year. The price of everything is pretty well going up, and if I am incorrect I would ask the Minister to correct me in that matter. Is it still 30,000 . . . ?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the situation is that each year the department brings forth its Estimates and indicates to the House the numbers of clinics that should be built for a certain amount of dollars. There has been an escalation of costs annually reflecting the inflationary situation within the construction industry.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for his explanation and I am very glad then to find out that they are learning from the mistakes that have been made in the past, because the Veterinary Clinic in Shoal Lake was practically at a standstill for a year, Mr. Speaker, waiting for materials and funds to get it completed and get it into operation, and it caused considerable difficulty in that area at that time.

One of the things that the Minister has done, I notice here, is he has increased the allocation from the Provincial Government to \$5,000 per veterinarian. I don't know how many veterinary clinics there are in the province that have more than one veterinarian. I'm sure that the Minister when he's closing debate will tell us how many there are that fall into that category, and in that respect then we will be able to ascertain, Sir, really how much additional funds the province is pouring into this veterinary program. I would suspect though, Mr. Speaker, that in all probability the number of veterinary clinics in the Province of Manitoba that have more than one veterinary are very small, and consequently the increase in provincial input is going to be very small.

However, Mr. Speaker, in another section in the bill he has changed the formula for the amount of local input - increased it 400 percent, Mr. Speaker, from \$300.00 to \$1,200. That is the understanding that I get from reading it, that the board will now be able to assess costs up to \$1,200 per municipality. Mr. Speaker, may I say, and I know it's improper, Sir, to quote a particular section, but it says, "that the board shall send a statement of the balance required, which shall not exceed \$1,200, to the clerk of each municipality." Before, Mr. Speaker, it was \$300.00, so the increased permissible assessment from the municipality is increased 400 percent but the province's input is really, Sir, very very little. And this coming, Mr. Speaker, from a Minister who has been going around the province . . .

BILL NO. 7

MR. USKIW: . . . I wonder if the member would allow me to correct his opinion of the bill in that respect.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister will have the opportunity at the end.

MR. GRAHAM: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister may have his opinions and I have mine. Mr. Speaker, the Minister has gone around this province telling people all the wonderful things they have done, and I'll admit that the veterinary program has been a good thing, but we're finding that the operation of it is going to require more and more local input, all the time the input from the local area is going to be increasing, and I doubt whether the input from the Provincial Government is going to be increasing in a corresponding manner.

PRIVATE MEMBERS RESOLUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hour being 4:30, we now move into Private Members' Hour. The item before the House, Private Member's motion of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. Resolution No. 8.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie,

WHEREAS almost all industrialized provinces other than Manitoba have enacted basically similar Pensions Benefit Standards Act to ensure employees a minimum standard of protection from their employers in respect of pension plans where employers claim tax deductions for contributions to such plans; and

WHEREAS Manitoba has no laws which guarantee even minimum standards of portability vesting investment supervision and solvency of employer-sponsored pension plans in respect of which employers claim tax deductions;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of enacting at this Session a Manitoba Pensions Benefit Standards Act to protect Manitoba employees who are members of private employer pension plans in respect of the characteristics of their plan along the lines already in force in Ontario, Quebec and Saskatchewan.

MR. SPEAKER: Before I accept this resolution, I must indicate there is mention of it in respect to private pension plans in the debate from the Throne Speech, rather in the Throne Speech itself, and if there is assurance from the Ministry that this will be done, then I'm afraid I must rule this resolution out of order. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I understood you to ask for assurance of the Ministry that this would be done so I wouldn't want it to be automatically ruled out of order or ruled in order without a response from the government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (Minister of Finance)(St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, I was just looking -- unfortunately the Honourable the House Leader is not able to be present and I was therefore looking for myself at the Throne Speech to see the specific -- oh, I think this is it. And I'm quoting now from Page 9 of Votes and Proceedings" "A proposal for control and accountability of private pension plans will be introduced which will involve consideration for for portable pensions for Manitobans."

MR. SPEAKER: That is the paragraph I was referring to.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I don't quite understand what it is you are asking of the front bench now, in view of the fact that you yourself have referred to this paragraph in the Throne Speech.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: On the point of order, I would make the suggestion that you would perhaps take this under advisement.

MR. SPEAKER: There is nothing to take under advisement. The question is whether we will debate an issue twice in this House. I have indicated that there is the proposal that this will take place, therefore the resolution should not be debated at this time.

Resolution No. 9, The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

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

MR. SPEAKER: It will have to go the bottom of the Order Paper.

MR. PATRICK: That's fine.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution No. 10.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member from Assiniboia, the following resolution: that

WHEREAS the cost of living has risen significantly in Manitoba in the past year and those of our citizens who are over 65 and living on fixed income have no way of increasing their income to meet rising costs; and

WHEREAS during the recent provincial election the present government promised to introduce a senior citizens income supplement to bring their monthly income up to a minimum of \$200.00 each and has failed to do so;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the government consider the advisability of immediately introducing an income supplement plan for all Manitobans 65 and over, whereby their income after taking into account their income from federal assistance plans and other sources, would be guaranteed at a minimum of \$200.00 per month, and that such plan be made retroactive to October 1, 1973, and that such plan contain an automatic indexing system to provide for future rises in the cost of living.

MR. SPEAKER: Here we again have an item which is an item in the Estimates of the Department of Health and Social Development in respect to basic annual income projects. I do need clarification from the Treasury Bench as to what that means before I can indicate that this resolution is in order.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, in response to your request, as honourable members may know I was not present at the time the Estimates were introduced. I understand that the Honourable the First Minister in my absence did indicate that there is provision in the Estimates for payment of a supplement to provide for a minimum income of \$100.00. I don't know whether he indicated where it is. My recollection is that it appears on Page 25 under Item (t) - External Programs. (1) Financial Assistance. If that is the information you asked, then I proffer it.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I haven't had time to check the rule book but I believe that it is customary in this House that any resolution the content of which has been referred to as a government promise by way of the Throne Speech, then it would be ruled out of order, and we accept that. But I don't believe it has ever happened in this House that any other governmental statement where they stated an intention other than the Throne Speech was in that category, so that if this ruling were made based on what was said by a Minister introducing the Estimates, then I would think that the opposition could not raise hardly any matter to be discussed, because in all programs there's a tinge or a hint of some other program, and it would be extremely difficult for you, Sir, to make a ruling on that matter let alone preclude private members from putting forward resolutions. And I sum it up by saying that it's been the custom in the past that only government proposals or government programs that were mentioned in the Throne Speech could there be a ruling made on a resolution which mentioned anything that was in the Throne Speech and not any other place in government announcements.

MR. SPEAKER: In this instance I would like to indicate that if a matter is already being agreed to, that there's no necessity for debate, and that is what I gather from the Honourable Minister of Finance. So therefore, I think for the procedures of this House we should eliminate the repetition of things that have been agreed to. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, if I may be heard on this, I would indicate that I do not want to argue the rules of procedure at all. If, your Honour, after your own investigation you decide that it is out of order, I believe that we will all want to support you. However, I want to make it clear that we are not opposed on this side to this resolution being presented. I will acknowledge that we did not believe it necessary to make special mention in the Throne Speech and did not do so. At the same time I have to recognize that the Premier did indicate at the time of the estimates that the money was available in the estimates; I've confirmed it today. We do not want to be in a position of objecting to this matter being debated but we do not want to establish any sort of precedent that takes away from Your Honour your own responsibility, so that I just leave it that way. We're quite prepared to debate it.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, on the issue before you, I would echo the sentiments of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, that if you were to rule this out of order on the

PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

(MR. ASPER cont'd) basis of a general statement as opposed to a Speech from the Throne, then, Mr. Speaker, we would be in a position where that would become a precedent. And, Mr. Speaker, if we were to bring in a resolution from anybody on this side of the House, or any private member in this House, calling for a debate on a specific proposal, the government of the day could have it ruled out of order by saying, "Well, we've allowed for that highway or that bridge in the estimates. That's not the way you thought you were going to get it, that's not on the basis that you wanted to debate it, but the concept is in the estimates," Mr. Speaker, you would have a precedent, and you'll appreciate, Sir, that we are simply trying to contribute to your deliberation of the matter because it doesn't, it's not of the essence in this particular case because we do have some assurances. But the precedent would be a very unfortunate precedent because it would allow any government of the day, by making a casual reference in an estimate to a program, to prevent any kind of debate on it, and on that basis, Mr. Speaker, I would urge that you not accept that precedent.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. I would like to thank all the honourable members for their contributions. I am very well aware of not trying to set precedent but our rules are fairly clear in this regard and I did ask for assurance, and the Rule 31 indicates that no member shall revive a debate already concluded during the Session or anticipate a matter appointed for consideration or of which notice has been given. And I asked for the assurance and I, in my opinion, received some to that extent, so therefore that motion goes out. Resolution No. 11. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the matter stand and be put to the bottom of the list.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. Resolution No. 12. The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rhineland,

WHEREAS it is reported the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation (Autopac) is reported to have operated at a loss of some \$8 million in its first year of operation; and

WHEREAS it is assumed that start-up fund of some \$6 million has also been expanded at a loss;

WHEREAS Premier Schreyer and some of his Ministers have on several occasions promised savings of some 12 to 15 percent for the people of Manitoba in the insurance of their vehicles and driving privileges; and

WHEREAS in the year 1974 there are substantial increases in the rate structure of Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation (Autopac);

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government give consideration to the advisability of the Public Utilities Committee of the Manitoba Legislature examining and enquiring into all aspects of the proposed enormous increases in the rate structure of Autopac, and that such committee be empowered to report its observations and findings to the Legislature at the earliest possible date, with power to send for persons, papers, documents, and examine witnesses under oath.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think, Mr. Speaker, it is fairly obvious the intent of our resolution, and it's been pretty widely published that Autopac suffered a substantial loss last year and, as a result of that, has announced some fairly large increases in the Autopac rates for the motoring public this coming year. Now the purpose of the resolution, of course, is to bring before the Public Utilities Committee the Chairman of the Board of Autopac in order that he may be questioned by members of that committee and provide us hopefully with some answers indicating why the substantial increases are required and what further increases might be required to cover the loss, because it's obviously going to be a substantial one in order to recover \$8 million unless it's spread over a period of a goodly number of years.

I think it's obvious also to us that things have not been well with Autopac. I think we want to question some of the management decisions that have been made in connection with claims and various other aspects of it, and I think this is the main reason for us requesting that the Autopac personnel appear before our committee. I think it is only good business to review the rate increases and ensure that they are realistic because we've been affronted with a new category, a business rate this year, which is not something new but it was something that wasn't

PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

(MR. BLAKE cont'd) included with the Autopac rates at the outset. I think the rate structure is going back full circle to the original position that was held by the private companies in the field. There is no question about it that the surcharge on license fees is something that had to necessarily come in order that the driver that was accident-prone was going to be subject to some additional charge rather than having the charge for accidents spread throughout the driving public.

These reasons, Mr. Speaker, are the main ones for us requesting that this committee have the benefit of having the General Manager or the Chairman of the Board of Autopac appearing before it in order that we may get some good down to earth answers that will convey to the people of Manitoba the real reasons for the losses in Autopac and the justifiable reasons for the rate increases.

Now I think the rates will have to increase a substantial amount in the next few years if they're going to recover the substantial losses that have been incurred to date. I would venture to say that the experience so far this year has not been any better than it was last year, and with the accident rates continuing on the increase we will be faced with another staggering loss again this year, and I think during the examination of the Chairman of the Board at the committee hearings possibly we can get some idea of what rate increases the motoring public might be expecting in the next couple of years, because there is no doubt in our minds on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, that those rates are going to be substantial.

I don't see how any private company could have suffered two disastrous years such as Autopac has had without having a real serious housecleaning in order to come up with some realistic answers that they might present to their shareholders, which are the motoring public of Manitoba and the taxpayers, and for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, we have proposed this resolution that the Chairman of the Board appear before the Public Utilities Committee whereby the utility has power to request witnesses and send for papers and documents in order that we may substantiate the rate increases and try and delve into the future to some degree to see what losses we may expect to see in the next one or two years under Autopac.

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

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this resolution by the--(Applause, Interjection)--Yes, you shall. In speaking to this resolution from the motion of the Honourable Member for Minnedosa, I think there are several things that should be pointed out. He mentions in his whereases that there was a loss of some \$8 million in its first year of operation. He states; "WHEREAS it is reported that the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation is reported to have operated at a loss of some \$8 million in its first year of operation." Well, Mr. Speaker, the facts are, with regards to the reported loss of \$8 million in its first year of operation, and I'd like to quote some statistics. The Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation's First Annual Report for the fiscal year ended October 31, 1971, reported a surplus on its interim facility operations of \$1, 778.00. This surplus was generated on business accepted by the corporation prior to the introduction of the basic insurance plan when the private insurers either refused to insure or would only insure at exorbitant rates. So that fact of the first year operation is absolutely false. It is not based on fact because it started up--(Interjection)--The second case, the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation's Second Annual Report for the fiscal year ended October 31, 1972, reported an earned surplus of \$709, 800 on the basic and extension insurance programs, and a further surplus of \$29, 300 on the interim facility program implemented to November 1, 1971. So the total earned surplus was \$739, 100.00.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Minnedosa goes on to state that there was a further \$6 million loss with respect to start-up fund of some \$6 million expended as a loss. Well, Mr. Speaker, on October 31, 1971 the Annual Report states that, and I'll quote from the Annual Report; "Funds for the initial organizational expenses were provided in a form of advances totalling \$320, 000 from the Minister of Finance. These advances and the interest charges thereon were repaid in full on September 29, 1971. It is government policy that the corporation and the insurance plans administered by it shall be completely self-sustaining and that there shall be no diversion of any of the funds of the corporation to any other government agency or department."

Now, Mr. Speaker, that corporation is a Crown corporation operating as any other Crown corporation and is responsible for any losses incurred and for any surpluses which it has used to pay off some of the start-up costs back to the Minister of Finance. The corporation has

PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

(MR. SHAFRANSKY cont'd) financed, Mr. Speaker, its capital costs such as development and implementation expenses, property acquisitions, buildings and equipment, etc., completely from operations. The corporation has not indulged in any long-term financing for these purposes. The corporation will depreciate and amortize its capital expenditure over a period of years in keeping with generally accepted accounting procedures.

These expenditures will yield benefits to the Manitoba motorist and, Mr. Speaker, this has been realized in the Province of Manitoba when you compare the rates in other areas of Canada, in cities of comparable size, that that is a fact.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'll entertain a question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: I wonder if the member would permit a question? He mentioned in his remarks just a moment ago that these figures were under generally accepted accounting procedures. I wonder if he would consider those any different from the accounting procedures generally recognized by the insurance industry.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, these accounting procedures are under the provincial auditor and I believe that the provincial auditor is well qualified to be able to give the proper methods in accounting.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the competence of the opposition financial critics, if they debated this very basic principle of accounting, would be wanting.

Now with respect to promised savings to the motorists and drivers of Manitoba. Well, Mr. Speaker, what are the facts? In 1971 and '72, as promised, average savings were between 10 percent to 35 percent. In 1973 the rates were reduced an average of 5 percent. Now we are just into the 1974 fiscal year. Because of the experience in the last year the rates have been increased, and this has been acknowledged, but we can go back over the whole period for the four-year period 1971 to '74. Under Autopac, Manitoba rates have increased in total some 9 percent compared to an average increase of some 30 percent in other provinces. Some 30 percent annually in other provinces.--(Interjection)--Under private enterprise, naturally.

For the four-year period, 1968 to '71 prior to Autopac, and I think this is something that has to be brought to bear to the members opposite, that Manitoba rates increased some 43 percent compared to the four-year period since Autopac of 9 percent overall increase and--(Interjection)--Well, when you consider the five percent, but there's overall increase, you're taking in the 1973 of some 9 percent. Mr. Speaker, this resolution which states, you know, the "Resolved that the government give consideration to the advisability of Public Utilities Committee of Manitoba Legislature examining and inquiring into all aspects of proposed enormous increases in the"--I don't know where he gets the idea "enormous". If you compare the rates in Edmonton, compare the rates in Toronto or Ottawa - I've had occasion to inquire into how much people pay on a comparable package - Manitoba is first and the lowest right across Canada--(Interjection)--the lowest, including even the Province of Saskatchewan. Manitoba is first in all cases for the type of coverage that it provides with the minimum of problems involved in the processing of claims. In fact sometimes, Mr. Speaker, I'm willing to say that possibly might be too generous. I remember an occasion when I had, you know, that private insurance in 1969, my wife had an accident and there were witnesses to the fact that it was not her fault. A car drove--(Interjection)--No I was here. And the witness, Mr. Speaker, the witness was . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: . . . Dalton Dupecky (?) at that time, and he was driving from the east, and it was right on the corner of Trans-Canada and Autumnwood. Well I reported it to my agent. He never bothered to come out; I took it down to the insurance company. I had names of witnesses; I had \$100.00 deductible. The damage, the total damage was \$439.00. I didn't get that glorious type of service that the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney often talks about because they told me, well sue him. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think if there was justice in the fact that it was clearly demonstrated - and I have the statements from the witnesses that it was not her fault, that the fellow drove into her, and fortunately she had stopped when she did because otherwise it would have been right into the side and children were looking out the window to see what was going to happen; she stopped in time and he just hit the front of the car. But there was not the type of service that we still hear from the opposition members.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

(MR. SHAFRANSKY cont'd)

Now, Mr. Speaker, the other day a question was asked by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, and he was trying to compare the rates in Edmonton, and he says he has a fleet of cars. The one thing he did not point out to me was, he stated that the amount of insurance he paid was some \$190 which was some \$3 less than what the rates were in Manitoba, but he didn't indicate whether that included the costs of the license plates, which in Manitoba that is a total package that you can pay when you're buying your insurance, if you take the basic plus the options. So I'm still not clear. Some time possibly I hope he will clarify this matter.--(Interjection)--You will. I'm waiting.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Minnedosa goes on in his, "Resolved that the"--talking about enquiring into all aspects of proposed enormous increases in the rate structure of Autopac, and that such committee be empowered to report its observations and findings to the Legislature at the earliest possible date, with powers to send for persons, papers, documents, and examine witnesses under oath. Mr. Speaker, it's a Crown corporation and there is a Minister responsible for it, and questions have been directed on a daily basis. I don't know personally, personally - I'm not speaking for the Minister - I really see no problem in having the Autopac, the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation, appear before, you know, the Chairman of the Manitoba Public Auto Insurance Corporation appear before the Public Utilities Committee. Personally I feel there is no objection. I don't know what the Minister - whether I'm going to commit him but I would certainly advocate that. I'd like to have him appear and report on the same basis as we have the Chairman of Manitoba Hydro, the Chairman of Manitoba Telephone System, the Chairman of the Moose Lake Loggers, the Chairman of the Mineral Resources Limited. I believe that this would be in order, and I would certainly advocate the Minister to consider that fact and have that general manager appear before the Public Utilities Committee, or some such other committee. Mr. Speaker, this procedure I feel possibly should be in order, and I would certainly support that argument, but I don't know if I would agree with this part of it to send - with powers to send for papers, persons, papers, documents, and examine witnesses under oath. When any other corporation of--the Crown corporation appears there is a chief spokesman and I would support the argument that we should have the Autopac, the General Manager of Autopac, appear before the legislative committee preferably, possibly the Public Utilities Committee.

Mr. Speaker, in opposing and yet supporting some aspects, I'd like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Crescentwood, that the resolution of the Honourable Member for Minnedosa be amended by striking out all the words appearing after "Legislature" in the third line of the fifth paragraph and substituting the following: "Receiving and considering the Annual Report of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation in the presence of the Chairman and the General Manager of the Corporation."

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution 13--I'm sorry. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I think what you have dealt with now is the amendment. Now we have to deal with the motion as amended.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. I stand to be corrected. You are very correct.

MOTION as amended presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution 13. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, may I have this matter stand please? (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution 14. The Honourable Member for Riel. Absent. Very well. Resolution 15, the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Stand please? (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution 16. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY McKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Morris is--(Interjection)--I'll speak on it.

A MEMBER: Sock it to 'em Wally.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River,

WHEREAS the cost of building and maintaining buildings in the Province of Manitoba increased at an excessive rate during the past year; and

WHEREAS the costs of building and maintaining private dwellings in Manitoba have

PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) increased at an excessive rate during the past few years; and

WHEREAS the costs of building and maintaining buildings to house our industrial . . . in Manitoba have greatly increased as well;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Manitoba Legislature give consideration to the advisability of asking the Government of Canada to rescind the 12 percent sales tax on building materials.

A MEMBER: Atta boy, Wally.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Well, Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple and forthright resolution, I think, that concerns nearly every person that lives in this province today who is trying to maintain his buildings, his property, or he's trying to construct a new dwelling, or make improvements to his business, because he's faced with this 12 percent sales tax on building materials. And you add, Mr. Speaker, the 12 percent with the sales tax on top of it, which adds up to some 18 percent on some items of building materials, that an ordinary citizen today has to pay if he's going to try and make his conditions a little better, his property a little better, or maintain his buildings, or build a new dwelling.

And of course, Mr. Speaker, we have listened to the housing programs that have been offered by the government and the members opposite and we find in most cases these housing programs are falling away behind. We find the enormous costs that people are being asked today to pay for a two-bedroom home or a three-bedroom home where the prices have escalated some 9, 12, 15 percent in a matter of a few months. And I think it's quite simple, Mr. Speaker, that this House certainly should recognize the seriousness of the matter in this province. And I think this resolution makes a lot of common sense, that it is time to take some of the tax load off the backs of our people. A very simple tax on--everybody has to house themselves, everybody has to take care of their property, and I can't see with the way that governments are spending money today that they're making full use of the tax dollars that they are taking. We have \$800 million that this government proposes to spend and I'm sure they're going to waste many thousands of those dollars before it's all spent. And why not take a look at this resolution, Mr. Speaker, and resolve that this Legislature stand up on its two feet and consider the advisability of asking the Government of Canada to rescind the 12 percent sales tax on building materials.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, I think it goes without saying that the resolution has merit, that any step taken by government to reduce the cost of housing would be welcome. We've seen figures that indicate that in Canada the cost of housing rose 22 percent last year; we've seen figures that indicate that in Manitoba the cost of new housing is going to rise somewhere between 15 and 25 percent this year. Mr. Speaker, this is an unacceptable escalation in what is a necessity, what is something that we all on all sides of this House deem to be, or at least pay lip service to, because that this is something that should be obtainable, individual homeownership should be obtainable economically by all groups within society.

Now, Mr. Speaker, anything that acts as a barrier to that objective is undesirable and certainly where government can act is in many areas but in one particular area, removing those elements that add to the cost of a home on a pyramiding base. Now at least the federal sales tax to which this resolution makes reference, at least it's at a lower base than the provincial sales tax which has, I think, in my estimation a more dramatic cost impact because the provincial sales tax is levied on the, in effect retail value of the building materials, whereas the federal 12 percent sales tax is levied on the manufacturing cost. Nevertheless both equally have an undesirable impact on the cost of the home.

Mr. Speaker, we have before this House in the Speech from the Throne a suggestion that the Government of Manitoba will finally recognize that individual homeownership is something that is slipping away as an objective, or something that's reachable by most Manitobans, particularly the 60 percent who earn \$6,000 a year and under, and we have to direct our attention to those people because they should have the prospect of homeownership just as well as those in the upper and middle income groups.

So we had introduced, or referred to in the Speech from the Throne, a very nominal, commendable, but only nominal, program of aiding home ownership through a home ownership

PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

(MR. ASPER cont'd) grant of up to \$300.00 with some modest monthly subsidies for low income people. And that is commendable, and the government will receive our full support as we have indicated on that, but the government can do more, much more. One of the things it can do is, as this resolution suggests, make an appeal to the Federal Government to abandon the 12 percent federal sales tax but it can do much more, Mr. Speaker. It can show its good faith; it can have an impact on the Federal Government by doing likewise itself. It's a hollow thing to ask the Government of Manitoba to go to the Federal Government and say, drop your 12 percent sales tax but allow us to levy ours. There's an old expression, Mr. Speaker, and I'm sure the Minister of Finance recalls it from the earliest days of his education, and the expression is: "He who comes into court asking for equity must come in with clean hands." --(Interjection)--Well, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Finance only has a recollection of Grade 2 it shows, it shows, Mr. Speaker, it shows, Mr. Speaker, so much more clearly in some of the programs he puts before this House.

Mr. Speaker, if the House is serious about this resolution, and I hope it is, then we would suggest that the resolution cannot have any validity unless it is all encompassing and applies to the Provincial Government as well as the Federal Government. And so, Mr. Speaker, I would move to amend the resolution as follows, and I apologize for not being able to give copies to the other leaders who aren't in the House because I only realized it was coming up at this time. The amendment is being written out.

That the resolution be amended by adding thereto at the conclusion thereof the following: "And giving consideration to the advisability of removing the Manitoba Sales Tax on the retail value of the building materials that go into the make-up of the home. "

I apologize for the delay in it, Sir.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. JORGENSON: Before the Minister proceeds, without objecting to the content of the amendment I wonder, Sir, if you would take into consideration the advisability of accepting the amendment. My understanding of amendments to resolutions is that they must deal with the subject matter contained within that particular resolution. What the amendment is doing is introducing an entirely new subject, and therefore I wonder, Sir, if the resolution as worded is properly in order. It seems to me that a new subject cannot be introduced into any resolution or any bill but must be related to the contents of the resolution that is presented in the first instance.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, if a narrow interpretation were given to the point of order made by the Progressive Conservative House Leader we would have to rule out of order almost all the amendments that government benchers, backbenchers have brought in over the past two or three years to private members' resolutions put forward on this House. For example, Mr. Speaker - and the Minister of Finance asks for an example - I can recall resolutions being put forward by this House being amended by the government backbenchers suggesting words such as "and that all operative words of the resolution be removed and the following be replaced therefore, e. g., that the government of the day be commended for the wonderful steps it's taken in such and such a direction", and those, Mr. Speaker, have been approved by you over our protests. Now, Mr. Speaker, going even to the broadest interpretation of what the Conservative House Leader says, we have a resolution dealing with the cost of housing and the taxation of those houses and a resolution which says, one of the things we can do is remove the Federal Sales Tax from those houses. Now, Mr. Speaker, the essence isn't the removal of sales tax, the essence is the cost of housing, and so that even if my honourable friend's point of order is valid then the amendment certainly comes within the broad scope of that, the cost of housing.

MR. SPEAKER: I do believe that in my opinion the amendment does comply within the rules of our regulations that we have. It is still on the subject of, as the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party pointed out, cost of housing, and taxation falls within that.

The Honourable Minister of Finance.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party says that this resolution deals with the cost of housing. Indeed it also deals with the cost of the construction of plants, of industrial plants; it deals with the cost of construction of--Therefore be it resolved--I now read the resolution because obviously the Leader of the Liberal Party who spoke on the resolution hadn't read it because he is assuming that this resolution deals with the cost of housing, and indeed it deals with much more than that. I suppose if one took the total cost of building material in the province that housing is probably a lesser part of the total rather than a greater part. So that we are now dealing with the proposal that we remove the - that we ask the Federal Government to remove the sales tax on all building materials which therefore, I am correct in saying, covers all industrial construction, all commercial construction, throughout the province. And therefore, what the Member of the Liberal Party, the Leader, now brings in the provincial sales tax, he's talking about that as well, which is typical of him. Because when I said he didn't understand what he was reading I really didn't mean that, I think he does understand especially on tax matters, and I think that he seeks throughout his legislative career to reduce taxation. I draw back from that because when it came to dealing with the mineral royalties tax bill that we had two years ago, he was the one who was the greatest proponent for extending that taxation to bring in individuals, to broaden the scope well beyond what was originally planned, so I withdraw, and almost in the same breath in which I said it, I withdraw the statement that he looks everywhere for reduction in taxation.

The fact however is that when he says as he did, it is a hollow thing to ask that the Federal Government withdraw sales tax unless we are prepared to do it - and I must look to him and say it's a rather hollow thing for members of the Liberal Party to support the resolution that was brought in by the Conservative Party to remove a 12 percent tax of the Federal Government, of their party, of the Liberal Party of Canada, that has that tax and then he remonstrates with us it would be a hollow thing. It sounds so awfully hollow to me to hear Liberal Party people saying, we must appeal to the New Democratic government of Manitoba to go and approach the Federal party, Mr. John Turner and the rest of his people, to plead with them to please remove a sales tax which is being opposed by the party, which is the Liberal Party of Canada, and I assume to which members of the Manitoba caucus of the Liberal Party belong. If they do not support the Liberal Party of Canada then I wish they would say so because I am under the impression that they are indeed members of the Liberal Party of Canada and supporters of it, and would have, I would think, a much more direct voice in being able to address themselves to the Liberal Party of Canada in order that they can plead with them to right what they must feel is a grievous wrong. --(Interjection)--Yes, well as I recall it the Liberal leadership in Manitoba is the one which wanted so much to be a part in the role of the federal scene.

So it is rather a hollow thing. Quite a hollow thing to hear the Liberal Leader point out the hardships created by federal taxation. If it weren't so hollow it might also be amusing. It's not the first time the Leader of the Liberal Party does that and yet he is the Leader of the Liberal Party here in this province and therefore when he wishes to speak again no doubt he'll get somebody to make another amendment to the resolution to give him the right to speak. Until he does of course he's unfortunately unable to participate further in this resolution before us.

Mr. Speaker, it would be a hollow thing if all that this government did was go to Ottawa and talk about what it should be doing. It would indeed be a hollow thing. I do not accept the Liberal Party representatives here in this Legislature telling us what we should be saying to the Liberal Party in Ottawa because I think they know the correct address and how one applies there. But I would agree that it would be a hollow thing for us to tell the Liberals in Ottawa what to do unless we were prepared to do something likewise, and indeed we have consistently in our tax policies apprised the Federal Liberals of what we were doing, what we wanted to do, and to the extent we were able to do it, independently of them, we did it. But it is the Liberal forces of the tax gatherers in Ottawa who to a large extent determine the tax base under which we in a province must operate. Nevertheless we have been able to make use of certain federal programs which have been helpful.

It may be that members opposite don't think much of the Central Mortgage and Housing, the National Housing attempts to make it possible to construct housing for people who are unable to manage on their own but it was not until our government came into power here that Manitoba started to see something being done about housing for people who are not able to provide for themselves. It was this government that found such a terrible, shameful program in the housing

PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) field as we inherited when we came into government in July of 1969, and we pledged ourselves to do something indeed. --(Interjection)--Yes, behind me they're saying what program, and it was so laughable that one could indeed say, what program did they have opposite to help people in that way? We therefore did substantial and we have done, and are continuing to do, a great deal. And it may well be that the Leader of the Liberal Party should ask his newest member of caucus just what did the City of Winnipeg do to assist this government in its efforts to do something within the confines of the border rather of Winnipeg? He may find out something that would be of interest and maybe new to him.

But there are other things that we found we were able to do at the provincial level and that was to carry out a very extensive program of reduction of taxation in the housing field by reducing and confining the expansion of property tax credits. Substantial moneys are being rebated to people of this province in the very area that hits them now in property taxation, substantial sums of money. We were able in our first introduction of the program to deal with \$140.00, with a minimum of \$50.00, and then last year we were able to extend it to \$200.00 maximum, with a minimum of a hundred - that is real help. That isn't 5 percent of the cost of the material in the capital construction of a home, that is not that at all, that is real, repeating annual costs burdens placed on people. That has a much greater impact on the people of this province when it comes to assisting them.

And the proposal in this resolution is very very small compared to what this government has been able to do, and as mentioned by the Leader of the Liberal Party we are this year carrying forward with our program for grants to new home owners. That is a program that we are sharing with the Federal Government in that we are complementing what they propose to do. And we will continue to do so, and we will continue to do so by bringing in tax cuts to the extent that we've done all along up to now but doing them on a selective basis.

And really, Mr. Speaker, that's the big difference between the two sides of the House. That side facing us keeps saying, cut taxes, reduce them; well they usually say, do it proportionately; instead of 5 percent, make it 4 percent, just proportional we want to benefit from it. And on this side we keep saying we want to reduce taxes and do so, we don't just say so we do so, and we do it on a selective basis. We have yet to increase taxation in such a way as to deal with regressive taxation unless - and now I can be called upon to account for increased taxation in tobacco - I may report with pride that it is almost three months now since I've not been a participant in paying the tobacco tax of this province - and the Leader of the Liberal Party points out that that's tax avoidance, and let me tell him that I learned from him also different methods of tax avoidance. This is one in which I would invite all people of Manitoba to participate in avoiding the taxation on tobacco.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hour of adjournment having arrived the honourable member will have an opportunity to carry on the next time. The House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 Thursday afternoon.