

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
8:00 o'clock, Thursday, April 4, 1974

BILL 34

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour has 12 minutes.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, just before we adjourned for the supper hour I had made a few remarks of the attitude of Opposition to Bill 34, which of course deals with Interim Supply. And at the offset of my remarks I took the occasion to compliment the Honourable the Member for Lakeside for his contribution to the debate; but then quite naturally I had to indicate to him and to the Opposition where notwithstanding the contribution of the honourable member, that in my opinion for the first time in the history of Manitoba we have at the present time an Opposition far more irresponsible than we've ever had in approximately 104 years since we joined Confederation.

I attempted to point out that in my opinion there are certain responsibilities of government, there are certain responsibilities of the opposition, that one of the responsibilities of government is to make sure that in the interests of the province that the government is able to conduct the business of the community in the best interests of those who supported the government by way of an election. I pointed out that in 1969 the voters of the Province of Manitoba decided that they had had enough of Conservatives, that they would not turn back the clock to give support to the Liberals and chose the third and best alternative, the New Democratic Government of Manitoba, which they did. And after a considerable number of years in opposition, and during those period of years, Mr. Speaker, we of the CCF and of the New Democratic Party had attempted to give alternate proposals first of all, to the Liberal government under the former Premier, D. L. Campbell, and followed by Dufferin Roblin, and then by Walter Weir. And I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it was because of the fact that we, the third party of that day, gave responsible constructive criticism to the programs of government that in 1969 we were elected the government of the day. And then it was decided in 1973 by my Premier that the Assembly would be dissolved and we would give the people of Manitoba an opportunity of seeing whether or not we had the support of the voters of Manitoba.

Now, I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that all of us have been engaged in politics long enough, either by individual participation or by reading history books, to know that no government ever is absolutely sure what will be the outcome of an election. The outcome of the election in 1973, I need not tell anyone, was that the voter in the Province of Manitoba gave a new mandate and a continuing mandate to this government.

And, Mr. Speaker, what is the situation now? The situation is now because of fiscal years, financial years, that it is a requirement to receive from this Assembly, as indeed it is from the Parliament of Canada or any other legislative jurisdiction, the authority to pay the bills and to pay the wages of the Civil Service within the jurisdiction. And that is what the debate is all about.

Mr. Speaker, when I was speaking before the supper hour, I pointed out that the Opposition have had at least two opportunities to debate the propositions of this government, in the Throne Speech, in the Budget Speech - and, Mr. Speaker, there is another one that I didn't mention before the supper hour - I do now - is Bill No. 7, dealing with the Civil Service of Manitoba; and the opposition used that bill, Mr. Speaker, not to discuss the merits of the bill itself but to use that as another media of criticism of the policies of this government in total. And, Mr. Speaker, No. 4 is the one that we have before us at the present time, Bill 34. The Honourable Member for Lakeside said when he was speaking that he intended - or somebody on that side intended to bring about a six-months' hoist on Bill 34. For what reason, Mr. Speaker? So that they would have another opportunity to go over the whole caboodle of ineffective arguments that they've put up so far. And also, Mr. Speaker, he suggested to us . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . that we had a methodology of ending debate, namely closure, and it may be, Mr. Speaker, that that would be desirable in the best interests of the people of Manitoba. But here is this man, the Honourable Member for Lakeside, standing up with tears in his eyes, claiming that they haven't had an opportunity - and indeed the Member for Roblin has just said that - haven't had an opportunity of debate. I have pointed out at least four methodologies which have been used, and now the Honourable Member for Lakeside this

BILL 34

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) afternoon, he suggested a fifth, a six-months' hoist to Bill 34, which would mean if we hadn't of taken legislative authority by way of Special Warrant, to provide the money for the civil servants and the creditors of the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I say that that is one of the most irresponsible approaches that has ever been made in the history of this province, and is so typical of the muckraking that we have been receiving from the opposite side of this House ever since we started in the session the last day in January. Even on that particular day, Mr. Speaker, you will recall that one honourable member took the occasion of that state function, or normal state function, to spout to the collective gathering that was here. That was an indication, Mr. Speaker, to me at least, of the attitude and the approach of an irresponsible opposition, and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Opposition should fold their tents like the Arabs and silently shut up. In order, in order, Mr. Speaker, in order, Mr. Speaker, that the government - in order, in order that this government - in order, Mr. Speaker, that this government who has a mandate from the people, the taxpayers and the voters of the Province of Manitoba to conduct the affairs of this province. They have the opportunity Mr. Speaker, of defeating us by a vote in this House. I challenge them to do it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I thank you for having this opportunity to say a few words, particularly following the Minister of Labour. That, since this afternoon at about 5 o'clock has been an absolute disgrace for the people sitting in the gallery, for the Members of the Opposition to have this going on for the last forty minutes, just disgraceful. To think the First Minister of this province that the people put so much faith in, goes to constituencies throughout the province during the last election in 1973 while campaigning and saying "This member doesn't do this. This member has been silent in the Legislature in this area." "If you elect a New Democrat in this constituency you're going to get more action there, you're not going to put up with a silent member."

Now I ask the First Minister at this time, Mr. Speaker, is this what he wants the members of the Opposition to do, is this what he wants the five new members that he got in his caucus to do? Get up and make speeches like that? That's ridiculous, it's a damn disgrace, it's disgraceful, and I say to you, Mr. Speaker, I say to you, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the First Minister is listening when I say these words. It's a damn disgrace to have a man that has spent 20 years in this Legislature to get up and rave the way he does, absolute rave. And when he got up and made the speech, just previous to the First Minister being in my constituency, and saying that that constituency was not properly represented in here, this man was standing in his place - the Labour Minister was standing in his place while the First Minister was speaking in Tuxedo at the Tuxedo Hotel, this man was standing in his place and here's what he was raving off about. "And I, as the Deputy Premier of this Province ta da da" and raving and grabbing the mike, and here's what he's doing. And I'll move over one, Mr. Speaker, I'll move over to the guy that's scratching his head right now - the Attorney-General of this province. And I want to know if the Attorney-General will back off and say that I'm lying when I say that him the other night that he threatened to bring a breathalyzer into this Chamber - did he or didn't he? Mr. Speaker, the man will not admit he said that and I say to him, anything that's being used, anything that's being used in this Chamber, breathalyzer, or whatever, should be tested first. And he's going to test it, he won't have to move far away from his own desk to test it. He can test it right here. And it's a damn disgrace when this Chamber stoops to the level that was stooped to by the Attorney-General, who is always highly honoured in any provincial government or any other government. And you remember, you don't have to look at me with that face. Mr. Speaker, it was a disgrace.

The show that was put on this afternoon and tonight by the Minister of Labour I say is disgraceful. He looks across at this Chamber and he says that we on this side are crying, the tears are rolling off our face. Mr. Speaker, further to that - but before I get to the slimy part he mentioned - about the tears rolling off our face. The five years I've been in this Chamber, coming up to five, I saw three people crying here. One of them was the Minister of Labour, he stood up and he cried, with his hanky mopping his face and said, "Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry I have to cry tonight but the sixteen years I've spent in this Chamber I've never seen the decorum in this House lowered to such a level as it has tonight." And he cried, and he cried.

BILL 34

(MR. MOUG cont'd)

And then I move over two chairs, I have to miss the First Minister because I say he's man enough that he doesn't stand and cry in front of a bunch of grown people. But the Minister of Finance, the man who is asking us presently today for \$833 million to spend, and him guide the spending of and distribute to the departments, he stood up. It's something about two Jewish people one looking at the other and giving a Nazi salute or something. And he bawled and bawled and bawled in here. That was two. Now we're crying on this side and I can't see it. I've never seen anybody in our caucus or in the Liberal caucus stand up in this Chamber in the five years I've been here and in the six sessions and cry.

Then I went over to a chair, I think it's occupied now by the Minister of Tourism and Recreation and at that time there was a Minister of Tourism and Recreation there or hoped to be. You know he was paying pretty heavily for what he wanted. He wanted to be a Minister, he wanted to be after 11 years or whatever that he had been a member of this House he wanted to be on the government side. And he got placed there, shortage of chairs or something I guess, there was some empty ones on this side but he got placed there. And he took that seat, Mr. Speaker, and it wasn't too long before he decided that he would back that government, keep them in power. He wanted to vote for Autopac. And he voted for them. And then all of a sudden one night when we came in here at 8 o'clock after him being here and boistering and banging his fists as the Minister of Labour did a few minutes ago, and as I feel liked doing now, he was standing there but his arms were crossed, his head was down and he was bawling. So that's three on that side of the House that I've seen bawl, and all three of them have been Ministers of the Crown and all three of them--(Interjection)--Yes you did and don't deny it. I'll further prove it in a minute. But at any rate the then Member of St. Boniface who turned out to be the Minister of Tourism and Recreation was up bawling because of the threat. There was a threat. He was elected as a Liberal, he voted socialist and he says he was being threatened. Now who was he being threatened by? The people of his constituency for letting them down and turning from a Liberal to a Socialist? Was he threatened by the people of the province because he was threatening to do away with a free enterprise group of insurance people, or was he threatened by the caucus because he was going to steal a chair in the treasury bench? Or was he threatened by the treasury bench, Mr. Speaker? That's what I wonder.

A MEMBER: Why don't you ask him.

MR. MOUG: I don't know he's not here now. But I would say, I would say, Mr. Speaker - and I'll deal with that in a few minutes if my memory stays with me. I'll deal with that in a few minutes, because there's something further to go on that when you say why don't you ask him. The First Minister says that after spending many millions of dollars over here to get that. And he got that, he got that vote, he got the Autopac there at the people's expense. And let's say that's true. We know it's true. We got proof of that, further proof of that.--(Interjection)--No I don't have to. But he stood up and said that he was being threatened and I would sure like to know what he's being threatened of that night. It had four ways to come from that he could have been threatened that night and he bawled.

So when the Minister of Labour gets up after the Minister of Finance has told us something like last Thursday night, Thursday afternoon, when it comes to private members' hour - it's in the issue of '69 of Hansard wherever - he doesn't want to go into private members' he want to stay on with the government's business. Oh the cheque-writers will stop on Sunday night. No longer can we pay the civil servants of our province. No longer can we keep our credibility good in the province, can't pay our bills because the Opposition over there's blocking. Who's blocking? The Minister of Labour's blocking, that's who's blocking, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour. The thing is, if there's any way that you can vote on this bill today and pass it and get it through here the time to vote on it is then. You're not going to further the the vote.--(Interjection)--You shut up, never mind me sit down. I sit here listening to you Liberace when I don't like it. It sickens me when I listen to you. Just terrible. Now you sit and listen to me and don't interfere.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. MOUG: If there's any way that you want to get a passage of a bill through here don't get the government's side of the House to get up and block the way he did tonight. And you're talking about blocking. There's the man who stood up for 40 minutes and blocked the passing of that bill. And the time that I stand in this Legislature--I'm glad to sit back here

BILL 34

(MR. MOUG cont'd). . . and listen to the people in the front benches that we have, that are more learned in passing of laws. I'm going to sit around here and get my education. That man's supposed to have had some. It sure as hell doesn't show so far. He shows no indication of education from his 20 years that he's spent in here. He gets up today, we can depend on getting that once a week, once a week we can get it, he gets up and he waves his arms and waves his arms and waves his arms, and it proves nothing in this Legislature. There's only one thing missing in this House, Mr. Speaker, to further prove my point. As I watched the other night it brought it to my mind, as I watched the show going on in the Academy Award presentation. I saw several actors on there and one of them reminded me of the Minister of Finance. I had forgot about it because I couldn't think who it could possibly be. Who could be in the Academy Awards that would remind you of the Minister of Finance?--(Interjection)--Well Liberace wasn't there. Then I got thinking after, actually it was somebody in the stands.

A MEMBER: The stalker.

MR. MOUG: No it wasn't the stalker. There was still somebody else in there that reminded me of him and I couldn't think of who it was. Then I was talking to a neighbour of mine and they said well who you're thinking about is not anybody in the Academy Awards, it was somebody in the House of Commons and it's years ago. The Finance Minister reminds you of Judy La Marsh but he hasn't got enough hair to really fill the bill. And I honestly thought that the man came up with an answer to what exists.

As far as the Minister of Labour and his mention of muckraking, he sits alongside of two more that does exactly the same thing. Slime, muckraking, the lowest you could possibly try and rate this opposition as, possibly, that's exactly what you have to say. Then the Premier sits beside him, Mr. Speaker, and he says exactly the same thing. Time and again he says the same thing. It's muckraking. It's pulling the slime out. The Minister of Finance - muckraking, bring out the slime.--(Interjection)--Yes, Yes, the First Minister absolutely, and the Minister of Finance says it. The Minister of Labour says it. There's no way that we can stand up here and say anything. The Minister of Finance, every bill he's brought through this House as Finance Minister since I've been here, if five speakers get up he says, well so and so spoke, well he did a bit, he made an effort, he didn't say much, but those other four guys they were terrible. There's no way you can get up and say that about the bill I bring in here. Yet we've had it proven to him several bills are wrong. The Mineral Tax Act is dead wrong. He knows it. The City of Winnipeg Act - if that's not wrong I want to know what is. If there's any way that this government can bail the City of Winnipeg out now after the mistakes they made - and they're only starting to get into them. The City of Winnipeg's not making the mistakes it's the province here that made it. The high taxes that are coming to us this spring is absolutely ridiculous. How do you get out of them? Collect it off the people. Rural Manitoba's got to pay 45 percent of it. It's got to come back in here. Regardless of what you say you're going to do for northern Manitoba, rural Manitoba, say what you like, what's the City of Winnipeg going to do with the tax they're faced with now. Lay it onto the people. That's exactly where it's got to go. The government doesn't appreciate the fact that the City of Winnipeg wants to do some of the operation on their own. The now Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs he came barrelling in here one day and he was going to have an emergency debate on telling the people, don't let private contractors repair any streets or repair any water mains or do any work. Simply leave that with the union people, the City of Winnipeg. The Premier realizes he can't do that. You got to let the City of Winnipeg operate on its own. And when you have 37 truly independent members of council in the City of Winnipeg, and I mean truly independent, politically unbiased along with a few other independent types, and a few donkeys that are guided and have to be guided by this government. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. MOUG: . . . there's got to be trouble. So I say, Mr. Speaker, that there is a few of the causes where if you don't get the government to settle down and get down to business with the City of Winnipeg, talk to them, all those people want to do is sit down to a table and talk. And you as the Minister of Urban Affairs say "they have been." Well if you listen to TV tonight, if you read the newspaper these people don't think so. Maybe they're wrong, maybe their dollar bill ideas are too high.--(Interjection)--Well apparently when you're at the meeting you're not talking to them because they come back out of there and they don't think that they've been answered. These people simply want, they simply want a bit of clarification from

BILL 34

(MR. MOUG cont'd). . . the government which way are we going. The government will sit and talk to them and say they want this put in as a capital project and expenditure and then all of a sudden when it comes along they don't know where they are. I asked a question in the House in the absence of the First Minister, I asked the Minister of Finance as Deputy Premier, if he knew why all these particular jobs are being held up, why there was no okay on them through the Municipal Board, and there was no answer, he didn't know anything about it, he'd like to know. He told me he'd like to know.

Mr. Speaker, I say that the Minister of Urban Affairs of today is somewhat of an improvement because now we've only got education being monkeyed up. You are somewhat of an improvement from what we had before. Now only education is waffling and monkeying about. But I say that those two levels that are probably the most two important things that this government has to do, and apparently both of them are still being waffled about without answers to either the responsible local officials, be it the school boards or the municipal councils.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to speak now, as I have got over what I wanted to say to the government and their misgivings, I wanted to mention to the government that I think they're making a bad mistake in wanting to go from time to time into Crown corporations. I think that the lesson has probably been learned by the members of the treasury bench that operations that are government controlled are just a little sloppy. I don't think any of us would deny that be it a CNR Railroad or Air Canada, or whatever, in there the operation is just a little sloppy. The trial I think that is proof for us now is Autopac with their \$10 million deficit. I think with the same premium - I feel sure and confident when I say that with the same premium as the government's charging today, and with the private enterprise overseeing it and administering the business, that there would not be a \$10 million deficit, there would be a \$10 million profit. And with that \$10 million profit the government would get six or seven million out of it, or five or six million dollars out of it in tax, and rather than be 10 million in the hole we could be five or six million dollars up.

The Minister responsible for Autopac said the other night that his expenses, and his controlled expenses of Autopac in overseeing was "X" amount of dollars, "X" percentage, but in private industry it was 35 percent. They were padding the desks in the offices and--with friends and so on, you know, creating jobs to keep that up to 35 percent. Well I don't think that's right because the sloppy operation of any government and the pork barreling that goes on, and that government, no different than any other government, can't deny that pork barreling goes on. I would say to the Member for Riel sitting in front of me, where is the NDP candidate that ran against him? There was three ran in there. There was an NDP, a Conservative, and a Liberal. The Liberal was defeated; the Conservative won; the Conservative is here contributing and doing a job in this Chamber that he was elected by the people and he gets \$7,200.00. Now there's a man by the name of Parasiuk: he was defeated as an NDP candidate and he gets \$14,000 - \$15,000 a year--(Interjection)--\$26,000.00. Pardon me, I was looking at two sets of figures there. But all that you do there is change the statutes of Manitoba as far as the elections are concerned and you elect all three. Because you take three at 7,200 and run yourself into less than \$22,000; rather than pay the guy that's elected \$7,200, and the dead loser pay him 26,000. You can have all three working for the government for \$22,000.00. You need three winners instead of one. I don't know. I was discussing it with--(Interjection)--well it's not the way the Conservatives ran it you know, this is the way the Englishmen run it. This is the way the Englishmen run it. There's a guy in the back hollering "question" all the time, question. This is the way the Conservatives would do it, the Conservatives. Well I'll tell you. Back in England I've seen the Conservatives pull the Labour Government out of the hole more times than they even got into it. And they're heading back in again; they're heading back in the hole right now. But you wait and see that the Conservative Government is going to have to bring them back out of that again. And I say that if that government on the other side of the House, and God Bless Them, they're in trouble for the next three or four years, but if they change direction and start following the thinking of the Member for St. Vital, then there's really going to be a --(Interjection)--No, I wouldn't--there's really going to be a pile of trouble, there really and truly would be a pile of trouble. The one way they can get out of trouble on that backbench is if they bring that - I don't know, he's not a Deputy Minister of Labour; he's a kind of a waiting to get in Minister of Labour you might say, you know an anxious to go Minister of Labour - and if we can get rid of the guy from Transcona and field him out in one of these

BILL 34

(MR. MOUG cont'd). . . \$26,000 jobs - give him an extra ten because he's a Minister - and get that guy from Crescentwood down into the front here. If he can keep holding that seat because he's . . . pretty slim pickings right now. I don't know how long he's going to last, but he doesn't have to last that much longer: one session is actually good enough for him because he's made so many speeches and crammed so much into each one of them, that if he never gets back in this Legislature he'll still be ahead of the game.--(Interjection)--Well there's Liberace humming across there again.

Mr. Speaker, I say that the biggest problem we have going now with the government is they're wanting to get into Crown Corporations, and they know they can't handle them, they've had it proven to them with the Autopac, and they stay away from them.--(Interjection)--Certainly that would be a real easement of taxation to the people in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, another thing that concerns me in the province today is not what the government's done for us but the mistakes that they've made, and I hope that the First Minister of the province is a big enough man to stand up and correct the errors that he's made. I'm sure he realizes after last election how bad a mistake he made on the lowering of the age majority, bringing the voters and the responsibility of a man down, and a woman, from 21 to the age of 17. I want to be serious--(Interjection)--to 18, pardon me. We have a real problem now, Mr. Speaker, with--(Interjection)--I did not. We have a real problem now with the young people, regardless of who voted for it--well regardless it doesn't matter. I didn't say, I didn't - what I'm trying to say, the reason I'm bringing this up, I'm saying to the First Minister is, there's a problem with it. I would hope that he would realize the problem's there and it can be corrected before it worsens itself. The idea is now we know we've got a problem - speak to the Inner City Police Force here, speak to the other groups, speak to the several school boards, go out in the country to The Pas, go to Flin Flon, go to Churchill, go to Thompson, go anywhere in the Province of Manitoba and ask them what they say as far as the age of majority is concerned and the control of the law. What they're trying to tell you, and this comes from one small district, just their Inner City Police Force here who controls only some 340,000 people, 350,000 people in the City of Winnipeg, and they brought in 77 juveniles in one week and they were handled by the City of Winnipeg Police Force. Now if you take these 77 people and just say, well ignore it; after it's here long enough and they get accustomed to becoming drinkers and the responsibility that goes with it, it will no longer exist, but this is not the case, Mr. Speaker. There's no buffer zone; there's no insulation between a 17 year old and a 21 year old. The 18, 19s and 20s used to be the minors that could stand up and take the responsibility, and if we caught the 20s and the 19s drinking that was one thing, but now when we see it spreading into the 17s and 16s and 15s I think it's time that the First Minister of this province realized that the legislation he brought before here - whether I voted for it or not I couldn't care less. If I voted for it I know I spoke against it, and if I voted for it I still want the First Minister to show me on paper I voted for it, because I say that I didn't. I say that I didn't maybe I did but I say, and I'll stand corrected, I voted against it.

But the First Minister's got to realize the problem that exists today with our people of 18, 19 and 20 is one thing, but what exists with the 17s and 16s is a terrible thing because they're getting out into groups and parties, and how do you segregate? The 20 year olds have friends that are 21 that buy booze, 22 years old that buy booze, and they have friends that are 17 and 16, and then you've got 15 year olds in there, and I say we can't let this go on. This report that comes out weekly from the Inner City Police Force, it tells you right here. There was one or two things that I thought was important enough to read in the records, Sir, was a total of 77 juveniles, 58 boys and 19 girls; 40 were detained, 25 boys, 15 girls. Here's a breakdown: it says 4 break, enter and theft; 14 for theft of under \$200.00; 10 theft of an auto; 7 liquor offences. Then the number of girls and offences were involved, five for break, enter and theft; 5 for theft under \$200.00; one on liquor offences; two neglected; two sniffing, etc.

It's also brought in the drug problem. The whole thing ties in together. You're pushing children of the 17 year old mark, and I call them children with all due respect, but I say that where they used to have the buffer zone, the insulation between their age and those that were 21, that's disappeared - and the Whip on the government side can wave his head and ridicule and say that he doesn't think it's funny but I say I think it's damn serious if something can't be done by that government to change over the problem that they have created. It's no longer something that just should be looked at and ignored.

BILL 34

(MR. MOUG cont'd)

It was brought in by the Member for Fort Garry here some two weeks ago, saying what was going on down at the community clubs, and I know what goes on around the community clubs. I have a family that goes and skates and plays hockey there. When you go in there and you see that the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. MOUG: . . . that this government thought that they could drop the age of majority from 21 to 18, they would bring in that university group; they'd bring in all the swingers and young people, and they would get the vote. Well that was rejected in a good many cases, I didn't see them picking up that mighty vote that they thought they were going to get. I don't see where they gained all that amount, but I'd like to know what they lost with the popularity of the adult people in the Province of Manitoba for the harm they're doing to our young people today. And anybody that wants to ridicule a statement like that I think are children themselves because certainly our children are--you're abusing the health and welfare of the young people where there's no way you can bring them out into adults and make some use out of them, and that's exactly what's happening. They're not in a position to make up their mind for themselves.

I got a vote when I was 17 years old, and there's not a lot of people in this Chamber can say that, but I had my right to vote when I was 17 years old, and never lost it; it's something they can't take away from you unless you do something under the Criminal Code, or whatever, that they can take it away from you. And I knew at the time when I was 17 years old I didn't know how to vote - I knew that - and I didn't know when I was 18, I didn't know when I was 19. I probably voted CCF some time, like a damn fool. But that's exactly what happens when you give kids that age the right to vote, even at 18, they don't know to vote, what to vote for. They take what's given to them by professors. We know that all professors and a helluva pile of school teachers are all socialists because this is the way they want to - this is what they want to see.--(Interjection)--Oh, all right, but most.

If you get that going on, Mr. Speaker, in a province I know we're in trouble, and if they would have only listened to, if they had listened to us in the Opposition at the time and asked them to carefully move that age of majority down from 21 to 20 to 19 to 18 and break the kids in, bring them in gradually and let them know they're adults and they have responsibility, but that went by the wayside, as is any other suggestion we brought up on this side of the House. I'm sorry that happened because I think it's going to have an ill effect on a lot of us that are trying to raise families and bring our children up the way we'd like to see them brought up.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to mention one thing about the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I asked him a question today, and I know it was hard to get an answer for it, but really there's a problem in the province in another respect because the Minister of Industry and Commerce, as he lets on to us, trying to bring people into the province and make a great province out of this, lend the money through MDC and get them going and enlarge on what they're doing and create jobs isn't exactly the case, because this letter was written on March 11th to a Joseph Poitras and Son in the Village of Ville de L'islet, Quebec, now my French isn't good on that, but it says that, "We are currently working with a Manitoba manufacturer who will be moving to new premises some time this summer. This company will be adding a new product line including bedroom and dining room furniture and will be requiring new or good used equipment for their plant. Could you give us a quotation of the following equipment including a delivery date, scheduled for August/September 1974. The machinery and equipment is as follows," and he mentions a 14 inch table saw--Tilt Arbor; single spindle dove tailer; wood turning lathe; 10-inch jointer; 36 inch bandsaw; single spindle carver, hydraulic cold press about 8 inch in length; Veneer Guillotine - this I guess cutting heads off the socialists - 8 foot capacity; Rotary Glue Clamp; Compressors - list and size of various compressors for woodworking manufacturing capacities. This will be a moderately sized new plant and will require the above equipment and machinery for the above product line. It is anticipated that most other equipment including a heavy duty planer, finishing systems, etc. will be established with local wholesale houses located here in Winnipeg."

Now they know that the balance of equipment can be bought in Winnipeg, and they know that you can walk into any wholesale house or equipment distributor in the Province of Manitoba and you can buy this equipment, but they write to the Province of Quebec asking them for prices, after they're putting our money in, the people of Manitoba's money going in there. And

BILL 34

(MR. MOUG cont'd) this is signed by an F. R. Moore, Senior Consultant, Industrial Materials and Construction Branch of Industry and Commerce. Now if that's what's going on, why are we so anxious to spend all the dollars in promoting the Province of Manitoba, flying all over the world, over to Japan, and over to Germany and Switzerland to bring people in here to locate in Manitoba, and we're only going to send letters back out to Quebec and ask them if they can supply us with a bandsaw. I'm sure I've got one of those in my garage at home. But a 10-inch jointer, you know, anybody knows what that stuff's used for, you make windows and door frames with it. Dovetailing equipment - and you write to Quebec and ask them. Well I didn't mind, Mr. Speaker, when they were paying off into St. Boniface here to get a Minister sitting in the House, but all of a sudden I think now we're trying to import somebody from Quebec. I don't know if it's Eric Kierans or who is it but it seems to me that there's somebody . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister state his point of order?

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I wonder if the honourable member would be kind enough to table it so that I can follow up the matter. (No problem.) Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood. The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. The Honourable Member for Charleswood referred to me as nodding my head in sort of opposition to his position on telling us about the dangers of drugs. I was not nodding my head at that time, because I was not particularly listening to him, I was going through my receipts here. And I should also point out that when the honourable member referred to "shut up you damn fools" he was referring to his own colleagues the Conservatives on that side.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: Well, Mr. Speaker, I didn't see him nodding his head, I heard it, I heard it. If it hadn't disrupted the smooth delivery I was giving here I would have never noticed, it was just that I was coming across so clearly here with the help of the Member for Roblin.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry to see that the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs isn't here tonight. I know that he would wish to hear that I have a complaint; I'll wait and register that some time when he is in the House.

There was one other thing I wanted to repeat to the First Minister and ask him if he would reconsider what the Department of Highways has set up in their program for the several capital projects they have going in the way of bridges and arterial roadways, etc., and ask him if he would reconsider and try to put together a program that would give us an overpass or the start of a construction overpass in Charleswood this year, because it's very serious, Mr. Speaker, regardless of what side of the House we sit on, what politics we have, or who we like to bug and who we like to leave alone, I think that--I've mentioned before in the House, and it's on record, we've lost ten to twelve people, some of them Charleswood people right at that interchange and at that junction of the highway and Roblin Blvd., and since then the population in Westdale has come up to 7,000 people with one or two other housing projects on the go and I would ask that he reconsider and have the Department of Highways do all they can to start construction on that this year. It's very hazardous between the hours of 7 and 9 in the morning and 4 and 6 at night. There's schools, there's a Catholic School that is on the east side of it, and the French and Belgium group of people that are the greatest attenders of that school live on the west side of the intersection and those kids are not blessed with a school bus, they have to walk that area. I would ask that he give real consideration to seeing if he can do something for that.

I know there's going to be more deaths if the overpass, the construction of an overpass is put over till '75, I know there will be more deaths between now and then, there's just no way out of it; there's been 50 people seriously injured and some of them crippled for life, and I would ask that he give consideration of that far sooner for instance, than the one million dollar bid that was submitted by Dineen Construction to the Department of Public Works to upgrade the dining facilities in the Headingley Jail. I think this is something more serious and it's something that would take us about 30 percent of the way along on the construction of that. Thanks very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

BILL 34

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, when I spoke on the Throne Speech Debate I mentioned at that time that I was very pleased that the First Minister complimented the new members of the House and gave them some advice on the decorum of the House, and I said at that time that because of that advice given by the First Minister that we would no longer hear the words of shyster, wretches, and possibly from the older members of the Legislature, slimy, and things of this nature. But the advice the Minister gave, the First Minister gave may have rubbed off on some of the newer members but certainly has not rubbed off on the members that especially have been here for over 20 years.

Mr. Speaker, the only defence that I have heard given from the other side about Bill 34 is that we are muckraking but really it's the government fighting for their own horrible bungling, that they have done with the finances of this province since 1969.

The Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker, spoke about traditions, and I can remind him of the statement in, I believe, the '69 Throne Speech where it was said, old dogmas and traditions may not necessarily be adhered to - and I haven't looked it up but I remember old dogmas and traditions. And yet, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour gets up today and he speaks of traditions. He says Interim Supply has never been held up before and yet at the same time we have a tradition of the Minister of Finance who turns around and decides that he will issue warrants during the Session because they don't have the capability of running the Session in such a way that this wouldn't have to happen.

Mr. Speaker, you know we had in Canada in the Federal Department a pipeline debate and the Opposition felt very strongly that there was something wrong in that bill, and it wasn't in favour of it, and they fought desperately to see that that bill didn't go through. --(Interjection)-- Yes, I believe the NDP at that time fought desperately to see that that bill did not go through. --(Interjection)--I didn't say Mr. Douglas, Mr. Speaker, I said the NDP Party. I also say, Mr. Speaker, it has been proven since that there was good reason why that bill didn't go through, but, Mr. Speaker, it was fought and the bill did not go through, or the bill was put through because the government has the ability to do so whenever they please.

You know, we see in many cases, Mr. Speaker, we see unions who are in negotiation with their management and you hear coming from the people if the union keeps this up we'll destroy the economy of the country, we will harm the people of the country, but you know all hell be damned, Mr. Speaker, the union takes the attitude that the principle is there, we must fight it, and we must let the chips fall where they may, and the members on the other side while speaking of labour legislation absolutely believe in that theory.

And here we are today, Mr. Speaker, here we are today, Mr. Speaker, with an Opposition who believes that this government has bungled the handling of the money of this province for five years and we get called muckrakers - call me that if you like - we get called people who are obstructing - call me that if you like. As the Member for Lakeside said today, I'll take it on my shoulders, be my guest, put it there, but we are going to have our say on the bungling of the finances just the same as unions have their say when they're negotiating, just the same as the pipeline debate. And, Mr. Speaker, the weapon is there, or the legislation is there, the parliamentary rules are there for this government when they have a stubborn opposition, every government has the power to put their legislation through if they so desire because they have the numbers. It is there, it is there for them to do it. It is there for them to do it. It's entirely up to them, if they feel we're stubborn, if they feel--(Interjection)--No, Mr. Speaker, I'm not asking anything, I'm saying to the government if they feel that this is what is being done by this Opposition, they have the method at their disposal, it's up to them. Mr. Speaker, it's up to them just the same as I explained, we're going to fight it, we're going to battle it the same as the unions who think they're right, the same as the pipeline debate, and we will talk about old dogmas and traditions the way they talk about them; they want the traditions when they want them, they don't want them when they don't want them, and that's the way it goes.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour spoke about the Throne Speech, you know, which was a nothing speech to begin with this session, but, Mr. Speaker, since that Throne Speech and we have had some bills presented to us, not very many; we have had one that we don't disagree with and we have fought that; we have handled all the other bills in the House that have come before us; we have had the Budget Debate which we have gone through the same as the rules apply. And in Interim Supply we have had a situation arise in this session of the House where we have presented what we feel are irregularities, which we feel that the moneys of this

BILL 34

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) province are not being handled in the proper manner; we have presented them not once but on three occasions because they keep asking to give us more, and we have said, this is irregular, we want something done about it. Nothing's been done, not a bit. The Minister of Labour said that the NDP fought very hard for changes in this House as an opposition, well, you know, they're a different bunch of people and because they don't think the opposition should fight hard for what they believe in.

Mr. Speaker, I told this government not too long ago that I wouldn't want them as an opposition. I wouldn't want anybody sitting on this side if I were there that wouldn't bring things to my attention, and I would hope that I would have the ability that if they were brought to my attention to do something about it.

A MEMBER: Hear, hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance wants money. He wants us to vote him money. --(Interjection)--That's right, it's all he ever wanted to do was just spend it. He got it through inflationary situations, what have you, but he finds spending ways. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance when I was first elected in 1969 and the NDP government came to power in Manitoba, I had many people, many people come to me and say, you know, it's a good thing that we have the Member from St. Johns there the Minister of Finance because he's probably going to be one of the better steadying influences in this government. If those people only know what we know now - the Minister of Finance has really in my opinion forgotten how to be a Minister of Finance, if he ever knew a Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker, should have his Provincial Auditor at his right side all the time saying, 'Mr. Provincial Auditor, as the Minister of Finance I have to find the money, I have to allot it to different departments, I have to look at all the budgets, I have all of these problems on my shoulder and, Mr. Auditor, I want you there at my right hand every minute investigating everything in this province, almost like a bank inspector, walk in at any time and see that the money that I give to people is properly spent.' And this Minister of Finance in fact in a committee blocks, blocks, blocks an auditor from doing that sort of thing. He's the man that brought the bill in about the auditor but here we have a Minister of Finance at the present time, and he wants money, and he doesn't want to know how it's being spent. Let's talk about why he wants money, or not why he wants money but he wants money. We have a new situation in Manitoba called "bridge financing". You know we've got a new situation. Not any authority from the Legislature, we get our budget, we get our estimates put in front, our capital put in front of us, now we have what is called bridge financing, and on what authority do the people who are given money by this Legislature go about like the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, loaning money to the Northern Manpower Corporation to build houses for the Northwest Territories. And the Minister of Finance didn't bungle, he doesn't - is he defending it? Is he happy with the report that was brought to us by the Provincial Auditor? Is he happy the way that reads? Is he happy the way the Provincial Auditor's Report, the report to this House reads? Yes, he's happy? The Minister of Finance wants to defend all of this bungling, not investigate it, not have a person at his beck and call who'd expect at any time would look after the resources of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, we have the fish co-ops. Again we have the man in charge of all the money in Manitoba; we have brought to his attention there may be some irregularities and we pointed out to him. Does he barge in, does he barge in and find out about it? No. No, Sir. And he wants money, we're muckraking, and he says I want money. Mr. Speaker, the hydro rates have gone up 20 percent. The same Minister of Finance was the Minister in charge of hydro not so long ago when we got into a mess in the Manitoba Hydro to go into Lake Winnipeg, which was nothing but a face-saving sham for the Premier of this province to spend \$250 millions, and this Minister wants money, and he asks us to vote for it.

We have what we call the Wabowden affair where a contractor was taken over to build two or three houses. They bought more material - you'd darn near think they were building this Legislature - and it was all of a sudden passed out during an election year, and when the election's over the company's gone broke, there's \$200,000 lost, and this Finance Minister absolutely, absolutely still refuses to have anything to do with it, passes it off, including the First Minister who can't even remember phone calls. Can't even - you know I challenge, I challenge anybody in any position that took a phone call, and as hard as it is to get through to our First Minister, because you gotta go through his secretary, you gotta go through his Executive Assistant, then you're referred to Ministers. You know I'm pretty well sure that he should check his Executive Assistant because maybe his Executive Assistant is checking with

BILL 34

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) Hofford, Schulz, and a few other guys, before he tells the Premier what's going on.

A MEMBER: Right you are Frank.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: But, Mr. Speaker, this First Minister and this Finance Minister want money. And they have the gall to stand there and say we're muckraking. We've got the Finance Minister, Mr. Speaker, who proudly presented, proudly presented the Winnipeg Bill. He went around to all of the different communities. He said I have the great answer to the City of Winnipeg. He came up with a small white paper written by people and advice of people in Ontario. He was told by Mr. Bole it would cost \$17 million. We pleaded with him to take time, at least a year, to experiment. We asked every possible way, would you please be cautious this is going to cost money. I was on a television program with the Minister and I said, "Are you going to kid me by saying salaries won't all jump up tomorrow?" I'll tell the Minister about a person that works for the City of St. James who got \$9,000 back pay and had a \$5,000 increase in salary in one year, and he says that that wouldn't happen - it happened, and this Minister of Finance wants money, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. It's 9:00 o'clock, we now move into Private Members' Hour.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: First item is private members' Bill No. 23. The Honourable Member for Radisson. --(Interjection)--Bill No. 31. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

BILL NO. 31

MR. F. JOHNSTON presented Bill No. 31, an Act to Amend the Highway Traffic Act (2), for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek. The Honourable Member for Morris.

BILL NO. 23

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. When Bill No. 23 was called I heard some voices say passed, and I don't know whether that bill is now passed or whether it still . . .

MR. SPEAKER: That bill is standing. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

BILL NO. 31

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, --(Interjection)--What? Well, if they're going to hoist it, Mr. Speaker, they're going to hoist it, after I've told them that they are absolutely unfair. They should be called before the Human Rights Commission that they set up themselves. I'm going to tell them that now because government sells the registration on your car, sells the insurance on your car, and sells you the license, that because they're Big Brother Government and all powerful they wield an ax over one of the three, which I think is a disgusting situation. Mr. Speaker, when I went down and I told this - the honourable members one time, Mr. Speaker, that there was absolutely no way that I would ever pay my insurance in full to this government; I will pay it on time; I will never give them any more money than I have to at any one time, and there's absolutely no doubt about that. But when I did so, Mr. Speaker, I was handed a little reminder, a little ticket that I have attached to this letter, and the little reminder says, to persons choosing the time payment plan. The final installment of your insurance premium is due 90 days from the date of commencement of your coverage. Failure to pay this final installment could result in the suspension of your vehicle registration insurance and driver's license.

A MEMBER: You're kidding. Driver's license?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Driver's license, Mr. Speaker. I have a young man - the letter is signed by Mr. Dygala, it came out, and it's dated to him, it says - well the first part he hadn't paid his \$31.00, and the records indicate this amount is still outstanding - "Therefore we regret to advise you that your vehicle registration card, certificate of insurance, number plate and driver or chauffeur's license are hereby suspended pursuant to Section 242 (1) and 242 (2) of the Highway Traffic Act."

BILL 31

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd)

You know the Minister is going to say that some people shouldn't be riding around, or somebody's paying for the license, or something of this nature. Did you know - and I'm sure you do, Mr. Speaker, I didn't like to start out that way - did you know, Mr. Speaker --(Interjection)--that if I bought a chesterfield and I didn't make my payments on it, the person I bought it from would have to maybe take me to the Small Debts Court; he would have to challenge the fact that I hadn't paid the payments, and I would go through a procedure, a procedure which protects me as the individual, a protection that the government sets up, my right of appeal, that that man would have to do to get my payments if I was in deferral of them. Mr. Speaker, the government have those laws which protect me, yet when the government comes out and because they sell the license, because they sell the insurance, they say . . .

A MEMBER: And the driver's license.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: . . . and the driver's license - they say, "Look Joe, if you don't happen to make your payment we're going to take your driver's license." And would anybody on that side of the House tell me what the fact the man didn't make a payment has to do with his ability to drive an automobile. You know that's like saying, Mr. Speaker, when I lost that chesterfield because of payments, the man that took it from me said, "Mr. Johnston you can't go over in your neighbour's yard or neighbour's house and sit on his chesterfield." You take, you take this man's driver's license because he doesn't make a payment.

A MEMBER: He has no right of appeal.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: He has no right of appeal. You know, Mr. Speaker, this is big government at its best. This is, this is the big ax that this government has put over little people in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that if this gentleman or anybody in that position were to take his case before the Human Rights Commission, or if in fact he were to go before the Minister of Autopac I would like the Minister of Autopac to sit in front of a young person today who wasn't able to pay his bill and was willing to give up his plates because he couldn't; he was willing to give up his registration because he couldn't, or his insurance - he wouldn't have any if he didn't have registration - and I want the Minister to turn to that young person and say, "Joe you can't, I'm going to take your license too." Mr. Speaker, I know what the Minister's going to say. He's going to say, if he's willing to give up the others he doesn't have to give up this. But did he go through the process of what we have in this country, did he go through the process of the Small Debt Court?

A MEMBER: And the right to appeal.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: The right of appeal, the right that this government gives anybody but the right that this government when they're putting down legislation of not giving a man.

A MEMBER: Right.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: You know--(Interjection)--I feed him some more. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that they all feed me some more. I would hope that I would get some common sense from the other side about this fact because I really can't see . . .

A MEMBER: Give it back to me Warner I didn't read it.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: . . . I really can't see, I really can't see what not paying a bill, a grocery bill, a furniture bill, or any kind of a bill, including your insurance bill, has to do with your ability to drive an automobile.

Now if somebody, Mr. Speaker, with all the arguments that I have heard, even on radio, from the Minister that he will give me, that he says that some people will be driving on the basis that others have paid, he can tell me that all he likes but, Mr. Speaker, I want somebody on the other side to stand up and tell me what not paying a bill has to do with the ability of driving an automobile. And why because this government sells you all three, and they are government, Mr. Speaker, holds a clout over your head to that extent. Why this government sets up legislation to give me protection from people who would take advantage of me, maybe if I'm in a financial strait or something, why they give me that protection and why they don't give that protection when they are dealing with the public themselves.

Mr. Speaker, they would take your license. And yet I would defy, Mr. Speaker, I would defy, Mr. Speaker - if I hadn't paid my bill on furniture in my home or my grocery, let's say furniture, if I hadn't paid the bill on the payment of my car a sheriff representing a private company could not walk into my house and take it without a court order, without first going

BILL 31

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) through the Small Debts Court, and first having a warrant, and first having all the protection that, you know, giving me all the protection that the government says. By law, by law.

Mr. Speaker, I have only to say this as an example of big government, big brother government, this is the example when they take the big stick and control all. And I repeat it again, it's worth repeating, and then I'm going to sit down, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to ask the Minister, I'm going to ask the Minister of Autopac to stand up and give me all the arguments he wants regarding financing, regarding not paying your bill, and maybe somebody else's paid your bill for you, and tell me what owing \$31.00 has to do with the ability to drive an automobile.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister in charge of Autopac.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In rising to speak on this bill, Mr. Speaker, I heard the . . . it's a bill, the honourable member I thought he was going to explain the principle of the bill, and I haven't got it before me, but he made a political speech insofar as the bill is concerned rather than explain the principle of the bill. But first of all the section, the first section that he amends, that he wants to amend, he really contradicts himself in it and really the effect of the amendment is to really hamstring the Motor Vehicle Branch in trying to collect any bad cheques that may be written by people who are dishonouring the payments on their driver's licenses, and if in effect they have dishonoured the payments of their driver's licenses the Act as it exists, the Registrar of Motor Vehicles has the ability to suspend that driver.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, that member, that individual, by the laws of Manitoba has in effect failed to pay for his driver's license and his insurance of course on that driver's license, and the driving privileges that have been extended to him. The honourable member attempts not to - to totally in effect hamstring the Motor Vehicle Branch.

And I'd like to put on the record some of the facts that have been presented to me as have been given to me by the department and by the Motor Vehicle Branch in dealing with the situation over the past two years. I know that this matter was raised and there were objections initially by members on this side when the section was being proposed, when the Automobile Insurance Act was being brought in. Since Autopac has been in force there has been a good number of cases where persons have paid by cheque which were subsequently dishonoured by the bank, and the only means of enforcing payment in respect to premiums and fees was to suspend the driver's license, and, if necessary, their registration issued to that person. We've had people all over the country not paying the bills that have been owed to the Motor Vehicle Branch. Now I'll give you one example, Mr. Speaker, where I think the point that the honourable member was raising initially, and when he questioned me in the House several months ago, was that, why do you suspend the driver's license of an individual who does not pay his insurance and his registration? Why do you do two things? I think that is the intent of the honourable member's bill. Unfortunately the bill does not do that. The first section totally negates the opportunity or the ability of the Motor Vehicle Branch to collect its fees on driver's licenses which may be owing by either the mispayment of a bad cheque or by the nonpayment for fees.

Now in respect to the registration, what is stopping--you know, first of all we must really realize who are we dealing with when we are talking about individuals not paying their bills. We are really dealing with--(Interjection)--Well, yes, Mr. Speaker, we're dealing with people who are - some of whom are on purpose using the system that has been extended to purposely not pay their registration or driver's license fee. Mr. Speaker, I have given the press statistics some time ago, and I haven't got them here this evening, but over the past two years we have not been able to collect somewhere in the neighborhood of \$200,000 even though these provisions of the Act are in. The people who we are really after are the people who on purpose deliberately want to misuse the system and defraud the province of the moneys owing for their insurance premiums or their driver's license premiums. And also their fellow citizens because I think the honourable member on the opposite side would stand up right away and decry that if someone was driving without a driver's license while his vehicle registration was suspended, you're allowing this guy on the road, how come you don't take him off the highway because he has his registration suspended or he's driving? What is to stop that individual if only, as the honourable member suggests, if only his vehicle registration was suspended. What is to stop the individual from turning that car over to a member of his family,

BILL 31

(MR. URUSKI cont'd) reregistering it, giving a gift, and there's just no way of checking out the plates that would be reissued to him to try and trace it back to that individual on the money that he is owing. There is no way of collecting it. As a result the system that has been developed--(Interjection)--Mr. Speaker, the system that is in effect does not prevent any individual from turning in his registration plates if he cannot continue payment on his insurance premiums, on his vehicle registration, and it does not cancel out his driver's license. All he has to do is bring in his plates if he does not wish to continue his insurance premiums and cancel his registration, and there is no suspension. The member can drive anyone's car.

Mr. Speaker, a memo that I have received that was given to me by some of the members of the department and who are charged with the responsibility of attempting to collect moneys, owing, and I might say we have had people, we have traced people as far as Alberta and British Columbia in an attempt to collect some of the moneys that have been owing over the last several years of nonpayment. --(Interjection)--Yes, yes, Mr. Speaker, and we are doing the same thing. The memo that was given to me indicates that it is a source of amazement that the amendment would introduce such a conflict in the section, unless of course it was deliberately designed to frustrate the collection of premiums and fees owed by a person who has paid by cheque which was subsequently dishonoured.

As I've indicated before the first section totally negates the ability of the department to collect premiums that would be owing on a driver's license because the intent of the amendment is in effect to do that.

The second section where he made his statement on the collection of the registration fees, as I've indicated, there's nothing stopping an individual from transferring the plates and there would be just no way of tracing down the owner of the vehicle and the car could go unregistered or registered in another name, and moneys owing would not be picked up or be paid. As a result both sections have been in effect.

To repeal the provisions of the Act which now empowers the Motor Vehicle Branch to suspend a driver's license for indebtedness to the corporation is in conflict with the principle that any person who is insured must and should pay his premiums and fees. Otherwise we would say that only those who can should pay and those who cannot or do not want to pay will be excused. As mentioned earlier, suspension of registration is not of itself sufficiently effective to enforce payment, quite apart from the fact that a person, and I've mentioned, can give the vehicle to another member of his family or friends, that the same individual can go to another agent and apply for an entirely new registration for the same vehicle, and there is simply no way that this can be detected since new plates are issued and a new file set up under the plate number, and it would be virtually impossible to cross reference the plate with the individual whose registrations have previously been suspended. The only key here is of course as I mentioned the driver's license, and this suspension is the only method of making sure that the individual who does not turn in his registration that would be suspended, therefore his driver's license would be suspended. And, Mr. Speaker--(Interjection)--the honourable member suggests put him in jail. This would be just the type of a--(Interjection)--that would be the type of a situation that the honourable member would create, but if only he would sit down and realize what the situation is. I've heard the honourable members speak and he tries to make the portrayal that it is big government, that he will want to allow the individuals who do not pay for their insurance premiums or who put in cheques that bounce, who put in cheques that cannot make the payment, and he would want those people to go free and let the rest of the motoring public who take out time payment and make their payments subsidize this group of people. These are the comments that the honourable member makes.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable member made some comments about payments of chesterfields, or other matters, or phone bills, or other bills. What normally happens if there is an avenue to collect it has been undertaken, and the avenue that is being utilized - and yet there has been an amount of money outstanding in the last number of years by people who deliberately have attempted to defraud the corporation and the motoring public driving without insurance coverage, and endangering the other motorists on the highway by not having the insurance coverage. You know if you go and agree to the system that the honourable member mentions, you may as well go back to the old system of the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund and allow people to go on the highway without insurance, and allow them to drive vehicles that are improperly registered, and if that's what he's suggesting I must say that I am not in agreement with the bill that he has proposed, Mr. Speaker.

BILL 31

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BOB BANMAN (La Verendrye): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would sort of pose a question to the Minister of Autopac. He's mentioned several times the problems they're having in collecting bad cheques. I think he realizes now the problem facing the private sector with regard to bad cheques and I would ask him if he would not agree with me that it's time that the government took a serious look at the writing of bad cheques and started to put some teeth into the enforcing and also some teeth into the law that would eliminate the problem that we are having. We seem to have a lax--have much more of a lax law than the United States does on that account and the rubber cheques are posing quite a problem to the private individuals, and as the Minister has already indicated it seems to be posing somewhat of a problem to the Autopac people. So I would ask the Minister to consult with his colleagues and see if he could not get some teeth into the legislation or enforcement of bad cheques.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I heard a very interesting and intriguing defence of the government's position by the Minister of Autopac and I want to thank him for responding to the introduction of this bill by the Member for Sturgeon Creek. It's infrequently, Sir, that we find a Minister on that side who is quick to respond, and I want to congratulate the Minister for having his material ready and providing that argument that ostensibly is supposed to justify the position that the Highways Branch are taking on this particular issue. It's rather interesting to hear the Minister say that if we allowed those who were unable or unwilling to pay their insurance bills, that we would be subsidizing the remainder of the motoring public. Well, Sir, if they're unable to pay their insurance bill, that sounds to me as though they are taking the government at their word and adopting the ability-to-pay principle which this government so loudly proclaims is a philosophy of the government and which they embrace so closely, I don't know why in this particular instance that they must depart from that principle. Surely if it applies in the application in taxes across this country and in the distribution of largesse from this government, surely it should apply to those who drive automobiles.

But the argument that the Minister has not answered was referred to by the First Minister in his interjection from his seat when he said, what happens to you if you refuse to pay your telephone bill? Well we all know what happens, we lose our telephone. But, Sir, it does not deny me the right to use a pay telephone, or nor does it deny me the right to go to my neighbour's and use his telephone while he pays the bill. If, as the Member for Sturgeon Creek said, that he fails to make the payments on his chesterfield the person who sold him the chesterfield has a perfect right to demand payment and if he doesn't get payment, he'll take the chesterfield back. But, Sir, he's not going to take the radio and the television and the car and the bed, that the Minister of Public Works wants to tax, he will only take the chesterfield, that which is properly his.

By the same token it would appear to me that if a person refuses or is unable or unwilling to pay his automobile insurance premiums, I wouldn't deny that the government has a right to say all right, you don't want to insure that automobile, it is therefore not legal for you for that automobile to use the highways. Accept that argument. But should that deny the individual in the event that he happens to be a truck driver. Should that deny him the right to earn his living, his livelihood, absolutely not. It seems to me, Sir, that the Minister's argument as valiant as it was falls far short of meeting the objections that are raised in this particular bill, and all that the Member for Sturgeon Point was attempting to point out, that there is justification because it's in the legislation, and certainly there is a great deal of validity to the government saying that automobiles that will travel the highways of Manitoba must be insured for the protection of not only the individual himself but the motoring public. We accept that. But I can find no argument that the Minister has offered, that suggests that man must be deprived of a means of livelihood. He has not covered that particular point.

One other interesting suggestion made by the Minister is that--and one gets the implication from the tenor of his remarks that this country is made up of a bunch of crooks. He says there's over \$200, 000 that are lost by people issuing rubber cheques, and we know there's a few of those people. I wasn't aware that there were that many. I was under the impression that the attitude of this government was such that we were led to believe that they embraced this compulsory government insurance program to the point that they were even eager, nay desirous of rushing to the Autopac offices and paying their bills. I find it somewhat dismaying, Sir,

BILL 31

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) to discover that there are still people, \$200, 000 worth of people across this province who have been either unwilling or unable to see the wisdom of the government's action in introducing the Autopac legislation. It's dismaying indeed to discover that we have so many reluctant people in this province. And the Minister is unable to deal with them other than to deprive them of their driving privileges. It seems to me, Sir, the Minister's argument up to this point has fallen short of meeting the objections raised by the Member for Sturgeon Creek, and I hope as the debate progresses that someone else may rise in their place and meet those deficiencies that were so obvious in the Minister's argument.

MR. BLAKE: I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Pembina, that debate be adjourned, unless the Member for Radisson wishes to speak.

MOTION presented and passed.

BILL NO. 35

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 35. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. WALLY JOHANNSON (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, Stand. (Stand)

RESOLUTION NO. 26

MR. SPEAKER: We are then on Private Members' Resolutions. Resolution No. 26. The Honourable member is absent. Drops down to the bottom.

RESOLUTION NO. 11

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution No. 11 as amended by the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek is now open. Are you ready for the question?

QUESTION on the amendment put and motion lost.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Ayes and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The motion before the House is Resolution 11, the amendment thereto.

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

YEAS

Messrs.	Axworthy	McGill
	Banman	McGregor
	Bilton	McKellar
	Blake	McKenzie
	Craik	Marion
	Enns	Minaker
	Graham	Moug
	Henderson	
	F. Johnston	
	Jorgenson	

NAYS

Messrs.	Adam	Miller
	Barrow	Osland
	Bostrom	Pawley
	Boyce	Petursson
	Burtniak	Schreyer
	Cherniack	Shafransky
	Derewianchuk	Toupin
	Dillen	Uruski
	Evans	Uskiw
	Gottfried	Walding
	Green	
	Hanuschak	
	Johannson	
	Malinowski	

RESOLUTION 11

MR. CLERK: Yeas 17; Nays 24.

MOTION on the amendment declared lost.

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

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to the resolution from the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party I must say that, first, in looking at the amendment I was a little amused until I checked a second time; I figured it was an amendment made by his own colleague the Member for Portage. Then I see the reason why the Member for Sturgeon Creek got up to ask for the ayes and nays since it was his amendment to the resolution. But I was always under the impression that it had been the Liberal Leader's colleague, the Member for Portage, that moved that amendment.

This resolution, Mr. Speaker, I felt first should possibly be ruled out of order completely. However, since this has not been the case I'd like to go into the resolution itself, and in the first resolution: "WHEREAS the price of consumer goods and prices is rising at a rate which exceeds the capacity of most Manitobans to increase their income enough to even keep up with inflation," is simply inaccurate. Certainly prices have been increasing but not, to quote the resolution "at a rate which exceeds the capacity of most Manitobans to increase their income enough to even keep up with the inflation."

The fact is that Manitobans have been experiencing a much lower rate of inflation than most people across Canada, and it is the fact that it is as a result of the policies of this government which has helped to keep prices, to keep the buying power of people in Manitoba at a much more favourable position than in other parts of Canada. We do know that the senior citizens, as a result of the housing program, those people who live in the MHRC senior citizens housing, do pay considerably less rent than those who do not have that possibility or enjoy that type of housing today.

Mr. Speaker, between 1972, December 1972 and December 1973, the Consumer Price Index for Winnipeg increased by some 7.4 percent, the second lowest rate of increase in all of Canada. Personal income per capita is estimated to have increased from \$3,580 in 1972 to \$4,051 in 1973, an increase of some 13.1 percent. Now, personal disposable income per capita is estimated to have increased from \$3,036 in 1972 to \$3,375 in 1973, an increase of 11.2 percent; and labour income to have risen by some 9.2 percent, from 2.2 billion in 1972 to 2.4 billion in 1973. Now, Mr. Speaker, these figures show once again that their facts fail to support the allegations of the Leader of the Liberal Party.

The second WHEREAS Mr. Speaker, is equally inaccurate. The argument that the government of Manitoba is presently - and I'm using the quotation "contributing to inflation by levying the 5 percent retail sales tax on the increasing prices" cannot be substantiated. Again I would like to cite a few facts. The food component of the consumer price index for Winnipeg rose some 15.7 percent between December 1972 and December 1973, and food, with the exception of restaurant meals \$2.00 and over, is exempt. Well in fact it's going to be exempt for \$3.00, up to \$3.00, from sales taxation while tobacco and alcohol, two of the most heavily taxed items, exhibited an increase of only 1.5 percent. Now I notice that there has been an increase in the price in just recent days. In fact on Wednesday the price of cigarettes in the machines went up, but I don't believe that has been as a result of any increase imposed; it has been through other factors, so this figure of 1.5 percent might be slightly changed. If one follows the logic of the Leader of the Liberal Party, surely the price increase experienced in tobacco and alcohol would have been greater than the increases in food prices.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the second WHEREAS of the resolution also suggests that the government is continuing to levy the tax on even the necessities of life required by low income citizens. He's saying "the necessities of life." Once again that claim, Mr. Speaker, by the Leader of the Liberal Party, is absolutely inaccurate. Certainly low income groups pay sales tax on their consumption of taxable commodities. However, the bulk of expenditures of low income families is on necessities and most necessities are exempt from sales taxation. For example, food is exempt; transportation - that is bus fare - is exempt; children's clothing is exempt; housing is exempt. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I don't think it is accurate to suggest that the bulk of necessities required by low income earners in this province are taxable. As to the criticism of the five percent sales tax rate, I wonder if the Leader of the Liberal Party is aware that all of the provinces which levy sales tax - and Alberta is the only province which does not - the Manitoba rate is the lowest in the country. We have just seen last year Ontario increase

RESOLUTION 11

(MR. SHAFRANSKY cont'd) their sales tax from five to seven. I believe the sales tax in Quebec, the Liberal province, is eight percent. Ontario, it went up from five to seven percent. --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Well, they were going to impose the same tax on heating but, just as the occasion was under the Conservative government back in 1967 when they were going to impose a sales tax on heating, they withdraw. They did for a period of time but they withdraw; the government of Ontario which intended to tax the fuels did change its mind because of adverse attitude on the part of the people of the province of Ontario, and in the case of Manitoba during the Roblin regime because of the New Democratic opposition to the sales tax imposition on fuel costs, on fuel bills, that the sales tax was not levied.

Mr. Speaker, I don't mind saying it, we are tied for the lowest rate with the New Democratic administration of Saskatchewan and with the governments of Saskatchewan and British Columbia. All other provinces in Canada which levy sales tax - and there isn't a New Democratic administration among them - levy sales tax at a much higher rate than the province of Manitoba. Newfoundland, Nova Scotia and Ontario--and I've mentioned Ontario but I didn't realize, I gave you these statistics in fact last year, I indicated that Alberta does not have a sales tax. --(Interjection)--That's right. I think pretty soon they'll be able to eliminate all kinds of taxes because we're going to pay for them. --(Interjection)--

Mr. Speaker, if the members opposite and my Leader would allow me, I'll continue. Mr. Speaker, Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, besides Ontario, also have seven percent sales tax while Quebec, Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick have an eight percent rate. Thus I think Manitobans may justifiably be proud of their New Democratic Government which has kept the sales tax rate at levels below those prevailing in all the other provinces except the provinces which have New Democratic Party governments.

Mr. Speaker, I would not want to convey the impression that inflation is not a problem in this province. I wouldn't want to leave that impression. But the fact is it is not nearly the problem that it is in other parts of the world, in other parts of Canada. I know Alberta is going to have a real problem. They're just going to get a billion dollars a year and I don't know what they're going to do with it. There's no denying that, that there is some problems accompanying the inflation that we're experiencing. Unfortunately it is beyond the scope of the Provincial Government to deal with the problem adequately. That is something that I wish the Leader of the Liberal Party and his colleagues would try to impress upon their counterparts in Ottawa, that they have to deal with that, and you have not been doing that very well. The Member for Fort Rouge said that's what he's been doing. Well, he didn't do a very good job.

However, I think all Manitobans are aware of this government's concern for those on low and fixed incomes, Mr. Speaker, a concern reflected in major policy objectives designed to increase their real income, and the other day - on Monday in fact, during the Budget Debate, Mr. Speaker - the First Minister gave a very clear outline of those measures taken to help people on low and middle fixed income basis. The Property Tax Credit Plan insures that relief from property taxation is concentrated on those who really need it. Benefits decrease as taxable income increases, and I think that is equitable; it is based on the ability-to-pay principle. The reduction and eventual elimination of health services premiums gives each Manitoban, rich and poor, the same dollar benefits of \$204.00 per family and \$102.00 per individual, which, Mr. Speaker, if you may recall back prior to 1969, was introduced by the Conservative administration imposing the same kind of tax on every family in Manitoba whether they earned \$1,000, \$1,500, and there were many at that time, and those that earned \$15,000 and \$50,000, they all were subject to the same kind of premium tax which we, Mr. Speaker, in 1969 eliminated by 50 percent and in 1972 eliminated completely. Now that's something that the honourable members don't wish to take into consideration when they talk about taxes. That was a tax that is eliminated from all, rich and poor, and everybody benefits.

Nor have our programs designed to give real income benefits to the majority of Manitobans been confined to tax measures. Low cost housing has made decent living accommodation available to many people for the first time: The Pharmacare Program, the Pensioners Home Repair Program and the extension of the Health Services to cover Nursing Home Services and Home Care, and the recently announced \$200.00 monthly minimum income for pensioners,

RESOLUTION 11

(MR. SHAFRANSKY cont'd) have improved the lot of our pensioners dramatically. Increases in the minimum wage from, I believe it was \$1.25 in 1969 to \$1.95 in 1974, and I believe there will be some increases, has really improved the lot of those people who have not been able to provide for themselves, because of varying circumstances, that type of guarantee of income which this government has made possible.

The benefits made available under these programs could be compared to the proposals put forth by the Leader of the Liberal Party and others, that additional items be exempted from sales taxation or that the five percent be reduced - the five percent sales tax be reduced. I've enumerated the various benefits that this government has already put into practice. This government cannot support such general measures which give excessive benefits to those who don't really need them while limiting the relief accorded low and modest income groups. A sales tax exemption obviously gives most to those who consume most of the exempted items similarly with no sales tax decreases. The impact would be to give minimal relief to low income earners and excessive relief to high income earners. That is the proposal of the Leader of the Liberal Party. For this reason, we have concentrated our sales tax relief measures on a very selective additional exemption such as shoe repairing, used clothing under \$25.00, used footwear under \$5.00, and used furniture under \$25.00. Mr. Speaker, the measures adopted by this government have been far more effective in ensuring people adequate real income than the measures contemplated in this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, accordingly, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Emerson, that the resolution be amended to read as follows:

WHEREAS the price of consumer goods and services is rising at a less rapid rate in Manitoba than in Canada as a whole; and

WHEREAS the rate of inflation in Manitoba is determined by external forces outside the Manitoba Government's control; and

WHEREAS many of the taxation and other policies of the Manitoba Government have been explicitly designed to provide assistance to those who need it most;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the government consider the advisability of continuing to devise and implement the kinds of policies and programs required to ensure adequate assistance to protect those with little ability to pay against the impact of inflation.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if the honourable member could help me. Is he suggesting that the resolution as it now stands be deleted in its entirety.

A MEMBER: After the first whereas.

MR. SPEAKER: That's missing. The amendment as it now reads indicated--(Interjection)--Very well, Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. When any resolution is treated in that manner where after the first word everything is deleted, or after the first--that is not an amendment, Mr. Speaker, it cannot possibly be classed as an amendment. I think that it's making an attempt that--that is a mockery of the Private Members' Resolutions and I would suggest . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member may be expressing an opinion but it is contrary to our procedures. The amendment is valid as it was enunciated. Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, when I heard the Member for Radisson speaking I saw the sign on his table there that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Is the honourable member going to speak to the resolution? In that case I shall call it 10:00 o'clock, he'll have an opportunity the next time around. The House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning. (Friday)