

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

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

Before the Orders of the Day I would like to attract your attention to the gallery on my right where there are some 33 Grade 8 students from the Golden Gate School under the direction of Mr. Vanderbossche. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia. And in the Speaker's Gallery this afternoon we have the honour of having Mr. Robert Cliche who is the Leader of the Quebec New Democratic Party, and on behalf of all members of this Legislative Assembly we welcome you.

Orders of the Day

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, before you proceed with the Orders may I lay on the table of the House a Return for an Address for Papers, Votes and Proceedings No. 6, dated February 10, 1966, moved by the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with I would like to direct a question to my honourable friend the Minister of Welfare. Can a recipient of a Medicare card present it to a dentist for his or her dentures, and will the dentist be paid for the set?

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas): Madam Speaker, I'll take the question as notice.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Honourable the Attorney-General. I have received a letter from the Manitoba Hotel Association informing me that they have learned that there will be proposed amendments to The Liquor Control Act to allow cocktail lounges to remain open during the present supper hour closing period of 6:30 to 7:30. To begin with, I find it most unusual that the House should be informed of proposed changes to The Liquor Control Act by way of a letter from an outside body, and I'd like to know from the Minister whether it is in fact the intention of the government to introduce such amendments.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN (Attorney-General) (Dauphin): . . . there will be legislation on The Liquor Control Act. I anticipate it will be here within the next few days.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, the Minister did not answer my question. In view of this letter advising me that there are to be proposed amendments, I would like to know from the Minister is it in fact the intention of the government to introduce such amendments?

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I take no responsibility for the correspondence received by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a further question to my honourable friend the Minister of Welfare, and this too is in respect to a Medicare card. Will MMS pay a chiropractor for his services rendered to a patient?

MR. CARROLL: Madam Speaker, MMS I believe won't pay chiropractors, no, but I think there are other arrangements within the department whereby we pay for chiropractic services directly, the same as we do for dentists and for optometrists and for other services that are rendered under our Medicare program.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, may I ask a question of the Honourable the Attorney-General? Will he endeavour to find out where the leak is in his department, or is that procedure that he encourages these people to discuss this would-be legislation before it comes into the Legislature?

MR. McLEAN: The member's question is quite improper and we'll look after the affairs in the department.

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . is it proper to find out if the affairs of Manitoba should be dealt with here?

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Madam Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Agriculture. On February 21st I entered an Order for Return, requesting information regarding land purchases in the vicinity of the Portage Diversion and

(MR. JOHNSTON, cont'd) . . . the Portage bypass. It's now over a month. Could the Minister tell me when I could expect an answer to this Order?

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville): When the material is ready.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Honourable the Attorney-General. A month ago today, on the 23rd of February, the Honourable Minister introduced to the House the report of the Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders, and it appeared in Hansard of that day. I asked him at that time the question, whether he intended to move concurrence, and he said, "No, not at this time, Madam Speaker, but I will be moving concurrence." In view of the fact that a month has elapsed, I wonder if the Minister could indicate when he intends to move concurrence of that report?

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I'm going to discuss with the Clerk of the House today the matter of having that matter brought on.

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, another question for the Minister of Agriculture. Could the Minister tell me if the Order for Return that I've just mentioned will be answered this Session?

MR. HUTTON: I anticipate so, yes.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon): . . . Order of the House No. 23 on the motion of the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Health. When can we expect the Report of the Select Committee of the House on Denturists and Dental Committee, etc.?

MR. WITNEY: As I advised the House yesterday, Madam Speaker, I have been in touch with the Queen's Printer and they told me it was in the printer's and that it would be up soon.

MR. SHOEMAKER: A subsequent question, Madam Speaker, Is it the intention of the government to introduce legislation based on the Committee's findings at this Session?

MR. WITNEY: Madam Speaker, as mentioned before in answer to the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie, I said that would depend on the reaction of the House.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture, how soon can we expect the amendments to The Credit Union Act legislation to come forward?

MR. HUTTON: Any day.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Health. He said in answer to the question regarding the Committee on Denturists that it would depend on the reaction of the House. Are we to assume from that, that if the report is passed by the House that he will propose legislation, or has he other intentions insofar as that word "reaction" of the House?

MR. WITNEY: If the House passes the report it would be my intention to introduce legislation.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I would like the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources to put his comments on Hansard if he would like to have them, because I'm very interested in having his comments on progress. Things like pension bills for Cabinet Ministers for example, I'd be happy to discuss with him.

HON. STERLING R. LYON Q.C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Fort Garry): I'm always happy, Madam Speaker, to say to my honourable friend, if he's willing to look after reaction, that's fine; we'll look after progress over here.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, then I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Does the bill that he didn't introduce but sponsored so readily last year on big pensions for himself and his colleagues, is that what he qualifies as progress?

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, progress assumes many forms. My honourable friend is so unfamiliar with it he wouldn't recognize it in any of its forms.

MR. MOLGAT: . . . I presume is the form in which the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources recognizes progress?

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the House Leader in the absence of the Premier. Has the government received any requests or applications for assistance, financial assistance, because of the big storm that we recently had?

MR. EVANS: I'll take notice of the question and convey it to the First Minister.

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK, Q. C. (Ethelbert Plains): Madam Speaker, may I direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Health. Has he received the long-awaited report or recommendation from the Manitoba Hospital Commission in regards to the doctors' clinics?

MR. WITNEY: Yes, Madam Speaker, and it is now being considered. At least, I will have it considered by the government and decisions will be made.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Can the Honourable Minister indicate as to when more or less we can expect the policy to be announced?

MR. WITNEY: Within the next two or three weeks, Madam Speaker.

MR. MARK G. SMERCHANSKI (Burrows): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. In reference to the announcement of March 9, concerning the first stage of the pulpwood and sawmill operation in northern Manitoba, is the total amount in the first stage of some \$49 million - is this the total capital investment, or is this a gross projected revenue for the year on \$49 million? There's been some subsequent figures that seem to confuse the issue, and I would appreciate if the honourable Minister could clarify this point for me.

MR. EVANS: The only figures of which I am aware are contained in the statement that I read to the House. My honourable friend can find them there.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: . . . question in reference to that, Madam Speaker, I would like to know, that \$49 million of Stage 1, is this total investment or capital investment or is it gross revenue? It does not state in the report which it is. Could he clarify me on that please?

MR. EVANS: My only comment at the moment is that I think the figure is \$45 million rather than \$49 million, and the reference is to capital investment. There is no reference as far as I know to revenue in my statement.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Health. It would appear that the Manitoba Hospital Commission will have to raise an amount of well over a million to cover its deficit of different hospitals, and this hasn't appeared in the Estimates at all. I wonder if the Minister would tell us how this money will be raised, or won't the deficit of the Manitoba Hospital Commission be paid this year?

MR. WITNEY: Madam Speaker, the deficits that have occurred over the past year, there have been some deficits and some surpluses and they have just been carried from one year to the other.

MR. DESJARDINS: Another question. It is not the intention of the department, then, to bring in any legislation to ask for this deficit, to raise this deficit?

MR. WITNEY: No, Madam Speaker.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I would just like to address a question to the Minister of Education. Yesterday I asked some questions regarding the position of the Winnipeg School Board and the increased grants for teachers' salaries. He at that time referred to a letter that he had sent to the Chairman of the School Board. The part that was read in the Hansard, was that the complete letter or were there parts of the letter that did not appear in Hansard?

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): I haven't checked with Hansard, Madam Speaker, but that was the complete letter, indicating the advice from the legal solicitor to the department, namely that this money could be used as outlined.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for a Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Elmwood.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: How many applications for Medicare Cards were rejected for the years: 1962, 1963, 1964, 1965?

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. CARROLL: Madam Speaker, the information that is being requested is not information that is normally kept by the department. Health costs are just one of the many components of need that go to make up the total needs of an individual or his family. I know that there are some people who require only Medicare and this is essentially the reason that they apply, but of course they could also be in the position of being able to meet all of their costs with the exception of taxes or with the exception of clothing or with the exception of winter fuel or whatever, so what we are saying is, this is only one of the components that go to make up the total needs of a man or his family. We can tell you how many people applied for social allowances and how many were turned down. We can also provide the information with respect

(MR. CARROLL, cont'd) . . . to how many are on Medicare only, if this particular figure is required. Unfortunately we can't provide the information as requested because we certainly can't begin to keep a breakdown of all of these other matters which, as I say, go to make up the total budget and the total needs of a family.

MR. PETERS: Madam Speaker, it seems rather strange to me. I had an Order for Return in a couple of weeks ago asking for how much money they paid out for people under the social allowances for real property taxes, and they didn't have anything on that. Now they don't have anything on Medicare cards. What do they keep track of? This is supposed to be a progressive-looking government. What do they keep track of? Anything at all?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, I would think that every person that made application for social allowance would expect that he or she was going to receive a Medicare card because this is one of the benefits that they all look forward to when they make application for social allowance, so my honourable friend, I think, has suggested that he could return an Order showing the number of applications that were made for social allowance and the number rejected, and then we could assume that the number that were rejected had not qualified for Medicare cards. I'm only speaking for our group; I'm not speaking for my honourable friend, the Member for Elmwood; but I think it would be useful, even if he did that.

MR. PETERS: . . . what he said he will, but it still isn't what I require.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Gladstone.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I wonder if the mover of the motion would prefer if I were to request that this stand on the Order Paper until the First Minister or the Provincial Treasurer is here; or if he cares to move it now I would propose to adjourn the debate.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well Madam Speaker, I don't mind allowing it to stand so long as I have some assurance that the Order will be tabled at this session of the House. I don't want it postponed indefinitely.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed to stand? Committee of the Whole House.

MR. McLEAN: I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following Bills: No. 6, 11, 12, 13, 20, 29, 30, 35, 48 and 49 on the Order Paper under the names of the Honourable the Minister of Health, the Minister of Education, the Minister of Welfare, the Minister of Mines and Resources, and myself.

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

#### COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Bills No. 6, 11, 12, 13, 20, 29, 30, 35 and 48 were read section by section and passed.)

Bill No. 49 . . . .

MR. FRED GROVES (St. Vital): . . . Mr. Chairman, in connection with Bills No. 48 and 49, if you would remember what the gentleman said when he was asked in Committee if we were losing much territory through these two bills?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm afraid I don't remember all the details.

MR. PETERS: It was the Honourable Member from St. Vital that was supposed to do the explaining to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Bill No. 49 was read section by section and passed.)

Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Madam Speaker, the Committee has considered Bills 6, 11, 12, 13, 20, 29, 30, 35, 48 and 49, all of which have been passed without amendments.

#### IN SESSION

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Vital, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

BILLS No. 6, 11, 12, 13, 20, 29, 30, 35, 48 and 49 were each read a third time and passed.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 7. The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, may this item stand, please?

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 53. The Honourable the Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, Bill No. 53 is An Act to amend The Labour Relations Act. If I am correct, this Act was amended in 1963 when I think the legislation of government-supervised strike votes was brought in. I think it was that year; at least it's not very long since this Act was amended to that extent. I thought at that time that this was good legislation. I supported it, and I certainly did not see any need that it needed changing or revising at this particular time, especially so in connection or in regards to the government-supervised strike votes. I think, in my opinion we are retracting from a position that we took at that time, and I think this is not to the good. I thought that a government-supervised strike vote was a good one because here we were assured that justice would be brought about and these people would be treated rightly, and if not, they at least could appeal to this House if necessary.

I clearly remember the representation that was made at that time by representatives of labour in the Law Amendments Committee, and at that time I was amazed and I was astounded by the statements made by the labour representatives. In my opinion, at that time, they didn't show any respect for the government Ministers' positions at all, and I think for any stranger to come in and sit in and hear such a representation, I am sure they would be amazed. I think whenever we have the representation to committees, and especially in reference to government Ministers, that the position of these should be honoured and not be talked of in that fashion.

I don't know why we are having this legislation before us. Is it purely on the grounds of the commission report that we have, which is referred to as the Woods Commission? It seems to me that we are probably being intimidated in bringing this legislation forward at this time. Certainly we have government-supervised votes in all their provincial elections, because they set out the pattern, they set out the people that will look after the work, so why not continue this legislation that we have in effect up until now? I thought it was good.

Then, too, we find in Section 21 (3) Subsection (4), the voting of the constituency is outlined there and we find that only members of unions will be qualified to vote. This is the understanding I have when I read the particular section, and in my opinion this would be wrong, because if we had an industry with a large group of non-members, the members would then be deciding for the non-members. If I am not correct in this, I would ask the Minister of Labour to correct me on it because I certainly would not like to see a situation of this type. Certainly we, as the government, are there to protect the minorities in whatever way we can, and in whatever way of life we find them.

Then also, I notice in some of the other sections that you were providing for a mediator and were also providing for the payment of a mediator. In my opinion, this can mean that we will have long drawn-out disputes, because if the government is going to foot the bill there will be no rush to concluding these matters. And I can see where this, because of this, there will be a tendency to have longer drawn-out disputes. Before, the costs of these matters were borne jointly by the employer as well as the employees or the union.

Then, also, I find that the result of a strike vote will not be binding. Just what is the use, then, of having a strike vote if it's not going to be binding? Is all this work for naught? I certainly could not subscribe to that.

I am sure there will be other members speaking on the bill and they will probably take quite a different attitude from what I'm taking. I know that I've heard members of this House speaking already who have spoken on this, and they all seem to butter up as much as possible; apparently they're all . . . . for the labour vote in the next election and they are trying to smooth things over. In my opinion, this is nothing but to please the labour bosses, and I doubt whether the labour union members as such are really after this. I think it's more a matter of just pleasing the ones that are in office and who hold office.

So, Madam Speaker, I intend not to object to second reading; I'd like to hear representation in Law Amendments. But I'd certainly reserve approval on third reading.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (St. John's): Madam Speaker, I presume that, having heard the Honourable Member for Rhineland, the government is now certain that it is right in the amendments which it proposes for Labour Relations Act, and if that gives it any solace,

(MR. CHERNIACK, cont'd) . . . then I don't intend to provide any additional.

I had occasion to deal in a general way with our attitude on this Act yesterday under Labour estimates, and I don't intend to dwell at any length on these today. We will certainly have something to say about the particular sections and subsections when we come into committee. But there are a few matters of principle which I would like to set forth - and again, I dealt with it yesterday. I objected then, as I do now, to the principle that the employer should be entitled to become involved in discussions on questions of certification and on revocation, making the point, as I did, that the people involved are the employees who do or do not want a particular organization to bargain on their behalf. It is not for the employer to decide or help to decide who shall bargain with him. It is up to the people affected to decide who shall be the bargaining agent, and to permit the employer to enter into the picture for any purpose other than to give information, or to discuss and debate and have a full interest in determining the nature of the bargaining unit -- that is, the types of employees that would be involved in one unit, that is something the employer has a right. But when it comes to discussions as to whether the bargaining or proposed bargaining agent is the proper body to represent the employees, I say that the employer should not have a say; and to the extent that there might be differences of opinion amongst employees, the purpose of the Labour Board is to determine which is the proper representation based on a proper assessment of the matters that appear before it.

Now the Minister of Labour said, "Oh yes, they are -- the employer should be entitled because he is one side of the agreement." Well he is really one side of the table, and I think this principle puts him on both sides of the table and gives him an opportunity to discuss, firstly, who shall represent the people with whom he will bargain; and secondly, then to have the right to bargain. I say it's wrong. We were dealing with the question of the vote on certification and the Honourable Minister said something to the effect that this is such a complex . . . .

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour) (Osborne): Madam Speaker, on a point of privilege. We were discussing the principle of this particular Bill 53, are we not? Voting on certification? This is pertaining to strike votes and mediation, changes in unfair labour practices. I don't think we're really discussing the points that the honourable member is talking about.

MR. CHERNIACK: Madam Speaker, I appreciate the sensitivity of the Minister on what I may be discussing, but I think what I am discussing are amendments to The Labour Relations Act, and I believe I have the right to point out the inadequacy of the amendments, and I think I have a right to deal with The Labour Relations Act to the extent that the Honourable Minister's bill does not deal with certain important features, and I think I have the right to do that subject, of course, to your ruling. But it is connected with the fact that -- and I don't want to deal with a section, Madam Speaker, but one of the first matters, permitted and prohibited acts, does deal and refers specifically to applications for certification. And it says: "An employer may appear on an application for certification of a bargaining agent." So I don't even know that I'm not talking about the very matter that is before us, Madam Speaker. I don't think we have to enter into a debate as to whether I'm in order or not. I just read from the amendment itself, and since it speaks of the right of the employer to appear, I have a right, I believe, to discuss that.

Now Madam Speaker, further in the proposed amendments there is a provision where the trade union is now barred from seeking by coercion or undue influence, or by any other means, to compel an employee to become a member of the union. Now Madam Speaker, when I mentioned votes on certification, I thought particularly of the next proposal in the amendment which deals with the right of a person, of freedom to express his views as long as he does not use intimidation, coercion, threats or undue influence. And I want to suggest to the House, Madam Speaker, that when a vote is taken on certification, because of the government's policy of recognizing a person not voting as if that person had voted by expressing the negative, then in effect we lose the principle of the secret ballot, because an employee who wishes to curry favor with the employer, or an employee who wishes to indicate loyalty to an employer, can do it readily by abstaining from a vote, and the employer who is involved in being barred from using intimidation, coercion, or any means, becomes aware of the fact immediately that this or the other employee, by refraining from the vote, is actually considered by this Act and by this government as having voted against certification, but I say that this is a derogation of

(MR. CHERNIACK, cont'd) . . . the principle of the secrecy of the ballot and makes it possible for the employer to have knowledge of an employee's vote, or of certain employees' indications for a vote, and by a negative means invites the possibility of that form of intimidation, so that I am pointing out that the danger in the government's legislation on this matter of considering every vote as being a 100% vote and of non-voters having voted against it, they are laying themselves open to this form of intimidation.

The interesting thing is that the next subsection deals with the freedom of speech - the right to free speech - and it says, "Nothing in this section shall deprive a person of free speech." Does that not imply that what precedes this subsection may be an infringement of free speech? If that were not the case, why say, "Nothing in this section shall deprive you of free speech," but the fact is that there is; there is the danger of an interpretation being placed on what an employer or a trade union is doing as being suppression of free speech, and then they come along and say, "Well, don't interpret that as being something that is dangerous to free speech." The mere fact they say so is an indication that what goes before it may have an impact on the free speech idea, and to be particular - and this is something I mentioned yesterday, so I won't dwell on it - the right to inform the public of a labour dispute or of a potential labour dispute, and the right of the public to know that there is a labour dispute or a potential labour dispute is endangered by the very section which says that a trade union shall not try to influence, and thereby may invite an injunction of some kind to prevent this straight bit of peaceful informational publication of the information which the Union possesses and which the public is entitled to know, and I say there that there should be no restriction on a trade union to attempt to sell itself by advertising, just like any other offer of services or commodities has a right to advertise its point of view to the public, advertise its product, if you want to call it that, advertise its message or its purpose, and we must recognize that right and I'm afraid that this proposed subsection will defeat that right. I think the public has a right to know about the grievances or the complaints, and I'm afraid that this could be interpreted by the courts as being something that would be use of means which are contrary to the intent of the section which precedes the one dealing with the right of free speech.

Therefore, I feel that the proper protection that should be added further, is that there shall not be permitted an ex parte injunction, an injunction taken and obtained in the absence of the other party affected. There is no reason in the world why two days' notice could not be given of an application for an injunction so that both sides could be heard, and I say that this is contrary to the idea of something happening tomorrow which is so dangerous that there must be an injunction against it today, but rather that the mere preparation of material for an application for an injunction takes enough days whereby notice could be given, so that to properly protect under this proposal in the amendment, there ought to be a provision for the free right to express one's self and the right to be represented at all hearings of injunction proceedings.

I skip now to the next amendment, which proposes that the board shall have authority to investigate complaints, and I point out that this section, which has its value, does at the same time force an employee to take a choice, and I don't see why that should be necessary. The employee by this Act is given certain rights against an employer. The employer can be taken to court; the employer can be fined; the employer can be dealt with in some way or another; but, if the employee wishes to have the board review the matter, then he gives up all his other rights under the Act and the employee is then bound by the decision of the board, with, I believe, no right of appeal - and I'm quite certain that the decision of the board is final - and there's no penalty involved there against the employer; there is only the requirement that there be reinstatement. And this section deals only with the question of a discharge because of union activity. It deals only with that question and does not bring in the possibility that an employer may be discharging an employee really because of union activity, but, by excuse, because the employee may have come late to work two weeks ago. The fact is, the law as it stands today entitles an employer to discharge an employee for any reason. Giving proper notice, the employee may be discharged. Now we know the threat of this charge is a grave one and the employer, having the right to discharge an employee for any reason, may pick any excuse, such as I say, coming late to work once in a year. That is legal justification, but that employer could really be firing the employee for union activity, and if he says "It's true; I didn't like his being involved in union activity, but he did come later to work last month," then I think the board will be bound to recognize that if there is any other lawful excuse - and I'm saying any lawful excuse; there is nothing in the Act to set up a lawful excuse - then that

(MR. CHERNIACK, cont'd) . . . lawful excuse will bind it, and I would like to think that along with the principle involved in this amendment - which we do not oppose, Madam Speaker, and the Honourable Minister will be pleased to know that the unanimous opinion of the Woods Commission is one which we too accept - a logical corollary to this would be a simple statement that an employee shall not be discharged without just and sufficient cause, and then a trumped-up excuse could not be made use of.

The section which gives the Honourable Member for Rhineland so much pain is the one dealing with the strike vote, Madam Speaker, and this section of course is here an attempt on the part of the government to make up for the panic legislation which it enacted just a few years ago and which the Honourable Member for Rhineland is so pleased with. The fact is, as he says, what good is a strike vote at all if it isn't binding? And that question is a good question. What good is a strike vote at all if it isn't binding?

Well, a strike vote would be important and is important to the union involved. It must hold a vote of its membership to know what its membership wishes it to do, but how it holds its vote and who is entitled to vote is a matter for the Union itself. The Honourable Member for Rhineland made a comparison that the government supervises the votes of elections and that's right, and I say it's right too because the government, which is the representative of the people which elect it, must of course set up the machinery whereby it shall determine the method of voting for its own constituency, which happens to be the Province of Manitoba. By the same analogy, a Union which decides to canvass its membership on its opinion on a certain issue, has the right and indeed the obligation to decide for itself the procedure whereby it shall determine the opinion of its membership and what persons shall be entitled to voice their opinion, and those persons obviously ought to be the members of the Union. If the Union in its wisdom feels it ought to go outside of the union membership and ask the opinion of others, by all means let it do so.

The Union would have the right to come to this House and say, "We're setting up a ballot box next door and we would ask you to express your opinion: should we, or should we not strike in a certain place?" and we would have the right to say yea or nay, or we would have a right not to vote, except for this government which says, "No, if you don't vote on your opinion then you are considered to have voted no." This is where the whole structure of the democratic idea of voting breaks down, because it is not a question of determining what shall we do; shall we strike; shall we not strike? No, not at all. The Minister's amendment says all you are going to do is find out what do the people want. Well if they are just going to find out what the people want and they are not bound by the decision, surely they are the only ones who are entitled to know, to decide who will advise them and on what basis they'll do so.

I submit, Madam Speaker, that the government in its effort to correct the panic legislation a few years ago, having waited for the Woods Commission to bargain out and try in some way to arrive at a unanimous opinion - which they did - are now bringing in a section which still has within it certain basic wrongs, certain basic harmful principles involved in what we have come to look at as certain basic democratic rights, to express and to obtain opinions that are voiced by the body that they represent. I say, Madam Speaker, that there must be a right to a Union and its membership to do the same as any other organization we know in our society, be it political parties, be it social clubs, be it community clubs, be it legislative bodies, or be it companies under The Companies Act. That right has been taken away from the trade union movement by the Labour Relations Act and by this government, and the government is perpetuating this injustice in its present proposed legislation.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 34. The Honourable the Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Madam Speaker, I have no objection to this bill going to Committee but I would like to raise one point. I had an opportunity to check this bill with the Act itself and it seems to raise a section which the Honourable Minister did not explain to us, and that's (g) under Section 4 where the fees will be paid to get a license or permit for installations, and I don't believe this is in the Act itself so it looks like its a new provision. I wonder if the Minister can explain how much the fees are going to be and if it's one of those hidden fees that are cropping into many bills now.

MR. BAIZLEY: Madam Speaker, it will permit regulations and it will permit the establishing of installation fees. It doesn't say, and I don't believe it is the intention to create another licensing body, but it will provide regulatory power that the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council could do that if he deemed it advisable.



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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 56. The Honourable the Member for Lakeside.

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, when I perused this bill and when I considered it in connection with the statute which has been rather frequently amended, and even after listening to the careful explanation of the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture, I still had some doubts about one point which is to me an important one. That's the portion of the bill that deals with the joint committee of a Weed Control District having the authority to cause a harvesting machine to be brought to a designated place and there inspected for a fee, if the committee so decides. It seemed to me from my recollection of this Act and my acquaintance with it over a good many years, that provision was already made for something of that kind, and this seemed to me to be a duplication of effort as well as the possibility that a fee could be charged - it might be rather prohibitive - and that great inconvenience might be caused to the person who was owning the harvesting machine. I am one who recognizes that committees of this sort do not intend and do not usually deal in an arbitrary or difficult manner with authorities of this kind, but it seemed to me that there was a possibility there. So I looked up the present statute and I read now from Chapter 45 of The Statutes of 1961, from what I believe to be the latest amendment dealing with this particular matter. This is Section 3, IX (3) "A harvester - except a harvester who operates his harvesting machinery only on land owned or operated by himself, shall -- no that's not the right one. It's Section 3, IX (1), subject to subsection (2): "Every harvester, immediately after completing any work with a harvesting machine, and before leaving the premises on which the work is done or before travelling upon any public roadway, shall clean or cause to be cleaned the harvesting machine, together with all wagons, trucks and other equipment used in connection therewith, so that seeds of noxious weeds shall not be carried from the premises to other premises or onto a public roadway by the harvesting machine or the wagons, trucks or other equipment used in connection therewith." That's the section that I was thinking about and it seemed to me, it still seems to me, Madam Speaker, that it could cover the matter that is under discussion in the latter part of this bill. I do not urge it as a reason for the bill not going to committee; there are other matters there that the Minister and the districts concerned are anxious to deal with. I make this suggestion now only so that the Minister and his advisors can consider the present Act in relation to what is proposed now, and see if the two of them couldn't be brought into concert rather than having what appears to me to be an unnecessary duplication in an Act that is already pretty extensively amended and begins to get rather difficult to find your way through. So perhaps we can have further discussions on it in the committee stage and I have no intention, of course, of opposing the bill going to committee.

MR. WRIGHT: . . . ask the Honourable Minister of Agriculture a question in regards to The Noxious Weeds Act. In the last few years there has been much concern about the invasion of Manitoba by some new weeds such as Stork's Bill, Crane's Bill, around the Gimli area. Has this aggravated the situation or made it more necessary to have these Weed Control Districts?

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Madam Speaker, before the Honourable Minister closes the debate, we've had on the statutes for many years now, the provision that a farmer whose land adjoins a road allowance is responsible for the cost of removing the weeds to half the depth of the road allowance along his farm. Well, I believe that a lot of those weeds could be brought in by various means through no fault of the farmer himself. In fact, you can find that farmers will cultivate their own lands very extensively and do everything they can to get rid of the weeds on their own land. On the road allowance, of course, it's just left there; and the general experience is that very little is done about it. I was wondering whether in this day and age we couldn't find some other method, I mean to say a more fair method, to make sure that we dispose of these weeds along the road allowances. The weed problems are serious in some districts and I don't think that they are receiving the attention they should. I might even suggest to the Honourable Minister that probably the province should, say, have a field staff over and above what is provided by the municipalities. I think we have to admit that our weed control in the Province of Manitoba is not as good as we would like to see it.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I haven't got the bill before me at the moment but it's a matter of interest to me, because just recently when we had the big storm, the Manitoba Branch of the Canadian Seed Growers Association had their annual meeting at the Marlborough Hotel, so having nothing else to do that day, I attended the meeting. For many years I have

(MR. FROESE, cont'd) . . . been a seed grower myself, so I took in the discussions at that particular meeting. One of the matters that arose at that meeting was this matter of the noxious weeds and the amount of noxious weeds in grain being delivered to the elevators, and if farmers didn't use tarps to cover their grain boxes, in this way they were losing a lot of, or scattering a lot of weed seeds, and the question came up whether there wasn't legislation on the books in this respect. I had always thought I had read somewhere a notice, I think it was in the elevators if I'm correct - the Minister can correct me if I'm wrong - to the effect that there is some legislation on the Statutes at the present time. I think the Honourable Member for Lakeside has already touched on it. These people, the Seed Growers especially, are very much concerned with the scattering of weed seeds, especially along road allowances and along the roads, on fields that they normally consider quite free of weeds and where they try to raise crops of seed grain, and then find out that next year when they have seeded clean seed, pedigreed seed on these fields, that there's a lot of weeds growing up, and in most instances these weeds were scattered probably by trucks taking down their loads of grain to the elevator and not having them covered, the wind will take off the seeds and scatter them all over. So this was a matter of their concern at that time and I thought I'd just raise it at this point because it definitely has a bearing on it, Madam.

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, to answer the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks and the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains, and the Honourable Member for Rhineland - we'll start with the question of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks: Did the emergence of new weeds pose a threat and require a new approach to weed control? The answer is yes. For instance, in the Interlake where this new weed found its beginning, we have formed a Weed Control District, and under these districts, where one municipality or more form a Weed Control District of at least 12 townships, we assist them in paying a full-time weed control inspector whose job is two-fold; enforcing the regulation through the summer but his winters are taken up in an educational program, and it doesn't seem to matter how much legislation we have on the subject, the real solution to the program is one of education, and we have the greater part of the agricultural area of Manitoba now covered with Weed Control Units with full-time weed inspectors, and in many cases they have assistants to help them and they are doing quite a good job. There's still a lot of work to be done, of course, but through their efforts we get municipalities changing the construction of the roads, for instance. Instead of just leaving a deep ditch that is difficult to maintain, they go right out and in many cases I have seen the municipalities co-operating in this weed control program to the point of removing the fences, taking all the blow dirt out, building the road with gentle slopes so it can all be mowed and looked after. Not only that, many of the municipalities in these Weed Control Units have adopted a road allowance program of weed control where they go out and through the use of chemicals at the proper time keep the weeds under control.

The problem of trucks carrying grain without tarpaulins or properly covered has been a big problem, but I think we have got the answer there, because we've recently just completed a little film in which we are stating the success of winning this argument with the farmers. It shows that in a very short distance at 40 miles an hour, or 30 miles an hour, or 20 miles an hour, the relative loss from a load of grain in wheat, oats and barley, and one trip that I recall the owner lost 20 bushels of wheat off the top of a load, just about enough to buy himself a tarpaulin; certainly enough to pay him for taking the trouble to pull it over. But it very dramatically illustrates the advantages to the farmer, the economic advantages of taking the time to buy a tarpaulin and use it. And we feel that when we have gotten widespread distribution of this film throughout the province it's going to make a marked impact.

All these things take time, however, but I can report to you that the situation today in terms of weed control as carried out by municipalities is ever so much better than it was 10 years ago.

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

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Department of Municipal Affairs.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Chairman, last night I was up on my feet for about a minute when the Acting Premier blew the 10:00 o'clock whistle and I was cut off my feet. I have regained my feet again and endeavour to say what I had to say last night - and a little more, because I've had more time to think about it.

I started off yesterday with accusing the government of not having proper liaison between the different departments. It seemed to me that each department has a policy that it follows on its own without proper consideration with other departments of the government. Several years ago -- I have a very good example, about three years ago, that famous pharmaceutical bill was one good example. Last year we had examples like that and this year again we come up with the same. And yesterday was a very good one when the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs stated that there are no taxes being ear-marked for a specific purpose, which contradicted the First Minister because two years ago the First Minister said, "This is a tax especially designed to alleviate hospital expenses." And subsequently in the papers it was reported that some of the members on the government side went around the countryside and said the Liberals opposed this new tax which was supposed to alleviate the hospital premium, or prevent the hospital premiums from rising. So there isn't.

Now, during the last Session I made a statement in this House that through government action the municipalities would be compelled to increase municipal tax burden. And this has come about, because as I said previously in this Session, the tax has been increasing by leaps and bounds in the last eight years; and in spite of what the present government promised that the tax burden will be alleviated. I also said at that time that the government was going to make the municipal men the scapegoat. By that I meant that the government members, government candidates, could presumably in the next election go among the people and say, "Here we, the progressive government, we are trying to reduce your tax burden and those bad, bad municipal men, they don't know any better; they are constantly raising their mill rate." And that's what they could say and they could cite one example, the tax rebate, and so on, and still your municipal men are the bad guys. They are the scapegoats.

Now, why are the municipalities forced to increase their mill rate, and some have been forced up to about, to increase the rate up to 6 mills on the dollar, from 2 to 6 mills on the dollar? We had some -- I can mention specifically some, the City of Winnipeg, there's Portage la Prairie, the Franklin Municipality -- they all had, and there are many others; they all had to increase their mill rate and this is -- I will say that the government is directly responsible for this because these municipalities were compelled by government action to do it. As I said yesterday, the government, or the municipalities, are now in a situation where they must levy tax on the property of owner to collect taxes to pay the taxes that the Provincial Government is imposing on the people and on the municipalities. And I gave that example yesterday, as the light bill - the government has a tax on light, the gas, the phone, telephones, our utilities. There are others. And that is one reason why the municipalities have to increase their tax. Another reason? The government cancellation of the 10,500 municipal grant. The government had cancelled that, and that imposes a hardship on the municipalities and they miss it. True, the government can say that we have taken over some market roads in lieu of this, instead of that. But that is not sufficient.

Now a third reason why the municipalities were forced to increase their tax, was the government's refusal to give financial support to all market roads, the construction and maintenance of all market roads - this has been mentioned yesterday - within the municipality, and especially these roads that are used as bus routes in divisions or in any consolidated school districts. I remember four years back there was a special statement issued by one of the departments - I am not quite sure but I think it was the Department of Education - that all bus routes would be snow-plowed free of charge. That has gone by the roadside. It has been withdrawn by the government.

Now, last night, just before we adjourned, the Honourable Minister, in answer to my Leader, told us that the municipalities are happy with the new arrangement in regard to some of the main market roads being taken over by the present government 100 percent. I agree that they are happy with that part of it, but the balance of the market roads was thrown back to the municipality as a complete responsibility to the different municipalities. And time isn't standing still. The municipalities have to keep constructing new roads, especially on account

(MR. TANCHAK, cont'd) . . . of divisions and the consolidation of larger schools. The Minister says then, "The municipal men come up to me and they tell me they are happy with this arrangement." No doubt there may be some happy with it but there are many, many that are not happy with this new arrangement, and they may be some municipalities that could be classed in the category of preferred treatment, I do not know. And they probably would be happy if they have preferred treatment. But I know my municipality isn't too happy and many others are not.

Now this tax rebate; it does not lower the mill rate as far as the municipality is concerned. The Honourable Minister says, "That's right." It does not lower the mill rate and we all know that. In fact, the municipality must make levies to make the taxpayer pay for this rebate so that the municipality could forward this rebate to the government so that the government could give it back to the taxpayer. What a merry-go-round, and a very expensive merry-go-round! So the municipality still must levy and the tax rate had to be increased. That's why the municipalities are not happy. And although some of the taxpayers, most of them, know that they'll get a tax rebate, the fact is there that the mill rate is up. The fact is there, and the municipalities are still being blamed: "Why is our taxation constantly rising on that?" And I would say that this government cost the municipality money, a lot of money, and compels the municipalities to increase their property tax.

There is one more thing I would like to mention before I sit down and it is this matter that we've had before us practically at every Session, and it is the matter of Daylight Saving Time. It is compulsory in Manitoba now. From the last Sunday in April to the first Sunday after Labour Day, daylight saving time is compulsory. After this, 'til the end of October, it's a matter of option. The municipalities, they have their option of staying with daylight saving time or going back to standard time. We know last year that Winnipeg continued with daylight saving time during this optional period but many of the different municipalities in rural areas did not; they went back to standard time. Now this caused an awful lot of confusion. Travellers, tourists and residents had no idea what time was observed as far as one municipality was concerned and another one. They travelled from one to the other and had to keep on asking, "What is your time?" They'd tell them, "Twelve o'clock." They look, "Oh, it's only one." Then they go through this one municipality, they go on, and say, "What time is it? Oh, the time here is one o'clock." And there is utter confusion all the way through.

I can cite you some examples: Some municipalities continued with daylight saving time for a week or so; there was confusion; then they thought that the neighbouring municipality reverted to the standard time, so this municipality changed, went back to standard time. In the meantime the other municipality decided to reverse its position and went back on daylight saving time. And that added to more confusion than ever.

I'll just give you one example - I have several here - what happened. Some of it may be on the humorous side. I know one party that missed a court case (it wasn't very humorous as far as he was concerned) by just exactly one hour, on account of this confusion between daylight saving and standard time. He missed his court case and had to take the consequences. Now I know of another couple - and these are true examples - wishing to get married. Now, it is terrible. They had to cool their heels for a solid hour before the altar.

MR. SMELLIE: Did they change their mind?

MR. TANCHAK: We're coming to that. They were waiting for a minister from a neighbouring municipality who was on a different time and didn't know that these people were on a different time. So this groom almost changed his mind about getting married that time, but he still did all the same.

I have another case which also is a true story, whereby the police almost got into trouble. They happened to be in one town, in one municipality entering another municipality; there happened to be a banquet there. They came up there and they immediately said, "You're out of order; the banquet must cease." Some people went home. After the president came and argued with them: "We are on standard time." Well, he didn't know it. And they didn't get into trouble, but almost did. This just shows you that there is an awful lot of confusion. And it is not only in my area; I know in many other areas, and to me it seems that the Minister has shown very little leadership in this matter. He's let this confusion just reign around him throughout the Province of Manitoba. There doesn't seem to be any definite action taken as far as this is concerned.

I have -- and if the Minister wants, some day maybe in the near future, I'll pass these resolutions on to him. I have resolutions from municipalities and from different organizations

(MR. TANCHAK, cont'd) . . . . urging me to present these resolutions to the Minister in regard to daylight time. Last fall I made a survey along the 75 between Winnipeg and Emerson, and between these two points I came across four changes in time. You can imagine what utter confusion this would cause. A short distance, not over 70 miles. And I think it is time that the Minister cleaned house in this regard. We should have uniformity and not confusion. What is the Minister proposing to do about this?

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, last night the Honourable Minister made much about the high rate of tax collection in Manitoba. On the way home I had time to think about this because I remember him when he was first appointed Minister, getting up in the House and painting a rosy picture of Manitoba, I believe it was 1963 and telling us how good tax collections were but he did take the credit for the school tax rebate as being the means to collect these taxes, while as far back as the early 50's in West Kildonan, we had tax collections of 98% but he's right when he says there was a little change last year, because we must remember that the original bill gave the date of December 31st 1965 by which time the taxes had to be paid and this of course, caused people who wanted to take advantage of this, to hasten their saving of this extra amount of \$50. I didn't want to let him get away with that by taking credit for the school tax rebate as giving us the impression that tax collections were good in Manitoba because of this, because they have been good ever since the days when people have been buying their homes with mortgages held by CMHC whereby the mortgage companies make prepayment of taxes at the very beginning of the year, so tax collections have been good a lot farther back than the days of the school tax rebate.

. . . . . continued on next page

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon): . . . . to join in congratulating some of the people employed with the municipal department. I would certainly like to extend the very best and agree with the Minister when he says that we have a very good Deputy Minister. I'd certainly like to extend that to the rest of his staff and I'd also like to extend that to the Assessment Branch. We had the opportunity of working with this branch in the Town of Steinbach a little over a year ago and they really did a good job down there. I think we only had about 32 appeals out of an assessment of roughly \$7 million or so. I think this is very good work. But I am a little bit concerned in regards to the costs that seem to be rising all the time and especially I'm referring to the assessment branch now, I think taking for example the Town of Steinbach, their costs rose from about \$7,300 to \$8,800 this year. I believe there was a similar rise last year. I have sometimes wondered and maybe the Minister can answer this later, if your assessment costs are based on an hourly rate or on the assessment, or on the population or what? I don't know and I would appreciate an answer on this. I think there was quite a concern shown by the urban municipalities annual meeting last fall at Fort Garry, I mean the concern of the cost of assessment costs rising, and I wish that - possibly the Minister can answer some of those questions.

Also another point on assessment - I was wondering although I feel possibly I know the answer, but I'm not sure, that is in regards to do rural municipalities pay on the taxable assessment only, or is the assessment of farm buildings included in these levies?

I was glad to hear the Minister suggest last night when he mentioned that a revolving fund may be set up to permit the Manitoba municipal corporations to borrow money at lower rates of interest and I hope this can be established in the near future. I was just thinking what possibilities this might have along the lines of the, like the school board possibly getting some of their loans through the pension plan monies. I was wondering if this possibly might, or if this might be possible also for the municipalities.

Quite a bit has been said about the tax rebate. I don't intend to add very much more but I think if this is added to the tax collections - and I do not want to say that it hasn't because I think it has in some way - but I was just thinking if it has helped that much - although I would have to go along with the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, but I think this percentage is possibly not so very much, but whatever it is, it is appreciated. But if this has already helped, I'm just wondering how much more it would have helped if the municipalities themselves had collected this money. On a basis of some people waiting from 3 to 4 months and also on a basis of especially some of the older couples, a lot of them will not pay their taxes, possibly stall them for a month or two for the sake of not having that last \$25, 35 or 50, and they could have maybe paid their taxes even two months sooner if this rebate had been given to them direct at the municipality level.

Well I guess the Minister was a little bit disappointed last night when we realized that the education department allowed or set aside \$10 million and I think he mentioned last night that this would now possibly come to the amount of about \$10 million instead of the \$7 million that was originally figured. I am a bit surprised that it is out as far as \$3 million and it even makes me feel suspicious as to what percentage of this \$3 million, or what amount of this \$3 million may be administration costs and I do wish that possibly the Minister could tell us or give us some idea of what these costs actually were.

When the Minister mentioned last night that he knew that municipal rates are going to go up and keep on going up, I wonder if he can also tell us how much more the taxpayer can really stand? I think there is a limit and I'm sure he knows there is a limit, but I do hope that there are solutions coming forth soon.

Also the discussion last night between my Leader and the Honourable Minister, I was really wondering, the one previous speaker mentioned partly, how much are we really better off with this new system? I realize it was intended to be put on a trial basis on a 2 year basis, and possibly we have only tried it one year and we shouldn't be in too much of a hurry to judge it at this time, but I'm wondering if some of the progressive municipalities - and maybe I shouldn't mention any names of municipalities in this respect - but I think some of the municipalities that have been quite progressive and successful over the last 10-15 years, and especially those municipalities where not roads so much in the like are involved, possibly only some of the capital investments -- I could give an example - the Town of Steinbach for example. We have sure certain designated streets that would come under this capital investment but really, if the town has been or this municipality in this case has been in a fairly good shape previous to this setup I think quite a few municipalities have lost substantially. I would be interested to know what percentage are in the same situation as

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd): this municipality that I was referring to.

I don't think I'll say very much about Daylight Saving Time; I believe the Honourable Member of Emerson has covered this well. I am happy that I got married at the old time and I was on time and I possibly -- but I want to agree with him, this thing is of more concern in some of the rural areas than possibly a lot of them think it is. I don't think we should take the matter lightly for some future reason. It seems to me we should have thought of the fact that more uniformity might have been stressed.

I'd just like to leave with two questions that I thought maybe the Minister could answer - I was going to ask while I was on my feet. The one is in regard to the announcement of the Manitoba Development and Loan Fund, that it's now extended to I believe, a September date. Now I know, I asked the Minister and he told me it was extended and I appreciate that, but I believe municipalities should get a formal notice, especially those that are having projects under these conditions, and I was just wondering why the department had not sent out notices. Also I would like to ask the Minister before I sit down, if there will be an extension on the April 15th deadline date of municipal budgets.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, my remarks will be very brief this afternoon on this Municipal Affairs Department. I'm sorry I was unable to hear the Minister in his opening remarks. I was not able to be present last night. First of all, I would also like to extend my congratulations to the Department officials of the Municipal Affairs Department. I have had every co-operation from them and they have I think, gone away beyond their duties in order to accommodate me and other people that I know of. So my heartiest congratulations to them.

The Municipal Affairs estimates are not as high as some of the other departments but I think they are of importance to us and my remarks this afternoon will probably be more in the nature of questions than in comments so much. The grants in lieu of taxes, I'm interested from the Minister to know just on what basis are they paid. Do the various municipalities do their own assessing, since we are dealing with more than one municipality are the assessments on the same level, or will we have one municipality probably assessing them at a higher rate and consequently we will be paying them more in lieu of taxes? Also in connection with this, is the business tax included in some cases - does this apply?

I had a discussion with some people in connection with the matter of having an investment authority similar to what has been set up now under the Canada Pension Plan to receive monies and disburse them and make loans to school districts and so on. Has the government given thought to having something similar for municipalities, because I notice a good number of the municipalities are in fresh condition. Apparently this is what we were given to understand at the meetings that we held last summer in Brandon and Winnipeg and Swan River, that they didn't want to see any changes, that they were well financed and well fixed - whether it's actually that way or not I cannot vouch for. But it would be interesting to hear on this matter because municipalities if they want to go into a certain project and have bonds on hand, this probably means disposing of them and probably at a time when they'll have to take a loss for them. I think a centralization agency of this type where they could be interchanged and where they could deposit these bonds with and probably borrow for shorter terms if they so desired, at a set interest rate, it might work out very well. Also the matter of liquidity would come into play here because the municipalities would not naturally have to have as much cash on hand or as much liquidity; they could afford to invest more when monies are not needed on the spur of the moment. This is one matter I would like to have some information on, if he has any to give.

Then on the matter of the municipal boards, just what are the functions and how all-inclusive are they? We have heard references made on a number of occasions when discussions took place at the meetings last summer and on other occasions of matters being referred to the Municipal Board. Could the Minister outline the functions of this board and just what they all entail. I have attended meetings in connection with applications made - I forget whether it was this department or whether it was the Highways Department, in connection with access roads to highways and I thought it was the Municipal Board that was ruling in this; probably it was another one. I think the Minister can inform us on this. Because here too, I think this is a matter of importance - people having valuable property along highways and are unable to get access connections to the properties. They are very hesitant about giving access crossings to these properties at the present time and so many people find themselves being refused. Apparently the reason given is they don't want to have too many accesses to the highways in order to avoid accidents and not having too many people get on to the highway; that they prefer

(MR. FROESE cont'd)... to have parallel side roads. But this matter of having parallel side roads generally is then up to the individual to get a road constructed and the cost is his, so that few people will go that far and therefore then they cannot develop the property as they should. I think this reduces the value of the property... as well. I certainly would like to hear from the Minister on this. If it's not within his jurisdiction well maybe this can be referred to another time.

I also noted there is a section dealing with research. Just what is the research that is being carried on by his department? Probably he gave a report. If he did so I'll read up on Hansard once I get it.

Then the other point I'm interested in is the Winter Works Program. I note we're budgeting \$150,000 under this item. What is the formula that is being used and how is the program getting on? Is it worthwhile? Is it something that we should encourage? Should we do more about it or is it satisfactory the way it is being run at the present time? I think these are just some general questions that I would like to see answered. If the Minister can do so I'd be quite happy.

HON. ROBERT G. SMELLIE, Q. C. (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Birtle-Russell):... last program to which the honourable member referred?

MR. FROESE: The intent of Winter Works Program.

MR. SMELLIE: Mr. Chairman, I will attempt to answer some of the questions that have been raised by honourable members if I can.

The Member from Emerson indicated that municipal taxes are increasing by leaps and bounds. Then he went on to say something - at least he left the impression with me that the government says that "Oh, it's not us, it's those bad municipal men who are raising taxes." I certainly want to say that I at least have never said this and I'm certain that no other member of government has ever said anything of this nature. In fact I think that exactly the opposite is true, that I think the municipal people of this province and as well the representatives of school boards in the Province of Manitoba, have done a remarkably fine job in holding the line in municipal taxes. I think if you would care to compare municipal taxation and school taxation in this province with those of any other province of Canada and compare it as well with the units of service given by those local governments that you will find that we have something to be proud of in the record of public service in local governments in this province.

Municipal men, in general, have done a remarkably fine job in holding the line on the taxes on real property. Their record will compare favourably with any other province in western Canada, certainly.

Then he went on to say that the tax rebate does not lower the mill rate and certainly it was never intended to lower the mill rate. And as I said last night every level of government has been faced with increasing costs; every level of government has had to increase their spending; but I think too that honourable members will have to take into account the fact that people today are demanding an increased level of services from governments at all levels, than they were satisfied with 20 years ago. And certainly honourable members on the other side of the House keep urging this government to increase their level of services on many, many occasions, and exactly the same pressures are being applied to municipal governments, to school boards throughout the province. I don't think we can be critical of them for the fact that mill rates rise from time to time. I think on the other hand that it's time some of us took a look at how little those mill rates have increased compared to the level of services that are being offered for the taxes collected by local governments. I think that if you really take a look at what is being done, you'll be proud of the job that's being done by our municipal people and our school boards throughout this province.

Then he came to the question of Daylight Saving Time, Mr. Chairman, and he suggested that I had shown very little leadership in this matter. Well, I'd like to draw to his attention the leadership that was shown by one of the other members of this House who went out and organized the school division in his - one of the school divisions in his constituency, and had the school division board approach the different municipalities and ask them to pass by-laws that would keep them on Daylight Saving Time for the same time as the Metropolitan area of Winnipeg. And he's the only member in this House that did it. I say to you that member showed leadership. And they had uniformity of time within his area because he was willing to go out and take the leadership in that particular area and show to the municipal people that there was some desire in the area for Daylight Saving Time for the longer period. I think that if my honourable friend is concerned about a difference in time between his area and the Metropolitan area, that



(MR. SMELLIE cont'd)... he can go out and show the same kind of leadership that was shown by the member that I've cited.

Mr. Chairman, the Member for Seven Oaks I think misunderstood what I said last night when I referred to the impact of school tax rebates on tax collections. The tax collections in the Province of Manitoba have remained at quite a consistent level for a number of years and I could give you the percentages collected in the various years from 1955 to 1964 inclusive when the lowest percentage was 98.97 percent and the highest percentage was 103.23 percent of the taxes levied in that year. But they have been fairly consistent and within that range in every year. I don't argue with that and I'm not really saying that more taxes were collected in 1965 than in previous years because as yet I don't have the figures on that, but what I did say was that the taxes were paid earlier in that year than they were in previous years and that many municipalities who previously had had to operate on borrowed money, in other words they had had to finance against the revenues they knew that would come in subsequently during that taxation year. Last year many of them report that they did not have to borrow and many of them report that they didn't have to borrow last year for the first time in many years, and the suggestion that I made was the fact that people were entertaining the idea of receiving a school tax rebate persuaded many of them to pay their taxes on an earlier date than they had done in former years. Many of the taxpayers who were paying their taxes at that time expressed this idea to the Secretary-Treasurers.

The Honourable Member for Carillon asked as to how the costs of assessment are apportioned. The costs of assessment are apportioned on the basis of the equalized assessment of the municipalities and all of the municipalities receiving the services of the provincial municipal assessor are assessed their pro rata share of the total cost of the assessment program for that year.

He referred to his interest in a revolving fund. I mentioned last night that a revolving fund is a matter of some interest to me particularly for the advantage of smaller municipalities for the reason that the smaller municipalities don't enjoy the same advantageous rates in the money market that the larger ones do. The City of Winnipeg has no problem or the Metropolitan Corporation has no problem in disposing of their debentures at very attractive rates; but many of the small municipalities find that they have had to pay 6 3/4 percent and some of them haven't even been able to market their debentures easily at that rate of interest. So a revolving fund is certainly a concept that is interesting to the department for the assistance of those municipalities that do have trouble in marketing their debentures at attractive rates. But such a fund will require the co-operation of other municipalities who have monies to invest. We have many municipalities in the province today who have funds invested and as the honourable member pointed out, invested in bonds. I believe it was the Member for Rhineland who pointed out that where they have their reserve funds invested in bonds and the time comes that they want to spend that money, that the price that they can obtain for the bonds they hold is not too attractive and it's sometimes awkward for them to convert their reserve funds into the cash they need at the time they need it. If a revolving fund were to be established it would require the co-operation of municipalities themselves in making their own investments in such a municipal revolving loan fund.

Then the Honourable Member for Carillon asked a question of how much of the \$10 million of school tax rebates was administrative costs. None of the \$10 million was administrative costs. The amount of school tax rebates that have been issued or are likely to be issued in the near future exceeds \$10 million. The administrative costs have been something less than one percent of the total amount paid out.

The honourable member then went on to refer to the rising cost of municipal services; and he and I both know that those costs have been rising. But then he asked the question as to how much the taxpayer can stand. This is a question that perplexed all of us because we know that recent studies - the Economic Council of Canada in the report of John Deutsch recently delivered to the Federal Government, indicates that the problems of provincial governments and municipal governments are now coming to the stage where something has to be done about it because the responsibilities that they are given constitutionally are increasing in cost at a much greater pace than are their revenues from their traditional sources of income, whereas the Federal Government's costs have not increased at the same pace as their income has, and the indication from that report was that soon we must achieve either a redistribution of responsibilities or a redistribution of the sources of revenue and the sources of the tax dollar as between different levels of government.

(MR. SMELLIE cont'd)...

The matter is at present still being studied by the Carter Royal Commission on Taxation and I think all of the provinces, and certainly many of the municipal people, are awaiting with interest the hopes for a report of that commission because we believe that they are going to confirm the report of the Economic Council, and we hope that they will suggest some realistic measures that may be taken for a redistribution of the tax dollar as between the levels of government commensurate with the responsibilities that they have.

His next question I am afraid I didn't get, and if he'd like to ask it to me again I'd be happy to try and answer it for him, but I missed the substance of his next question. I don't really know what he wanted.

Then he asked about the Municipal Development and Loan Fund and the extension of it and why no notices had been sent out. I think the honourable member should get in touch with his Secretary-Treasurer because the notices were sent out to all municipalities approximately ten days ago, and if the Secretary-Treasurer hasn't told the Mayor about it yet in Steinbach, I think the Mayor should ask him if he didn't receive such a notice.

The Honourable Member for Rhineland asked on what basis the grants in lieu of taxes are made, and the answer is that grants in lieu of taxes are calculated on exactly the same basis for government properties as are taxes for properties owned by individuals. There are however certain limitations on the amounts that the government pays in grants in lieu of taxes. For example, on this building the taxes on the land are paid in the ordinary way but the taxes on the building itself are established by statute at \$100,000 a year. Taxes in some of the municipalities are limited in the formula that was suggested by Michener, and where the assessment of government land and buildings exceeds five percent of the total assessment in the municipality, the amount of the grant is limited to the amount of five percent of the total levy in the municipality. This does not apply to any form of taxation except real property tax.

He then asked a question concerning the municipalities of the province, saying that during the committee studies last year we had received some indication that all of the municipalities of the province were in good shape. Basically, I think this is true, and certainly the municipalities told us in no uncertain terms, wherever we went on that committee hearing, that each one of them individually was in good shape. But I could give you, if you're interested, the percentage of their capital debt as compared to their assessments at the end of 1964. For rural municipalities it was 1.1%; in suburban municipalities it was 8.5%; in villages it was 13.2%; in towns it was 14.4%; and in cities it was 15.6 percent. There will of course be some variation as between individual municipalities but those are the averages for all of the municipalities in the province.

Then he asked what are the functions of the municipal board. Well the municipal board has basically three functions: it has the function of the approval of certain capital debt; it has the function of an appeal board from assessments; and it has the function of an appeal board for certain planning functions throughout all the municipalities of the province. If he is interested, the duties and functions of the board are set out in the following statutes: The Municipal Board Act, The Municipal Act, The Public Schools Act, The Planning Act, The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act, and The Manitoba Hospital Services Act.

The question he raised concerning the access to property - this is a function exercised by the Highway Traffic and Co-ordination Board and it really has nothing to do with the Municipal Board.

He asked a question as to what research is being done in this department and I would have to say that the research program in the Department of Municipal Affairs has been a rather modest one, but we have in the last year continued a study that was begun under the ARDA program by Dr. E. J. Tyler of Brandon College concerning the migration of population in rural municipalities. Under the ARDA study, Dr. Tyler undertook to find out if you could relate the people who moved from a rural municipality to any given set of factors, and he began by asking a series of - I believe it was about 30 questions in the beginning and subsequently was narrowed down because some of them apparently were incapable of answering - but he asked the questions concerning every person who moved from that municipality. They were varied questions, such as the racial origin of the individual, his religion, his age, his marital status, the number of children he had, the distance he lived from school or the distance from a railway station or a post office, the size of his farming operation if he was a farmer, and many other similar questions. Then with the use of a computer, they were able to determine what the relationship was between any individual question and the actual migration of people, and they brought the

(MR. SMELLIE cont'd). . . number down to some 12 or 15 questions that apparently had some relationship with the people who moved. It was hoped in this original study that they might be able to, by applying these questions to the people who remained in any rural municipality, to tell who were the people who were likely to move and who would be the persons likely to remain.

Dr. Tyler has since then been doing a study in a little bit more detail, following up the people who moved from the particular municipality in which the study was originally done, to determine from them what reasons they thought were the reasons why they moved and to determine whether or not the answers to his original questions were accurate. Further research is being done to determine whether or not we can in fact use this method as a means of determining not only what the population of a municipality is likely to be after a given length of time but what the characteristics of that population are likely to be. I think all of us can appreciate the advantages there might be to this sort of information to any municipality or school board or to any of our utilities because if we know who are the people that are likely to migrate and who are the people that are likely to be left and what their characteristics are, it may have vast implications in the determining of where services will be placed and what the future policy of the municipality might be.

So, as I say, we have put some money into this program and it's a very modest amount, not nearly as much as we would like to do. It is hoped that we may receive some assistance for this program in the future because the Canadian Council on Urban Renewal and Research has indicated some considerable interest in the research that is being done and it's hoped that perhaps a broader study can be done in the future that may have practical implications for some of our municipalities.

The winter works incentive program that is operated by the province as distinct from the program of the Federal Government is a rather modest one and it's had application primarily in local government districts and areas of that nature, because in order to qualify under the provincial program, the persons employed have to be not eligible for unemployment insurance benefits and either on relief at the time the project starts or would be receiving relief or welfare assistance from the municipality or the local government district if it weren't for the work provided under the program. I think that this program has some value and should be maintained for at least several years into the future. Now this is not the federal winter works program but the responsibility for that program in its continuation of course is a matter for the Federal Government policymakers.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Chairman, I don't hope to win an argument with my learned friend the lawyer - I know I won't - but I'd like to express my feelings on the answers he gave me in regard to daylight saving time. Just as an ordinary layman, not a lawyer, it seems to me that this was the most weird explanation of responsibility of the government that I have ever heard. The Minister who is entrusted with the responsibility of this matter is sloughing it, and what does he tell? He's suggesting that the members individually assume responsibility to bring about a uniformity of time in their respective constituencies. I wonder if this would result ultimately in a uniformity of time throughout the Province of Manitoba if we approached this matter in this manner. It seems to me that this is a very good example of what I accuse the government of.

I said at the opening of my speech that there does not seem to be any team work among the Cabinet Ministers, and now what does the Minister suggest to us? He's suggesting that members individually form their own policies as far as their respective constituencies are concerned and these policies are supposed to help the Province of Manitoba - sort of a scatter-gun effect. I think the Minister is sloughing his responsibility. In my opinion, Manitoba wants leadership and democracy and not anarchy.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry if I took up the time of this House concerning the question of the extension of the Manitoba Development and Loan Fund, but as of last Monday night when we had our Council Meeting our secretary at least did not have it at that time unless - he's only a human being - he may have erred.

Also, coming back just for one question on the assessment basis, I wonder if the Minister could indicate what the difference might be - the costs of assessing I'm talking about now - between the city chartered municipalities - that's using a broad sense - and the other rural and urban municipalities. Basically, the question that possibly the Honourable Minister missed that I was trying to put on the other question that he was referring to, I was trying to compare or find out how many of the municipalities have gained under this new system - we're not under the grant system any more you might say - and also how many of the municipalities may have

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd)... gained. He may not have these figures handy and I don't need a figure right now.

MR. SMELLIE: Mr. Chairman, I'd be quite prepared to check and make certain that Steinbach has received their notice under the Municipal Development Loan Fund of the extension of time for forgiveness.

In the matter of the difference between municipalities with a city charter and other municipalities on assessment, there really is very little. In the Metropolitan area, the assessments are done by Metro for all municipalities regardless of what their type is, and we have in Metro, as you know, towns, we have cities and we have rural municipalities. Those assessments are by and large all done on the same base and it's the same method - the same manual is used by the Provincial Municipal Assessor for all of the other municipalities in the province that come under his jurisdiction. There are still four in Manitoba that do not come under either Metro or the Provincial Municipal Assessor. Those are Brandon, Portage la Prairie, Selkirk and Dauphin.

The Michener Commission recommended that they should all come under the supervision of the Provincial Municipal Assessor. However, when the full cost of assessment was given to municipalities, we asked the Municipal Advisory Committee to assist us in forming policy as to how assessments should be done and which municipalities should be assessed in any given year, and their recommendation to me was that until the level of assessment had been brought up to what is considered to be a satisfactory level for municipalities already under the Provincial Municipal Assessor, that no further municipalities should be taken on.

Now we haven't received any request from the other four as yet. We did last year take on Flin Flon and The Pas because they were having serious difficulty in maintaining their assessment program and the Municipal Advisory Committee recognized this and have accepted it. But with the exception of those four municipalities, the program is as uniform as we can make it throughout the whole of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister a couple of questions. I don't want to prolong the debate, but in the last 20 years the amount of money that a municipal council has had control over in relation to the total budget has been shrinking. In other words the uncontrollables have been rising. By uncontrollables I mean debt charges, schools, street lighting, cost of water and waste removal. These things have been rising more rapidly than the other municipal services.

There has been a school of thought that perhaps in view of this the school boards should become a committee of council. These are what people are talking about in municipal conventions. But I was wondering whether the Minister could foresee this, whether there has been very much agitation for this sort of thing, because it seems to me that the cost of education alone now is the lion's share of any municipal budget and yet the council has no control whatever over that. And yet we see, Mr. Chairman, the style today to ask for city status among places with 15 to 20 thousand population, and in many cases requests for an increase in the number of council members. I'm just wondering in view of this whether or not the Minister has any thoughts about, in the future, school boards becoming a committee of council thereby giving them more control over these uncontrollables.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could give me some information as to whether there is any progress in the case of the people who have cottages around St. Laurent. I think he knows the case where there have certainly been complaints on the re-assessment, the way it was done, the lack of police protection and so on. I think the Minister will recall he had discussion with some of the people down there - I don't remember the name of the organization. I wonder if he could tell me whether anything has been done on this and if this has been settled to everybody's satisfaction.

MR. SMELLIE: Mr. Chairman, it's certainly a common complaint among municipal people that their uncontrollables are increasing and it seems that that proportion of their budget increases in proportion to the total budget almost every year, but I have received no recommendation from anyone, except a few people who didn't really mean it seriously, that schools should be undertaken as a committee of council. Certainly it is not government policy to make any such change and it is not under consideration at this time.

The matter in St. Laurent municipality that arose from cottage owners out there who complained that their assessment was no longer realistic because the levels of the lake had gone down materially, leaving their cottages so far from the lake that they were almost valueless as recreation or sommer home facilities, this matter was certainly checked into. The Assessment

(MR. SMELLIE cont'd)... Department has examined the matter very thoroughly and in any cases where it was thought there was any justification for changes, those recommendations have been made to the municipality.

There was a lack of police protection complained about and we contacted the Administrator of that municipality and discovered that the person who had been appointed as constable in the area had left the area or was unable to act or something - I can't remember what it was - and he was requested to find someone else to act as a law enforcement officer in that area. I've heard no further complaints from the area, so I must assume that the matter has been looked after, perhaps not to the satisfaction of everybody, but at least there has been some improvement.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister tell me if there is better co-operation there between the Administrator and the people of that district because they certainly were not satisfied with his attitude at all. They thought that he was more dictatorial than anything else. I don't know if it's the same administrator and I hope that in this case there should be better relationship and better co-operation between the Administrator and those people.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, just one small item. I notice from Public Accounts, the one that we've got for the last year, there's an item of almost \$11,000 for fees under local government districts. What would this be and how much is included under this item for fees again this year?

MR. SMELLIE: I'll have to get that information for the honourable member. I don't have it here.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, before we leave the Minister's salary, I'd just like to bring up a suggestion of a general nature. This is in regards to the advice given to people on zoning changes. I appreciate that it doesn't come directly under the department, but I wonder if he could not use his good offices to get a standard practice established across the Province of Manitoba with all of the municipal corporations.

In the course of the past year - that is since our last Session - there's been one case come forward that is very obvious and that is with regard to the garbage dump in the Old Kildonan municipality. Last year there was a bill presented here in the House on behalf of Old Kildonan and of West Kildonan and the House enquired, the normal questions that we enquire of here, "Are both municipalities in accord?" We were told, and quite correctly so, that the two municipalities were in accord. What we did not realize at that time, and which I suppose members of the House could not be expected to guess, was that the property in question was immediately adjoining another municipality, that is West St. Paul.

Subsequently, complaints arose from residents of West St. Paul that they had not known that this was going to happen, that this was damaging to their property, that a number of them had residences very close to the garbage dump and would suffer as a result, and they claimed that because Old Kildonan had no residences in that immediate area they had no concern but West St. Paul did. Well I think the whole thing comes back to this question of advising people about changes in zoning. I have had a number of complaints in previous occasions as well on other instances, where apparently what happens is that a sign is put up on a telephone pole, or on a fence post, in the area affected. Well maybe in the City of Winnipeg proper, or in the Cities, a sign on a telephone pole is something that you can readily reach. Mr. Chairman, it's pretty difficult to reach a sign on a telephone pole out in West St. Paul or some of the outlying areas because the telephone poles are down in the field normally and if it's in the winter, it's virtually impossible to reach them.

The other source of information are the notices that appear in the newspapers. Well again I'd like to ask the Members of the House here, how many of them go through those notices in newspapers, to find out if there is any zoning affecting their own area. I think that very, very few people do this. So I think we should arrive at a standard procedure, across the province for advice to people who are affected by zoning and by government decisions.

Would it be impossible to have, for example, a standard practice of where there is to be a change that will affect a certain area, that we notify everyone in that area by letter. This would then put the onus on the individual, if he has a complaint then he can make his voice heard. But surely at the moment, when we say to someone, "Well there was a notice on the telephone pole" - and this is in the month of January for example - we can't reasonably expect them to go and check every notice that appears on a telephone pole in the area. And similarly an ad in the newspaper, while it from a legal standpoint is what we call for now, surely from the standpoint of keeping the people informed, again is not sufficient. I think we would correct

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd). . . a lot of the complaints that arise and we would be helping the people of the province if there was this standard practice of notification directly to the people involved by letter, so that they know exactly where they stand; they won't be caught all of a sudden with a situation that has already been changed and about which they knew nothing and could do nothing beforehand.

So as I said at the outset, I realize that this probably cannot be done directly by the department but could we not take steps to get all the municipalities together, establish a standard practice and then have that followed in all areas.

MR. SMELLIE: Mr. Chairman, I had forgotten what the fees and commissions were that were paid by local government districts. These were Land Titles Office fees. I think that's the matter that my honourable friend wanted to know about.

This question of standard zoning practices in municipalities throughout the province is a really thorny problem and it's one that we have wrestled with for not just a matter of months, but literally years.

The Metropolitan Corporation have one system and the rest of the Province of Manitoba has another system. They are gradually coming closer together and indeed in many cases, the Metropolitan Corporation are asking us to change their system to a system more similar to the one followed under the Planning Act. But when you come to a question of giving advice to people in the area by letter, in what area? If you take an area that is in downtown Winnipeg, what area would my honourable friend suggest, a radius of 300 feet? Within a radius of 300 feet we may have 100 or more owners. We may have many more tenants in that area. We have one situation in downtown Winnipeg; that situation wouldn't help in Old Kildonan because if you notified every owner within 300 feet you still wouldn't have notified any of the people in the Municipality of West St. Paul who were the people who raised their voices in criticism after it was discovered that the garbage dump had been established. It would have required a radius of 1,500 feet in that case; and if you make a radius of 1,500 feet in the central city, the costs of zoning application would be monumental; it is beyond comprehension. And then what would be the legal consequences if you missed two people - and we all know how easy it is to miss a few people in an area like that, because enumerators at election time have occasionally missed whole apartment blocks. It creates real problems in the administrative detail for the people that have to go through this and so I say that it's not easy. There are, however, going to be some changes in the procedure in the Metropolitan Winnipeg Act that I hope will be before the House pretty soon. I don't suppose that it will cover this situation in any event because the situation out in Old Kildonan, basically arose from the fact that the Council in that municipality had somehow or other lost touch with the people. I can't explain it; I don't know what the reason is, but the people in the municipality certainly did not know what council's intentions were and they took very prompt action when the opportunity presented itself last fall to tell the council what they thought of the situation. I sincerely hope that the new council in Old Kildonan will have some closer liaison with the people in the municipality than the last one did. I think what happened there was a very unfortunate affair.

I don't mean by that to criticize the action of council in doing what they did because I believe that they acted in good faith and that they firmly believed and could justify the action that they took. However, I still think that they had some responsibility to maintain touch with their people and let them know what was going on.

The principles that apply to zoning throughout the Metropolitan area, by and large, the yellow placard on property where it is proposed to rezone, is very effective in the densely populated area of the City, because anybody driving past the property and seeing those familiar yellow placards on a telephone pole or a fence, recognize that there is some zoning change about to take place, and those who are interested will stop and find out what it's all about.

Also the zoning notices in the paper I think are quite well read by people in areas of the city where there is a changing land use and particularly if there is a little map or diagram accompanying the notice so that they can see that their area is affected, they'll make it their business to find out what it's all about. In an area like the area of Old Kildonan however, this hardly applies and I couldn't agree more with my honourable friend that you have to have two very different criteria for the two situations. An attempt is being made to work out some system where there can be reasonable notice to people - that is actual notice, not just legal notice.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, according to a press report I have here the largest cheque that was paid to any single person, firm or corporation for school tax rebate was \$22,100, and it says that this firm owned 442 lots qualifying for the maximum rebate on each and every one of them. I wonder if this is a fact or if this is an error, because it certainly does point up that there isn't much principle about the rebate if this is a fact.

I said a year ago that I had a friend who owned 41 parcels of land in eleven municipalities and could conceivably qualify for \$2,200 or something of this kind and my honourable friend said I was lucky to have a friend of that kind.

MR. SMELLIE: You're lucky to have a friend.

MR. SHOEMAKER: I'm lucky to have a friend - my honourable friend is going to be without friends pretty soon I'm afraid if he keeps up a lot of these tactics. But if this same firm or corporation happened to own a single building with exactly the same assessment, he would only get \$50; but because he has got 442 lots, he qualifies for \$22,100.00. Is this a fact, that there was one cheque went out for \$22,100.00? And could he explain the principle then, because apparently there is one, of why a person that has 442 separate lots, why he is entitled to \$22,100 whereas if the same person owned exactly the same total assessed value in one parcel, that he'd get \$50, well then what is the principle?

On the subject of assessment -- Mr. Chairman, they're having a big three conference across the way there and I guess they're going to come up with the solution to my answer of what . . . .

MR. SMELLIE: Mr. Chairman, the answer is very simple. I don't know anything about it. It's the Department of the Provincial Treasurer that looks after school tax rebates and I have no information as to the size of the largest cheque or any other cheque really at the moment.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well then probably over the supper hour he can call a cabinet meeting and they can decide what the principle is then. Surely my honourable friend does attend the odd cabinet meeting.

MR. DESJARDINS: In Neepawa.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Yes, occasionally in Neepawa. They get away to a rest. They've had one out there and they've had one down at a motel here, but I see they haven't had one lately. We were told by my honourable friend the Minister of Mines & Natural Resources that they had a spot within 15 . . . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're discussing municipal affairs.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Yes, I intend to get back to that but now I'm getting interjections from every other Minister except the one that I'm directing questions to. I'll ask the Minister of Education what the principle is in respect to this. Does the Minister of Education want to enter the debate?

Well, Mr. Chairman, I want to get back to the Minister's estimates - despite the interjections from all other Ministers opposite. Now surely my honourable friend can answer this one - what is the relationship in this day and age of the assessed value of property to the actual cash value of the property. Now there must be a relationship - there must be, on farm-lands and on town property; because if my honourable friend tells me there is no relationship at all, then what is the basis for assessing? We used to use, and it was determined by myself more or less, what the relationship was based on sales that we had made in our office. I find the relationship, if there is one, is widening and perhaps my honourable friend can tell me, well the whole basis of assessing - certainly, there must be a relationship between the assessed value and the real value or the actual cash value of property. --(Interjection)-- A magic formula someone has said, Well that should be revealed to the House. If it's a magic one or otherwise we are entitled to know what it is because we are not all magicians.

Some years ago, and I think it was before my honourable friend was Minister of his department, The Municipal Act, I believe, was amended to provide for the erection or construction of fall-out shelters in your basement, or anywhere else I guess as far as that goes. As a result of that, certain people proceeded to build fall-out shelters and they were assured, so I am told - so I am told - that the assessment on their property would not be increased because of the fact that they proceeded to build these bomb-proof shelters. I am now informed that The Municipal Act has been changed and they are now discouraging that, and that in fact the First Minister tore his bomb shelter down. Well that's what I'm told - and I'm asking a question - that he tore it down. He's had some second thoughts on bomb shelters. If this has been changed, then it will change the whole basis for assessment again. Those people that

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd). . . . . have proceeded to build bomb shelters, I suppose, will now be taxed. Well now, their property will be assessed and it will mean increased taxes on this.

On this subject matter of assessments, my honourable friend on one of the few occasions that he came over to our side of the House - and I welcome him at any time - he came over to discuss this matter that I have raised on more than one occasion, and that is that I think it would be an excellent practice that where assessors go out - whether it's on rural farm property or in town property - that they should be provided with calling cards and make completely known the purpose of their visit, because I have had one or two complaints in the Neepawa area and, as my honourable friend knows, I had a complaint from the Springfield area. I don't know whether it is in my honourable friend's constituency but it was from Transcona - Transcona-Springfield. While the Honourable Leader of the NDP is not here tonight to defend his estimates - his estimates - I hope he will be back shortly.

So, Mr. Chairman, perhaps my honourable friend could answer two or three of the questions that I have put to him. I am particularly interested in knowing what this magic formula is and the principle, the principle of the school tax rebate, that is the principle of paying it in this fashion rather than the other.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I can understand the Honourable Minister wanting us to bail him out. This is not the first time that the government has done this on this question of daylight saving time, but I can't understand his lack of concern for the people and the lack of leadership from the government. If the Minister remembers, a few years back I brought in a resolution on this question of daylight saving time and this was declared out of order - we were anticipating. This was done two years in a row and finally the government - and it is the government because it was my honourable friend that sponsored this bill - came in with this question of daylight saving time. He made wonderful speeches at the time. He told us that the main thing, the main thing that the government wanted to institute at the time was this principle of uniformity. He told us then that he wouldn't please everybody, that the government would not please everybody - that was sure.

If I remember right, Mr. Chairman, the year before that they had brought in an amendment. They had asked that - oh, that the urban association and the rural groups and I think everybody but the Shriners and the Knights of Columbus had to give an opinion on this daylight saving time. So when they received this - and this was unanimous from all the people - they proceeded the following year to say, "All right, we're going to bring in this question, the principle of uniformity." And this, I think, made sense. They brought in the question of uniformity but one year after this was all defeated; the government took a step backward. It was worse than ever. For a few months you had everybody the same; another few months the people of Winnipeg by law had to observe daylight saving time; and then the people of the rural points - well it didn't matter, it was up to them.

Now he tells - my honourable friend - that it's up to us to go and organize the people and sell this province. If this isn't the most ridiculous thing that I have ever heard, and this is certainly lack of leadership. This is a government that's going backwards. It announces a principle of uniformity and now with all this trouble that we have with the school children, the buses picking up these different students, and they're all mixed up because one municipality might -- in the same school district that is, certain people are on daylight saving time and others are on slow time.

Well, this is not a thing that we could discuss too long. It is clear that the government will not accept this responsibility in this field; it's clear that it's trying to shove this responsibility on somebody else and try and have the members of this House bail them out; and this is the Minister that's responsible. I know that at the time, after introducing this bill, he said, "Well the government will not stand or fall on this issue. This is not a government business." This is not a government bill but it was a Minister that brought this in, and if it wasn't a government bill, I wonder why - I wonder why my motion was out of order and I wonder why this was in the Throne Speech. This has never been explained to me.

Now when we were talking about this tax rebate, a few weeks ago I guess, I asked the Minister about a special case. I couldn't discuss this too much then, it was just a question before the Orders of the Day, but I think he knew of the case. Now I thought that the principle of this rebate was to help people because their taxes on property might be coming up and up all the time. This was the principle. Now before this was legislation -- and I think that I should explain the case that I'm referring to, Mr. Chairman. There was a citizen of the Municipality of St. Vital - or the City of St. Vital who had received a receipt from the



(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd).....municipality marked "Paid in Full." Later on, the municipality told -- this was for - not for taxes, this was for local improvement. He wanted to pay cash. He went into the municipality and said, "I want to pay all of it now. Give me a receipt." And he did receive a receipt.

Now a little while after, the municipality or the City of St. Vital decided that he still owed money. I am not choosing sides and this is not the point here - did he owe money to the city or had he paid in full - but the point is that at that time the onus was on the municipality or the City of St. Vital to go after this man, to take legal action if they wanted this money back, because he had a receipt and he claimed that this was paid in full. Then when this rebate came in - when this rebate came in, they used this as a club. Now the onus is up to this individual - this was something that wasn't foreseen at all - this is not the principle of tax rebate. He has paid his taxes; he refuses to pay this portion that the municipality claim he owes - and maybe does, this is not the point at all - I am not choosing sides and I don't care about that. But I am interested in the principle. I don't think that it is fair; this rebate wasn't meant for this. If the City of St. Vital or any other city feels that this man is indebted to them, I think that it's up to them to take legal action and I don't think it's fair to put them in a position to hold this club and to hold back his rebate. I would be very interested in listening to the Honourable Minister and what he has to say on this. Now maybe in this case - maybe he's not aware of this case - but I think this is dangerous if we let this condition go. I think it is very dangerous. This is a legal matter. This is a battle between a citizen and the City of St. Vital.

Now when we were talking about this rebate, this municipality - and I think that it certainly should have something to do with the municipality because they accept - they're the one that give the receipt and without this receipt you can't get your rebate. I would like the Minister to tell us if he agrees with the statement made in this House a few weeks ago by the Minister of Agriculture who said that the farmers were better treated in this question of rebate because they were receiving an average of \$150 instead of \$50, although two-thirds - I think it was two-thirds - of the money collected to pay this rebate was collected in the cities of Manitoba.

This was an important statement that was made by a Minister and I think that we should know if this government feels that there is a special privileged class of citizens in Manitoba, or if this was meant as a subsidy for the people living in the rural areas. I am not against these people receiving a fair deal, as I said, Mr. Chairman, but I am against - in this society I am against the existing of any privileged class. The Minister of Agriculture at the time said, "Maybe I shouldn't say this - maybe I shouldn't say this at all, I'll get in trouble." And he said it, and I want to know now what - I don't know if I am talking to the right Minister - I am sure that if I had asked this question to the Minister of Education, I don't think he could have answered because certainly we realize how ridiculous this is to put this in the estimates of Education. I think that the Minister himself realizes this. This is just something before the election to -- this is the government that's been talking about priority and they want to show they're spending an awful lot of money in this field.

So I think that the Minister should give us some information on this and give us the policy of the government on this. We're entitled to know if there is a special privileged class in Manitoba or is everybody treated the same, and if this policy . . . . .

MR. EVANS: I didn't want to interrupt, but I think that the time has come when I must move that the committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the Speaker. Madam Speaker, the Committee of Supply has instructed me to report progress and asks leave to sit again.

#### IN SESSION

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River, that the report of the committee be received.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: It is now 5:30 and the House will now adjourn and stand adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon.