

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

1:15 o'clock, Saturday, May 25th, 1968

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

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'll be very brief indeed. My position is that I do not have the confidence that some members have in the Canadian Wheat Board and the Federal Government in increasing the price of wheat. I think it is up to the provincial legislatures and the governments of the three prairie provinces to put pressure on behind the Federal Government and that we do get increases in the prices of the wheat, because the International Agreement that we've had over the years there is originally very little change from one to the next one. It doesn't nearly do justice to what is required in Canada and that the farmers get a fair price.

Mention is made here of farm organizations as far as negotiations are concerned. I don't think we should spend too much time on negotiations. I think it should be a matter of just the provincial governments pressuring the Federal Government that we'd have increases in prices of wheat, and let's subsidize it if necessary. But I don't necessarily say that it is only a matter of subsidy either, because if they instituted the two-price system this would help some and then we could have, in addition to that, increases. Certainly I don't want to go into the whole matter of the way I would like to see things done because I've explained it on previous occasions, but I think the pressure should come from the provincial governments of the prairie provinces.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to simply put my own position on record as between the two spokesmen for the -- the one spokesman for the New Democratic Party and the other spokesman for the government side of the House. I would be occupying middle ground in that first I would be inclined, and have been for years, to support a two-price system for wheat, agreeing completely with the Honourable Member for Brokenhead in that regard. But the place where I would have to diverge from his point of view is that I would not find it possible to advocate that the extra cost should be applied to the seed used on farms as well, because, Mr. Speaker, more than half in the average year of the domestic consumption goes as feed on farms, and no matter how much attention we pay to the wheat crop - and it deserves all the attention it's getting, it's most important to the economy of this province and to the economy of Canada - but we must never forget, in my opinion, that a sound agricultural policy requires the livestock industry as well, and the livestock industry depends on having a good feed supply and it can not, in my opinion, because of the competition it's bound to face, afford to pay an extra subsidy. So I would agree with the two-price system but it would be only for the part used commercially, not on farms.

I shall not take the time of the House to comment or to enter into once again the debate with my honourable friend from Arthur on the question of who sells wheat, but I would simply say this, that I would prefer to have Prime Minister Trudeau himself explaining his policy with regard to wheat rather than having my honourable friend from Arthur explaining exactly what it means.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education)(Gimli): Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, of course.

MR. JOHNSON: As a practising grass roots wheat farmer, wouldn't the Member from Arthur be very capable in expressing this opinion as well as the Prime Minister?

MR. CAMPBELL: I think all of us, Mr. Speaker, would agree that as a practising and successful and well-informed farmer and wheat grower that the Honourable Member for Arthur is abundantly qualified to speak on the wheat-growing aspect. I consider his qualifications to be considerably less when it comes to interpreting what the Prime Minister said about wheat.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Did the Honourable Member for Arthur have a question?

MR. WATT: On a point of privilege, I was not interpreting what the Prime Minister said; I was merely quoting the press as to what he did say himself.

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

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I want to take some exception to the comments made by the Honourable Member for Lakeside because he was trying to imply that what I was suggesting was going to raise the price of feed to the livestock industry, and that's not what I'm suggesting; it's not at all what I'm suggesting. I'm not trying to imply that they pay an increased cost for

(MR. USKIW cont'd.) . . . . their feed; I'm trying to imply that government should recognize that they should support a certain amount of production in the wheat industry and that's as far as it goes.

Now insofar as the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture is concerned, I want to say that I'm disappointed that he hasn't seen fit to participate in the debate. Either he doesn't know enough about the subject matter that he would delegate his responsibilities to someone else, or that he is not confident that he may present a proper case before the House. And I want to just make that observation.

Insofar as the comments of the Honourable Member for Arthur are concerned, I want to ask the honourable member - or tell the honourable member that I am sure there is no dignity insofar as the farmer that has to do without the basic necessities because he hasn't been able to derive a reasonable income by virtue of the fact that the prices of his product are too low. I'm sure that he isn't dignified if he has to go uptown with patches on his overalls because he can't afford a new pair of overalls.

MR. ENNS: Have you got patches, Doug?

MR. USKIW: And I'm wondering, Mr. Speaker, how undignified it is for oil companies to get concessions in terms of tax relief and for mining companies to get tax concessions. Do they feel indignant about this thing? I don't think so. I want to see cash in farmers' pockets. I'm not that concerned about that question of dignity that my honourable friend from Arthur expresses.

MR. WATT: . . . dignified farmers.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sure no one wants to disturb the tranquility of the House today.

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

MR. USKIW: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. For the benefit of the honourable gentlemen that were not in the House when the matter was being discussed, we are dealing with Resolution No. 15 of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Campbell, Desjardins, Doern, Fox, Froese, Green, Guttormson, Hanuschak, Harris, Hillhouse, Kawchuk, Miller, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Petursson, Tanchak, Uskiw and Vielfaure.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Hamilton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Spivak, Stanes, Watt, Weir and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 19; Nays, 26.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the resolution lost. The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains. The Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains.

MR. KAWCHUK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead, that

Whereas the per acre costs of production have reached a high point; and

Whereas farmers cannot absorb substantial losses because of the high financial inputs per acre of production; and

Whereas losses to farmers due to hail damage may substantially reduce their incomes; and

Whereas under the present Crop Insurance Program farmers could suffer substantial losses due to hail damage and still remain ineligible for compensation under the present Manitoba Crop Insurance Program; and

Whereas it is highly costly to maintain two crop insurance agencies in that there is much duplication of costs which farmers must bear;

Therefore Be It Resolved that the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of amending present crop insurance legislation to provide hail insurance on an individual field basis.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. KAWCHUK: Mr. Speaker, I think we had adequate debate on this subject matter during the estimates of the Minister of Agriculture. I would like to set a precedent for this afternoon. I highly recommend this resolution to this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, because of the last Whereas, it appears to me that if this would apply that it would be a compulsory program and therefore I could not support it.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, if there's any change to be announced by the government with this respect it will be announced in due course, and that's my only comment to this debate.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Yeas and nays please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

MEMBERS: Same division.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. There are vacant chairs and the bell must be rung if you call for it. I've had trouble on that one before.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Campbell, Desjardins, Dow, Doern, Fox, Green, Guttormson, Hanuschak, Harris, Hillhouse, Kawchuk, Miller, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Petursson, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Uskiw and Vielfaure.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Hamilton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Watt, Weir and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 20; Nays, 27.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the resolution lost. The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Wellington, that

Whereas under the Civil Defence Act a "civil disaster" includes "a disaster occurring within the Province from fire, flood, earthquake, tempest or other cause . . ."; and

Whereas "Civil Defence" under the said act includes the organization, establishment and operation of safety measures, controls, facilities, and services of all kinds necessary or desirable in the public interest for meeting, preventing, reducing and overcoming the effects of a civil disaster; and

Whereas it is abundantly clear that in the event of a civil disaster, and also on a continuing basis, ambulance services owned and controlled by the public are of vital necessity;

Therefore Be It Resolved that the Government give consideration to the advisability of encouraging Municipal Governments to establish publicly-owned and controlled ambulance systems by providing municipalities with civil defence grants in aid thereof and making representations to the Federal Government to do likewise.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, if the Leaders of the parties will indicate how their groups are intending to vote, I won't ask for a division, but I ask that the resolution be adopted.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, we do not agree with the third whereas where it says that the ambulances have to be owned by the public and this is a vital necessity. Now in the past we have voted in favor at times for this ambulance. Our standard is still the same on these matters; the important thing is the welfare of the citizens. We feel that if something could be done under the system of free enterprise this is what we want; if it can not be done under this, then we will accept compulsion or public ownership on these things.

Now it seems that the trouble that we've had is in the Greater Winnipeg area mostly. This is not a question because the ambulances are owned by the free enterprise, it's a question that they have to get together, rectify a few things, and we feel that it would be wrong at this time not to give them a chance. We understand that this is being looked into and we will not support this motion at this time.

A MEMBER: You will not support it?

MR. DESJARDINS: Not at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm closing debate. I indicated previously that if the leaders or anybody of the Party would indicate how they intend to vote I would not ask for a division, but if they don't then I am going to ask for a division.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, I hadn't realized the Minister of Health hadn't returned. We can't support the resolution either.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I know that the volunteer organizations throughout the province where you have groups operating this type of service are doing a very good job. I think that they deserve municipal support to some extent and that would be my position.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the resolution lost.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Kildonan. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Logan,

Whereas Section 55 of the Manitoba Labour Relations Act applies only to specifically named employees of the boards, commissions, associations, agencies or similar bodies; and

Whereas many employees of Her Majesty in the right of Manitoba do not have employee-employer relationships and collective bargaining rights enjoyed by employees in the private sector;

Therefore Be It Resolved that Section 55 of Manitoba Labour Relations Act be amended to include all employees of Her Majesty in the right of Manitoba for the purposes of inclusion under the Act, except those covered by the Civil Service Act of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I intend to be very brief. This is a very simple resolution and all it asks is that all employees of the Crown have the same privilege. As you know, we've had some discussions last year in this House in respect of members of the Vegetable Marketing Board who did not come under the purview of the Act, and there were others as well. This year we passed another Bill which would create some more employees in this area and I think it's only fair that they all have the same opportunity to set up organizations and to bargain collectively under the Act of the Labour Relations Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour) (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, very briefly, I think I should state the policy of this government on this issue and the policy is this, that all employees already have bargaining rights where they desire it. This is accomplished in three ways, as most honourable members know, under Section 55 of the Labour Relations Act, under the Civil Service Act and on a voluntary basis where the employees so desire. An example is the Workmen's Compensation Board. I might try and clarify the one issue about the Marketing Board last year, it was the uncertainty of that particular body at that time that caused the problem. And for honourable members I should like them to know that there aren't a large number of employees who are not covered. I did a quick calculation here and those who are not covered by some type of agreement or association is one-tenth of one percent.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Selkirk, Whereas the government has imposed a 5% sales tax on Manitobans, and

Whereas the government claimed that the purpose of this tax was to finance education, and

Whereas the government claimed the purpose of this tax was to shift the load of education taxes from real property taxes to provincial taxes and thereby relieve the burden on the local taxpayer, and

Whereas the government, in 1967, established that the local tax required to finance the foundation program would be 9 mills on farm and residential property and 33 mills on commercial property, and

Whereas most Manitobans considered that this would establish these rates as fixed levies at the local level and that there would be no further increases in the local taxes for education purposes except for special levies, and

Whereas the government has now announced for 1968 a 45% increase in the mill rate on farm and residential property from 9 mills to 13.1 mills and a very substantial increase in the mill rate on commercial property from 33 mills to 37.1 mills, and

Whereas on this basis, further increases in the local taxes can be expected in following years, and

Whereas in addition to the great hardship which this increase imposes on the property owners, there is also considerable concern in Manitoba about the effect on development and growth of a high realty tax on commercial property,

Therefore Be It Resolved that this House request the Government of Manitoba to immediately review the school foundation levy program to establish a fixed province-wide mill rate for education purposes which will not vary from year to year.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I had intended to make a major speech on this occasion because it is a major resolution. I had with me the report of the Michener Commission, the report of the Municipal Enquiry Commission, and it had been my intention to re-emphasize how this has really been the advice of the investigating bodies in the past. I will not proceed today to make any lengthy exposure except to repeat that this is really in the minds of Manitobans a vital matter and one where they really feel that a stop must come. They are not prepared to see a continual increase in the realty taxes, the local taxes for education purposes, and this certainly has been what they expected from this government. The promises of this government had been to proceed with that shift; the shift has not occurred. The imposition this year of the additional 4.1 mills has deeply disturbed the municipal people and, above all, the taxpayers themselves.

When I prepared these resolutions I wrote to every council in Manitoba and I received a large number of replies which I have here, Mr. Speaker. Of all the replies that I have received, every single one of them was basically in favor of establishing a fixed mill rate. Two were not; one on the basis that they didn't want to get involved in politics, and the others on the basis that they couldn't see how it could work. Well, I wasn't going to detail the source of these. I happen to know the particular gentlemen involved in the replies that were made and it appeared to me to be somewhat political in reply. However, be that as it may. Every other reply, Mr. Speaker, was strongly in favor of this.

I recognize that you couldn't establish a rate and hold to it forever. Michener recommended, as I recall it, that there might be a review every five years. This might be a method of doing it, but certainly, Mr. Speaker, to proceed with increases every year - which is obviously what is going to face us now - is not realistic; it is not what the public expected; it certainly was not inherent in the recommendations of this government at the time of the school division vote; and the people of Manitoba feel that they have been let down by this government. This could cause us very substantial difficulties in developing better education in the future, because that resistance is going to grow towards this method of financing education. I recommend this resolution to the House.

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

MR. JOHNSON: I think this deserves a few words anyway, and I again was prepared to enter into a lengthy debate on this matter but I'll cut my remarks short too.

I'm most concerned about the letter that was sent out by the Leader of the Opposition to all the municipalities because it did imply that we had not come clean a year ago in the 9-33. It's in the White Paper; I have reiterated in the past and I won't read it back to my honourable friend. He knows perfectly well that the sales tax went into the consolidated revenue. He knows that we were attempting to do what we can to assist the local homeowner with his taxation in the view of rising costs. He knows that there are more services being offered. There is more transportation; he knows that inflation is one of the factors in rising prices; he knows that the province, that this country - and it's an international matter, this money matter; and he knows I'm sure, as every member of this House knows, that we must do everything within our power to maintain a tight ship in education, to try and get the very best services within our ability to do so, that we can't really at this particular time completely abandon real property as a source of revenue.

However, I have had many letters from the municipal people too, bringing the honourable member's resolution to my attention. I have replied by sending out copies of the statement made in this House a year ago; namely, in the White Paper, to make abundantly clear that there was no attempt to mislead the public. I would hope that this message comes through loud and clear to the people - the municipal and other people throughout rural Manitoba.

One of the big things I want to emphasize to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that he must know, one of the great features of the Unitary Division Plan - and I know it's one of the main reasons he supported it - and that it was a measure of equalization of costs throughout rural Manitoba. I need only take the Division of Turtle River which he represents with a total expenditure this year of \$1.3 million. The provincial share was 1,048,000. The total grants were 1.1 million; 73 percent of the educational cost in his division was covered. The mill rate, had their been no injection last year, would have been 111 mills in Turtle River constituency this year, and the best, although it's in many municipalities, the best average rate we

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd.) . . . . can reckon are about 39 on residential and 60-odd on commercial.

Now, no one on this side is minimizing the importance of keeping the costs of education within our ability to pay; no one is denying we have to take all those measures we can to develop the best possible educational system in concert with the trustees across this province; but we all agree that we have to try and give more and more opportunities to our boys and girls. And I would just say in rejecting this resolution that our position of the government has been made amply clear at the time of the introduction of this Bill and I would therefore say that we would have to vote against this resolution most emphatically.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I'll try to be as brief as the previous speakers. We were going to bring in an amendment to this resolution, but at this late stage of the game it seems useless. We do feel, however, that the motion presented by the Leader of the Official Opposition misses the main point, and the point established by this government when they introduced the Foundation Program. It was to shift the burden of taxation, and if you accept the principle of a fixed mill rate, you are freezing this shift that the government promised and which all of us would like to see, certainly on this side of the House, because the Foundation Program was supposedly a step in the direction of freeing the local property owner from having to pay for the standard educational system in Manitoba. This special levy was supposed to look after these extras that the individual school divisions required. But the Foundation Program is a standard basis of basic education and that was to be paid by the provincial government and this was a step in that direction. By fixing the province-wide mill rate for education, and on top of that then having the special levy, isn't going to achieve it, and our amendment would have called for what we called for in the past, that the province undertake to pay the Foundation Program through the Consolidated Fund of the Provincial Treasury.

Now they can tell me that they haven't got the money, but I can tell them that the local taxpayer has less than they have and has less flexibility in finding the money, because, as we all agree, the concept of payment for services such as this through property taxes is outdated, outmoded and just can't exist any longer.

With regard to what the Minister said, he is quite right in saying that the government in their White Paper last year talked in terms of 65-35. I would like to remind him though that if he goes back to his own figures and his own estimates, the point is that the 45 percent increase which is thrown on to the municipality this year was due to the fact that the 9 and 33 mills didn't raise what the department and the Minister estimated it would raise. Had it been correct in the first place we would not have been faced with a 4.1 increase. There may have been an increase, and if it would have been it would have been no more than one-third of one mill, if that, so that I can't entirely accept his statement. But since, as I said, bringing in an amendment at this stage of the game is somewhat futile, with these few comments I'd let it go to a vote.

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

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, if I should speak politically on this resolution I would have to favor it because it would reduce taxation temporarily in my riding in the municipalities. However, this resolution will not change things as they are because it's a resolution only and most likely will be turned down. However, on principle I would have to oppose it, because in my opinion it just would further centralize the whole process, and, as I've stated previously, kills the incentive to economize because you're pooling. However, as far as equalization of costs, to a certain extent this no doubt does equalize the costs, at least as far as real estate taxes are concerned.

It also mentioned the five percent sales tax, of which we're getting very little in our area, and if this was applied most likely more revenue would be coming our way. But I think I would have to oppose it on principle for the time being anyway.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: The Minister speaking for the government said that I knew and that we knew on this side many things and he listed them. I didn't keep track of all of them. I want to tell him, Mr. Speaker, that I know one overwhelming thing in this matter, and that is that the public are fed up with the increases in local taxes for educational purposes and they expected, when the government made their statement, that the shift was really going to occur; it has not

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) . . . . . occurred to the satisfaction of the taxpayers of this province.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. Again, for the benefit of the honourable gentlemen that were not in the Chamber, we are dealing with Resolution No. 26 on Page 10 of the Orders of the Day, the resolution of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Campbell, Desjardins, Dow, Fox, Froese, Green, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Kawchuk, Miller, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Petursson, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Uskiw, and Vielfaure.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Hamilton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Watt, Weir, and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 19; nays, 27.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain. The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. EDWARD I. DOW (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia,

Whereas the increased municipal assessments across the Province of Manitoba are of real concern to our citizens, and

Whereas the result of such increased assessments to reduce the amount of provincial grants to the school divisions and hence to increase the load on the local taxpayers, and

Whereas the Manitoba Government uses the sale or market price of property transactions in an area as the basis of assessment rather than having productivity as the basis, and

Whereas such sale or market values inject into assessment valuation, industrial sales, speculative sales and other sales irrelevant to the productivity of the land, and

Whereas such basis of assessment is largely responsible for the increases in actual assessment which have taken place, and

Whereas the cost-price squeeze continues to be the major problem in agriculture, and

Whereas the Manitoba Government does establish productivity figures for land when establishing valuations for the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation loans and when establishing premiums and insurable amounts for the Manitoba Crop Insurance Corporation,

Therefore Be It Resolved that the basis of agricultural assessment be productivity rather than market value of land.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. DOW: Mr. Speaker, since this resolution was put on the Order Paper we have discussed assessments in regards to estimates and so on, and I'll be very brief and establish one or two points in regard to it.

First of all, there has been a major increase in assessment throughout the Province of Manitoba on farm lands, and the productivity on the average doesn't work out with the percentages of increase. If you will take a 24-year average of wheat yields in Manitoba, the average yield is 18.6 bushels per acre. The yield in 1967 worked out at 19.4 bushels per acre, so you can see what the average yield was last year; if you want to go to 1957, it's below the average, and the productivity doesn't bear a relationship to the increased cost of assessment as we now have.

There's another thing, Mr. Speaker, that no credit has been given to, is the fact that some yields have been increased in the province by the farmer putting his money up to buy fertilizers, insecticides and so on, and this has helped increase that particular yield, but this has been a cash outlay that he has put. I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that this assessment, knowing full well that it's the basis of taxes within the municipality and knowing full well that if we had no other basis for assessment only the municipal operations, then the assessment is meaningless because it's on an equitable basis and the municipality can govern the taxes. But when you get it into the fixed figure where you've got the increased equalized assessment whereby the school foundation grant takes a mill rate cut at this, this is where your ever-increasing cost comes. I don't think we have to go into it too deeply except that people are concerned in the increased taxes and assessment.

I feel sure since this resolution has come up, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister will support

(MR. DOW cont'd.) . . . . this because she admitted in one of her statements to us that they were using the productivity basis of assessment in Manitoba. So the only thing I can say, Mr. Speaker, if this is a fact, this is true, they will support the resolution, and my only hope would be that they would put the men to work to get the productivity figure for assessment down to where the productivity is.

HON. THELMA FORBES (Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs) (Cypress): Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not agree with this speaker and I take quite an amount of issue with the third "whereas" in here: "Whereas the Manitoba Government uses the sale or market price of property transactions in an area as the basis of assessment rather than having productivity as the basis." Mr. Speaker, that is false. There has been no legislation passed in this House showing any change -- there's never been any change in the legislation passed in this House as to the method of assessing property in this province, and when the honourable member makes a statement such as he does in the third whereas he is accusing the Assessment Branch of the Department of Municipal Affairs of not following the rules laid down in this House, and, Mr. Speaker, this I take and must challenge because that's of a very great concern to all of us. Where productivity is the dominant factor in determining the value of land, productivity is the determining factor in the assessed value and it's the determining factor in the market value, and we certainly can not support this resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this amendment, we on this side can't quite follow the reasoning proposed by the Member for Turtle Mountain where he suggests, as he did this afternoon, that productivity be the basis on which assessment is made, and gives as an example a good year or a year where there is crop failure as being something that enters into the question of productivity. Now if one year you do happen to have a crop failure, is he suggesting that the assessment be low because the productivity was low? Next year there happens to be a good year, because perhaps the rain was plentiful, that the assessment perhaps should be doubled because the yield is doubled? I don't think that is the proper approach to assessment. I think that that introduces another concept, and the concept I think the member is trying to introduce is one really where it's based on ability-to-pay and income. In other words, the productivity of that individual during the course of that year, and this is of course a completely different concept. This is a concept on which people pay income tax, the earnings for that year.

I would also suggest to the member that you have to also look at this and equate it with the problem of assessment in the urban areas, whether the towns or the cities, and if you have someone located on a corner lot or in a commercial area who is not doing too much business, the fact that his business may or may not be successful - in many cases they go broke - but that does not affect the fact that the land on which his business is situated is valued at a certain amount, and many factors go into achieving the assessed value of that land. I'm not belittling the problem, I'm not suggesting that the problem doesn't exist; I accept that the whole matter of assessment is one that should be under continued review and should always be examined, but I don't think we should be kidding ourselves into thinking that we can somehow in one particular area of our constituencies or Manitoba get a better shake from the assessor. What we will do is get a lower assessment, therefore lower taxes, unless somebody else somewhere else pays a higher assessment and a higher tax.

And I would like to move, seconded by the Member for Brokenhead - incidentally, I want to apologize because I do not have copies, we didn't have secretarial staff today - that the resolution be amended by inserting after the word "that" in the second last line thereof the following words: "an examination be made by the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs to determine whether " - and then it goes on for the balance of the resolution.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, perhaps you should read the whole resolution -- or the resolved part.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the amendment?

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few remarks, not necessarily on the amendment only, if I can have the leave of the House to do so.

I think it makes little difference whether the amendment is included, because when we're voting on the resolution as it is on the Order Paper the resolved part is what counts, that we should take into consideration the agricultural, the productivity rather than the market



(MR. FROESE cont'd.) . . . . value. I think that's the basic issue here and I am fully in accord with the resolution. I do not mind referring this to the Municipal Committee if the members so wish because I'd go along with that, but, on the other hand, I think the basic issue is as is purported in the original resolution in the resolved part and I'll support it.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the amendment lost.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the main motion? The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. DOW: I would just like to make a few closing remarks on this debate. I don't remember or recall where I said that legislation had been established to change the method of assessment. I will now say that there is no doubt in my mind that there has been a change in agricultural assessment in the last year or two and that market value has been the predominant factor of establishing these figures, and if you wish to go into it, I could give you some examples to prove it out. The fact is that the assessment has been based entirely on the basis of an inflated value of land which has been created by certain free credits and it doesn't bear a true relationship with the equity or productivity of this land.

As far as the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, it is very understandable to me that he doesn't understand the working productivity or the assessment of farm land, because there is two types of assessment in Manitoba, one for the urban and one for the rural. If you wanted to go into it and be specific, the urban one is based on a square foot basis plus depreciation, whereas the agricultural assessment is a straight case of an acre of land and how much is it worth and discount it and here we've got a value.

So, Mr. Chairman, I have no hesitation in sponsoring this resolution on the fact that I feel that at the present time the farmers are in this cost-price squeeze, that they are definitely being penalized by our type of assessment in Manitoba based on the way it is now.

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

MR. USKIW: I'm just wondering, Mr. Speaker, whether I am in order here. I was going to ask for leave to make one comment. -- (Interjection) -- Fine.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the resolution lost.

MR. DOW: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. Again for the information of the honourable members, we are dealing with the proposed resolution No. 27 of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Campbell, Desjardins, Dow, Doern, Fox, Froese, Green, Guttormson, Hanuschak, Harris, Hillhouse, Miller, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Petursson, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Uskiw and Vielfaure.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Hamilton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mesdame Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 21; Nays, 28.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the resolution lost. The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne. The Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne.

MR. M. E. McKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): Mr. Speaker, before I move this motion, could I have leave to add the word "special" in front of the word "committee"? -- (Interjection) -- have permission to add the word "special" in front of the word "committee"?

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Arthur,

Whereas the practice of artificial insemination is important to the cattle industry of Manitoba; and

Whereas there is a need to review the legislation respecting artificial insemination of livestock in Manitoba;

Therefore Be It Resolved that the special Committee on Agriculture be instructed to look into all aspects of legislation respecting artificial insemination of livestock in Manitoba as provided under The Animal Husbandry Act.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, all I want to say at this time is that I had a forty minute speech all prepared, but I would like to recommend this resolution to the House.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, by leave, I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if I may now at this time introduce the motion that stands in my name with respect to the Special Committee on Page 3?

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Minister have leave? -- Agreed.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I am informed His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor recommends this proposed measure to the House. I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Health, that the Special Committee - if I can abbreviate the resolution - that was set up to hear the matter of farm machinery and now also the matter that has just been referred to it, that is on artificial insemination by the Honourable Member from Souris-Lansdown, be set up.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I think there has to be - and we could do this with leave of the House - I think there has to be an amendment -- I was going to use another word but it was too related to the Bill. There has to be something inserted in the resolution to encompass the resolution that the House just passed.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, or Mr. House Leader, if I could ...

MR. LYON: Have you got an amendment on that?

MR. ENNS: Well I could move then so, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps by leave the Clerk could record it. All that it would be required is that in addition to the "Therefore Be It Resolved", there will be this addition: That Therefore Be It Resolved that this also be the Committee to look into the matter referred to -- look into the artificial insemination program in the Province of Manitoba. This is the matter that has been referred to it by the member's resolution just passed.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, would the Honourable the Attorney-General explain just why and how the subject matter of this resolution fits in with farm machinery?

MR. LYON: I defer to the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. ENNS: It's a mechanical process, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, we are deeply concerned on this side of the House about the state in which this government has found itself. We hadn't realized that the condition had deteriorated to this point.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if I might not put the question with regard to the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture, and possibly an amendment with what he has in mind would probably be the better way to handle the situation.

MR. MOLGAT: Supposing we move on to the other resolutions. We could come back later to this one when the amendment is prepared.

MR. SPEAKER: I must say the recent remarks have got me all confused. I just don't know which way to go.

MR. MOLGAT: Confused or worried, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed then that the matter be left in abeyance for the moment?

MR. LYON: All that has to be done is an amendment, Mr. Speaker, to the resolution that's before you adding to the first clause of the operative section, "that the Special Committee be set up, to be reconstituted to investigate and report on all aspects of sale and use of farm machinery and repairs in Manitoba with particular reference to adequacy of provincial legislation; and all aspects of legislation respecting artificial insemination of livestock in Manitoba as provided under The Animal Husbandry Act.

MR. PAULLEY: May I suggest a better amendment? "And other matters referred."

MR. LYON: Well, no other matter has been referred.

MR. PAULLEY: This one here has.

MR. LYON: That's just a resolution of the House.

MR. PAULLEY: And other resolutions referred to this Committee ....

MR. LYON: No, it won't work. It doesn't work then because if the Committee was called particularly to hear evidence only on artificial insemination problems there would be no authority to pay the members of the committee for that meeting. I think if we can do it this way it will be the best.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you prepared for the question to accept the resolution as put forward by the Honourable the Minister of ...

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry that we're causing you this problem at this time. In addition to that already mentioned by the House Leader - and I do agree with him that that amendment as worded would suit the purpose - I would also ask that the name of the Honourable Member from Souris-Lansdowne, Mr. McKellar, be added to the list of the committee, by leave.

MR. MOLGAT: Replacing who, Mr. Speaker?

MR. ENNS: Replacing myself if need be, although I would prefer to stay on the committee, but I can appreciate the arithmetic of the committee has been set up this way. But the Member from Souris-Lansdowne has of course a specific interest in the matter just referred to it and...

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if the business of the House could not proceed and the confused situation that we're in be developed in the next few minutes.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, there's no confusion, with the greatest of respect. The Minister has moved a resolution; you have it in your hand. There is amendment now which we've all agreed upon which I will formally move. I move, seconded by the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer, that the motion of the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture be amended by adding the following words at the end of the fifth paragraph of the resolution, namely the operative section: "And all aspects of legislation respecting artificial insemination of live-stock in Manitoba as provided under The Animal Husbandry Act."

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture has asked for something further, and that is a change in personnel.

MR. LYON: If we could dispose of one at a time, Mr. Speaker, I think nobody would be confused.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the resolution and the amendment as outlined?

MR. LYON: Just the amendment before us, Mr. Speaker, first of all. The amendment has been properly moved. If you put the question on the amendment then you'll be all right. All in favour of the amendment?

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sure the honourable gentlemen will wait until the question is put.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the resolution?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, as indicated before, I request the privilege of adding thereto the name of the Honourable Member from Souris-Lansdowne, Mr. McKellar.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister... an addition or a substitution, because if it's in addition then I think the normal procedure in the House has been that these are discussed between the Whips. Now I have had no knowledge of any discussion of additions to the committee. If a further addition is required, my colleague the Honourable Member for St. Boniface has shown considerable interest in the subject matter and could probably be added as well.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I'll withdraw that.

MR. SPEAKER: ... the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. ENNS: Pardon me, I'll withdraw that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Now we're dealing with the resolution of the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. GUTTORMSON: Did the Honourable Minister of Agriculture withdraw his motion?

MR. SPEAKER: I heard him say that, otherwise you'd have heard from me.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Thank you.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet,

Whereas air transport is a major means of transportation and communication in Northern and Central Manitoba; and

Whereas modern technical advances in our resource development are bringing about continuing changes in the Northern and Central areas of our Province; and

Whereas there is a continuing growth in our Northern communities; and

Whereas the Air Transport Committee of the Canadian Transport Commission is

(MR. BEARD cont'd.) . . . . responsible for the issue and control of air transport licenses and franchises;

Therefore Be It Resolved that this Legislative Assembly request that the Chairman of the Air Transport Committee of the Canadian Transport Commission hold continuing reviews of the franchises and air services offered in Northern and Central Manitoba and consider public interest representations to ensure that the public interest is being served.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? Those in favor please say "Aye" (some members - Aye) Those opposed say "Nay" (some members - Nay)

MR. BEARD: Mr. Speaker, I was ready to let it go but I see there is some dissenting votes on it, so I think probably I should better explain it. --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. LYON: We've already had the question, Mr. Speaker, we're ready for the next resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: I don't recall it. No one has advised me otherwise. When was it taken?

MR. LYON: You put it.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it any wonder I'm confused. The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Churchill - this is No. 20. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: I guarantee you won't make the same mistake twice, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet,

Whereas Churchill Research Centre is proving to be one of the foremost rocket launching bases in the world; and

Whereas the recently announced 100 millions of dollars of Arctic mineral and oil exploration by the Government of Canada and a consortium of private enterprise companies will require the facilities of Port Churchill and Fort Churchill airport facilities; and

Whereas there is world wide concern over the low profit structure of the primary food producer and farmers; and

Whereas there is world wide concern over rising food costs of which transportation costs are an intricate part;

Therefore Be It Resolved that this Legislative Assembly urge the Prairie Economic Council, the Manitoba Chambers of Commerce, Manitoba industry, and Manitobans generally, to work towards the immediate development of Port Churchill facilities.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. BEARD: Mr. Speaker -- (Interjection) -- well, we lost 40 minutes last time, Mr. Speaker, maybe we can make the 80 up this time.

I do feel that in all probability in considering this resolution along with the last one we would have to consider that transportation in Northern Manitoba is one of the prime requisites for the development of that area. I would suggest to you that in considering transportation in Northern Manitoba that we must consider water, resource and rail transportation in respect to the development of Churchill, and not only Churchill but other northern areas in that portion of our province.

I would ask you also, Mr. Speaker, to keep in mind that this development of this part of the province is a development that asks for assistance from both provincial and federal funds. I'm sure that you don't want a long speech today, or this afternoon, in respect to the program of development in the north. Certainly if we haven't shown enough interest in the last two or three months then I can't convince you today. But if we're speaking on the development of Churchill then we're speaking of the development of Northern Manitoba, and I would like to bring into the debate at this time the fact that Mr. McGregor has indicated that he is stepping down from his position with the Air Transportation and -- (Interjection) -- Well, I'm speaking on this part: whereas there is world wide concern over the food costs of which transportation costs are an intricate part. I'm trying to tie it into that area of the resolution which is the last whereas, and I would point out to the members of the opposition that I'm trying to keep it out of the political field, if this is what he is concerned about.

I would hope that in respect to these things that as the Chairman of Transportation is, in effect, set up to look into all means of transportation for Canada as a whole, as I understand it, then he will consider these different fields in which we all depend - and particularly in the north - on new modes of transportation and new ways to develop and take advantage of our resources of Northern Manitoba. And if we're speaking of Churchill, I would point out that the real factor in Churchill development today has been acknowledged annually by the Hudson

(MR. BEARD cont'd.) . . . . Bay Route Association, and by those members that tend to the Hudson Bay Route Association, that the development of Churchill itself is dependent upon transportation in two factors: one in respect to transportation by water; and the second, transportation by rail.

We have to bring into this debate the National Harbours Board that are responsible for the Port itself. We have heard a great deal in respect to the grain storage and the movement of grain, and the storage that has gone on for many many months now and the fact that honourable members have brought up the fact that it requires additional burdens on our farmers. So in many respects Churchill has something to offer, not only to Manitobans but to Western people as a whole, and of course to the farmers in particular. And I might point out to honourable members again that the development of Churchill was brought about primarily because of a petition signed by some 175,000 people in western Canada who were interested in this type of transportation and in this type of development in the north, and particularly Churchill. So I do feel that Churchill was not only the wishes of Manitobans but it is there to serve all of western Canada, and if we are to protect the interest of western Canada, then I think we should do everything possible and indeed a great deal more than we have done in the past in respect to our obligation, federally and provincially and as Western Canadians, in respect of the development of Churchill. And if you're to do that, then you must look one step further and say that you must have the people in Churchill to do the work for you; you must have the environment in Churchill that would bring about this.

In closing with these few short remarks in respect to the last day, I would point out that it once again shows that it's a rough thing if you live in the north because you always seem to get in the tail end of the issue, and this is what is happening with these resolutions because we're at the end of the day, with the end of our session. I would hope, just as I sit down, that I could again depart from the issues in this House and say that I would hope that the Leaders of the political parties in Canada who are out campaigning would at least pay some respect to the development of the northern parts of the provinces of northern Canada as a whole, which they have not done to-date, and I would hope that as they come through the northern part of the western provinces and those parts of Canada who have asked and asked repeatedly for help, that they as leaders would come out with some type of a policy, some type of a practical assessment of what they're going to do to assist us to develop the rest of Canada which is lying dormant today and which technology offers us the many opportunities which were not there as in yesteryear. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for his comments and for his resolution. I am very interested in the resolution he has before us, and as one who has spoken on many occasions in the past about the development in the north and about Churchill, and an optimist about the future of our north country and the tremendous contribution which that area I think has to make to the Province of Manitoba and to Canada as a whole, I am pleased to see a resolution that proposes development in that area. But I'm disappointed, Mr. Speaker, when I see the member proposing the resolution recommending that the Prairie Economic Council should do something, the Manitoba Chambers of Commerce should do something, that Manitoba industry should do something, that Manitobans generally should be doing something, but the main responsible body - his own government - apparently doesn't need to do anything. Everybody else is supposed to be involved but not the Manitoba Government, and I'm disappointed that the Member is shielding the government in that way because the basic responsibility surely is that of the Province of Manitoba to begin with.

The first body who should be responsible is the Manitoba Government, then we get everyone else involved as well, but to start off by saying that everybody else should do something and the Manitoba Government need not be involved, Mr. Speaker, I think is the improper approach, because all these other groups have every reason to say, "Look, it's up to the Manitoba Government first and foremost to take the leadership." That's the position that I have taken in the past and which I repeat.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. George, that resolution No. 20 be amended by adding the words "the Manitoba Government" in the first line of the operative section immediately after the word "urge".

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm in a bit of a dilemma just for a second or two, in that

May 25, 1968

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) . . . . I had prepared a resolution on this matter and I had not anticipated of course that there would be an amendment from my honourable friend. So if I can have your indulgence just for a moment to consider the resolution, as I understand it, "urge the provincial. . .

MR. MOLGAT: Manitoba Government.

MR. PAULLEY: government or Manitoba Government" and I would have to change my -- may I then move the following sub-amendment. No, I don't think I can and have it in order. Possibly I could let this one go and then introduce my own, Mr. Speaker. It's rather complicated at this stage . . .

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

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C. (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I will only make a very short contribution. The basic responsibility for the Port of Churchill facilities is that of the Federal Government. The reason the Port of Churchill facilities have not developed is because the Federal Government, because of whatever lobbying or demands have been made by eastern interests, saw fit not to develop the facilities and use it to its maximum capability. There is a responsibility on all parts of Canada for the development of the Port of Churchill, including the Provincial Government, but the suggestion to be made by the Leader of the Opposition that the responsibility is that of the Provincial Government is nonsense. The responsibility for the development of the facilities was and still is the National Harbours Board and they have not developed the Port of Churchill facilities.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the Honourable Member a question? Is the responsibility of the development of the Port of Churchill that of the Manitoba Chambers of Commerce?

MR. SPIVAK: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, is that not what this resolution says? Is it the responsibility of Manitobans generally to develop the Port of Churchill?

MR. SPIVAK: It is the responsibility of Canadians.

MR. MOLGAT: Well my honourable friend better read the resolution, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: I think we've sat through quite some time. I don't think it will hurt for members to listen to a little more of this debate.

I did not intentionally leave out the Province of Manitoba and it has always been my contention that the Province of Manitoba has a responsibility, and I maintain that Manitobans as a whole have a responsibility, and this is why I placed it as to urge the Prairie Economic Council. Now this was not hiding anything, but it was hoped that in grouping people together that we could get more weight behind a resolution which, if we would - apparently mine isn't enough - but if we could convince them, the Prairie Economic Council who is made up of the premiers of the three western provinces - prairie provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta - and they also have the other council which is made up of the Deputy Ministers.

I maintain and I believe, as I believe that all Manitobans that are interested at least in the development of the north, that this has to be a responsibility in part of the Province of Manitoba. I don't withdraw from this at all, and I don't withdraw from the fact that Manitoba's responsibility is accepting those parts of the development which must be financially faced up to by the province as a whole, but I also point out in respect to the amendment, Mr. Speaker, that Canadians as a whole have to face up to the development of northern Canada of which Churchill is a part.

I don't think that we can afford, as Manitobans, to shoulder the whole responsibility of development of Northern Manitoba, just as we cannot accept all the revenues which come out of the development of Northern Manitoba. Some of these must be shared by other parts of the country. And so I would agree, in fact I would not disagree with adding a responsibility directly to the Province of Manitoba as long as we accept it on a shared basis in respect to Churchill, that there must be a responsibility first by the Federal Government to meet on a ministerial level with the Minister of Municipal Affairs at Churchill to decide what that policy should be and what the formula should be, because this is what is necessary. There must be a formula set up and then, and it is only then that I would admit that the Manitoba Government, this Manitoba Government has fallen behind if it does not accept that share of the policy which is set up fiscally for them. But Canadians as a whole are benefitting and Canadians as a whole should assist, and it is only through the fact that people are not interested as yet about the development of that part of the province which they do not want to live in, or that part of the

(MR. BEARD cont'd.) . . . . country which they have no interest in other than the fiscal return.

The reason for putting these resolutions on the paper is that perhaps some way I may be able to stir up some interest or some controversy which will shake up Canadians as a whole a little and perhaps help them look further north than the short municipal boundaries in which they are trying to live at this time. I would be ready and willing to accept an amendment if it is placed in -- as I understand it, the Leader of the Opposition, that he would be amending it that: ~~Resolved~~ that this Legislative Assembly urge the Province of Manitoba, the Prairie Economic Council and the others - I would be in agreement with that.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I think the amendment is very important in this particular resolution because these other bodies have very little means to do any real promotional work and I think it should be incumbent upon the provincial government to give support, and to give support in the way of means so that something can be done. I note that they have Manitoba industry in there but the Department of Manitoba Industry and Commerce is not mentioned. I think they should play an important part too, because we have heard so much during the session of this department and certainly this is an area where they could probably do some valuable work.

Mr. Speaker, I am fully in accord with the resolution and that something should be done in the way of increasing the facilities, and also the whole matter of the Churchill port facilities that it be put to greater use.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased indeed to see that the Honourable Member for Churchill is so much more realistic than the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. The honourable member for the constituency is quick to see not only the logic but the advantage of adding the amendment that has been suggested, and yet the Honourable the Minister, who in his position should be one of the first to try and strengthen the resolution, immediately dashes in to say that the Government of Manitoba has no responsibility. And what is asked of them? What is asked is to work toward the immediate development of Port Churchill facilities, and my honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce would suggest to us that this is outside of the purview of the government. . .

MR. SPIVAK: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker,

MR. CAMPBELL: . . . with his department being the one that has the most immediate concern of any of the government departments, and yet they apparently . . .

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. . .

MR. CAMPBELL: . . . haven't any concern.

MR. SPIVAK: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I did not say that the Manitoba Government did not have any responsibility. I simply refuted the position of the Leader of the Opposition that the basic responsibility was that of the Manitoba Government.

MR. CAMPBELL: The basic responsibility, and because he said that the Federal Government had the basic responsibility then he was refusing, until the Honourable Member for Churchill for at least the second time in this session has, in defiance of the position that the Honourable Minister has taken, has gone ahead and done the reasonable thing. I recall the time, Mr. Speaker, when it was necessary for the Honourable Member for Churchill to say to my honourable friend, "you sit down", and it's too bad that he hadn't coached him to that extent today before the Honourable Minister once again, through his bubbling enthusiasm, put his foot in his mouth.

Now if the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce takes the ~~shortsighted~~ view that he does of a resolution of this kind, then he certainly should also take the view, to be logical, that he has nothing to do with the question of airport facilities in the Greater Winnipeg area, nothing to do with this. My honourable friend spends much time with his propaganda agency to try and convince the public of what he is doing in that area, and yet here he would refuse to join in working. . .

MR. SPIVAK: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I at no time said that I refused. Not at all.

MR. CAMPBELL: There's no point of privilege whatever, because I'm just taking the position that the Honourable the Minister took, and I'm trying to point out to the Honourable Minister the position that he's placing himself in. It's too bad that my honourable friend the Member for Churchill hadn't given him the advice to sit down a little earlier the way that he did on the other occasion. Maybe, maybe after this experience, my honourable friend will learn that sometimes that's a very good procedure.

May 25, 1968

**MR. WEIR:** Mr. Speaker, I was attempting to get to my feet before the Member for Lakeside and I'm sorry that I didn't make it, because for one who is usually so constructive, I'm sorry that I didn't have it straightened out before it happened because I certainly didn't take the remarks of my colleague the Minister of Industry and Commerce the way he did. The Minister of Industry and Commerce, it is true, made some remarks about the responsibility of the Government of Canada, but he in no way, as far as I can recall, attempted to take away any of the responsibility that there may be to the Government of Manitoba. And to set the record straight, I too, I too believe that the Government of Manitoba has a responsibility, not as great as the Government of Canada but a responsibility, and I'll tell you right now I'm prepared to support the amendment. I'm prepared to support the amendment.

I think it's unfortunate when the Leader of the Opposition was looking this closely that he was prepared to make an amendment on this basis, that he did not carry on and include the Government of Canada as well, which is also missing from the resolution. -- (Interjection) -- Pardon? No, it doesn't. The resolved part of it leaves out the Government of Canada entirely. It leaves out the Government of Canada entirely. I don't propose to make any amendment to it; I just want to put my thoughts on the record so that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and other members of the House will know that I believe that the basic responsibility of a government community - because that's what it is, if it wasn't for the Port of Churchill and its associated areas it wouldn't be a community at all - and while we of the province do have a responsibility, their's is the major one.

The Province of Manitoba has said for an awful long time that we're prepared to co-operate and we are, and we're prepared to meet, we're prepared to do anything to attempt to improve things at the Port of Churchill, and I want to in no way detract from that position. I intend to support the amendment; I intend to support the resolution. I don't intend to make an amendment to it even though, even though if I wanted to be picaresque I could say that I believe the Government of Canada should be included in the operative part of the resolution, but I think I get my thoughts across.

**MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk):** ... each and everybody in the House takes that the Government of Canada is primarily responsible, and these various agencies are being urged to ask them to develop.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Are you ready for the question?

**MR. GUTTORMSON:** Mr. Speaker, I think it's pretty obvious that the First Minister has come to the rescue of the Minister of Industry and Commerce and bailed him out.

**MR. WEIR:** Baloney.

**MR. GUTTORMSON:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Industry and Commerce chastized the Leader of the Opposition for mentioning the Provincial Government, and after all the resolution in the operative part says: Therefore Be It Resolved that this Legislative Assembly urge the Prairie Economic Council, the Manitoba Chamber of Commerce, Manitoba industry and Manitobans generally. Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the Opposition suggested that the Manitoba Government should lead the rest of these organizations towards this project and the Minister of Industry and Commerce chastized him for suggesting it and said it was a Canadian government responsibility. There's no question that he said it.

**MR. SPIVAK:** On a point of privilege, I did not. The Leader of the Opposition said the basic responsibility for the Port of Churchill facilities was that of the Provincial Government and I simply reminded him that the basic responsibility under the constitution for harbours is that of the Federal Government - the basic responsibility was that of the Federal Government - and I in no way suggested anything that the Honourable Member for St. George has suggested.

**MR. GUTTORMSON:** Mr. Speaker, I won't prolong the debate. I just want to thank the Member for Churchill and the First Minister for their stand in supporting this despite the words of the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

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

**MR. MOLGAT:** I won't insist on a division if I have the understanding the Minister of Industry and Commerce is now supporting the resolution.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Are you ready for the motion on the main motion as amended?

**MR. PAULLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I indicated a few moments ago that I had an amendment to propose prior to the amendment that we've just dealt with, and due to drafting difficulties



(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) . . . . on the spot, I suggested that I would withhold that until such time as the amendment proposed by my friend the Leader of the Opposition had been dealt with. That now has been done and I'm prepared to offer another amendment to the resolution. I appreciate very much the concern expressed at this session, although not priorly, by the Honourable Member for Churchill. I appreciate very much that the First Minister and the Government of Manitoba has in this year 1968 come to the realization apparently that there are problems at Churchill, and they are suggesting by the resolution, and the amendment which is now part of the resolution, that something should be done about the Port of Churchill and the general area, and I appreciate this very much.

But I don't think, Mr. Speaker, it is enough just simply to give mouthings in this Assembly at this particular time to the difficulties of Churchill. I think that it is necessary to have a fresh start in looking at those problems and I suggest that the way in which to approach a fresh start is a confession of sins of the past. Those of us who ascribe to the benefit of confession will understand what I mean, when in order to start out once again we must confess the errors of our ways in order to lay a proper basis for a fresh start.

I agree in part with the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce that there is a considerable degree of responsibility which rests at the federal level. I agree with the First Minister that Manitoba should be urging or taking part and urging in the development of the Port of Churchill. But I think, Mr. Speaker, that before we start we should recognize our deficiencies in this House, the deficiencies in the Federal House, and that there is an equal condemnation which should be directed to both the provincial and the federal authority for the deplorable situation that exists at the present time in the Port of Churchill. I do not need to draw to the attention of the House at this stage in our deliberations the contents of the Murray V. Jones Report on the Port of Churchill. I did that the other day; others have spoken of that report. I'm sure, or I feel that the Honourable the Member for Churchill will agree with the amendment which I now will propose in connection with this resolution, Mr. Speaker, because he has taken the stand already in this House.

Therefore, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains, that the resolution as amended be amended by adding the following: "Be it Further Resolved that this Assembly regrets the Federal and Provincial Governments have failed to provide for the proper development of the Port of Churchill for the benefit of the citizens in the locality and for the well-being of our province and our Dominion." By that amendment, Mr. Speaker, it places the blame where it belongs properly, on present and past provincial and federal governments.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Yeas and Nays please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Campbell, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Doern, Fox, Froese, Green, Guttormson, Hanuschak, Harris, Hillhouse, Kawchuk, Miller, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Uskiw and Vielfaure.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Hamilton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 21; Nays, 26.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the sub-amendment lost.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the amendment?

MR. PAULLEY: I think, Mr. Speaker, what I proposed was an amendment to the amended resolution rather than a sub-amendment, but I'm sure we're all aware of the situation.

MR. SPEAKER: The sub-amendment is lost.

MR. PAULLEY: That's right. Now we will be voting on -- no, it was really an amendment to the main motion as amended, and the vote will now be taken on the motion as amended, the main motion.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the honourable gentleman for his comments. I call for the vote on the amendment to the main motion.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, on the main motion now as amended?

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? We are now voting on the main motion as amended.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Churchill. In order that there be no misunderstanding, this is Resolution 21.

MR. BEARD: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet, Whereas the Government of Canada is responsible constitutionally under the B. N. A. Act for Indians; and

Whereas this responsibility has traditionally included the provision of medical services; and

Whereas the Government of Canada has officially advised treaty Indians that certain of these medical services have been arbitrarily withdrawn;

Therefore Be It Resolved that this Legislative Assembly protest against this arbitrary action on the part of the Government of Canada.

MR. MOLGAT: Before the motion is put, on a point of order - and I want to make it very clear I'm not protecting the Federal Government in any way - but when the resolution was introduced it was certainly accurate, but has not the situation been completely altered since and is the resolution therefore in order in the light of today's circumstances?

MR. BEARD: Mr. Speaker, speaking on that point of order, I was going to be very short on it. It was, to my knowledge, only extended for a year and I'm certain . . .

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Inkster,

Whereas transportation and the movement of masses of people is a vital problem affecting the future economic development of large urban areas;

Therefore Be It Resolved that the Manitoba Government give consideration to the advisability of exempting municipally owned and operated public transit systems from: diesel and gasoline fuel taxes; 5% Provincial Sales Tax on equipment and materials purchased; and substantially increasing the annual grant presently paid towards meeting the deficits incurred from the operation of a public transit system.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I could make a forty minute speech on it; it merits a forty minute speech. However, I will not do this this afternoon, I'll no doubt have an occasion next year to do it. I would simply like to point this out, that the transit system in Greater Winnipeg is in trouble, that it is incurring deficits at an alarming rate, that the deficit now is in the neighbourhood of \$4 million. It cannot cover its operations by the fee or the sale of tickets only; it must be subsidized and it must not be subsidized at the expense of the property taxpayer. The transit and the movement of people within built-up urban areas is now recognized as one of the vital needs of any urban community which Winnipeg and areas like Brandon are. There must be mobility in the cities. People must be able to function within the cities if the cities are going to flourish and grow, otherwise they're going to atrophy.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I would urge the government to give this matter their serious consideration. I would point out to them that in other jurisdictions this same consideration is shown. In Ontario the transit system pays no provincial sales tax on equipment or materials; in Saskatchewan and Alberta the transit systems are exempt from fuel tax; and Nova Scotia rebates part of the tax. I think it's high time that the provincial government looked at this seriously and did something about it. I will not spend any more time on it unless there is some other debate on the matter. I would just let it go to a vote now.

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

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if I may pause at this particular moment and direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have some guests from Montreal, university students who are travelling - on my left - who are travelling throughout the provinces of Western Canada and have stopped off. It's been related to me that they're taking quite a good deal of interest in our activities this afternoon.

On behalf of the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you all here today.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster, Whereas the increasing use of hard and soft drugs and stimulants constitutes a problem for the individual and the community; and

(MR. DOERN cont'd.)

Whereas a special medical facility could be provided to assist self-admitted addicts; and

Whereas the entire drug problem is of provincial as well as national concern;

Therefore Be It Resolved that the Government of Manitoba give consideration to the advisability of establishing a medical facility to treat and assist persons who voluntarily ask for help and those who have been charged with violating the law.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to speak on this due to the lateness of the hour. I would ask, however, that the other parties in the Legislature declare whether or not they are in favour of this motion.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the resolution lost.

MR. DOERN: Well I ask for yeas and nays then.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. For the benefit of the honourable members that were not in the Chamber when the discussion took place, we are now dealing with Resolution No. 30 submitted by the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Doern, Fox, Froese, Green, Guttormson, Harris, Kawshuk, Miller, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Uskiw and Vielfaure.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Campbell, Carroll, Cowan, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Hamilton, Hillhouse, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 18; Nays, 29.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the resolution lost. The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster, Whereas the increasing use of hard and soft drugs and stimulants are of serious concern to the community; and

Whereas research into the effects of drugs and stimulants would be of value; and

Whereas a co-ordinated campaign by the Departments of Health and Education could provide useful information to the public;

Therefore Be It Resolved that the Government of Manitoba give consideration to the advisability of instituting research and a public information campaign on drugs for the public's benefit.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, in view of the lateness of the hour, I'll limit my remarks. I can only say that I think that the community has expressed its concern about this problem through many meetings and many phone calls and letters, and I think there's a need for research to determine the extent of the problem. It doesn't seem as if the government is concerned about this problem. The Minister speaks almost as if he's oblivious to it and the Minister of Education, at least on one occasion, said he had spoken to the provincial psychiatrist and didn't really seem to take much recognition of the fact. I think there's no doubt that we need a combined and co-ordinated campaign on the part of the two departments, and I think this is the only way to attack this problem through education and information.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. JOHNSON: In view of the lateness of the hour I just want to say one thing. I would ask the Honourable Member for Elmwood to peruse the departmental bulletins which he receives which indicates a large number of films and other informational materials available through this department with respect to drugs and so on.

I would also inform him of the monumental amount of research being conducted across Canada of probably the outstanding School of Pharmaceutical Research on the continent right here in Winnipeg, formerly under Mark Nickerson, and I would just say to the honourable member that I know that the leaders of the medical profession, our university people in this field, and any knowledge that will be of any benefit to the mass nature of the people of Manitoba will be made available to the department as it is known.

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

MR. WALLY McKENZIE (Roblin): . . . Mr. Speaker, between hard and soft drugs, I've had no phone calls and nobody has ever even talked drugs in my constituency. Would the member explain what he's talking about?

MR. DOERN: In short, I would say that heroin would be a hard drug, and marijuana and other drugs are considered soft drugs.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Wellington. The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we may have this resolution stand?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. You mean to the next session?

MR. PAULLEY: It's not withdrawn. I'm asking for it to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed to stand? -- Agreed. I must say at this juncture it's been a most interesting day for me, there's so many things happening. The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, that

Whereas some skilled tradesmen and apprentices are required by their terms of hiring and employment to furnish and maintain their own mechanical tools, the annual cost of which can be substantial and no part of which is a deductible expense under the Income Tax Act (Federal),

Therefore Be It Resolved that this House urge the Government of Canada to amend the Income Tax Act by allowing to such tradesmen and apprentices as a deductible expense against wages the capital cost of supplying and maintaining the tools of their trade in all cases where the terms of their employment require them to furnish and maintain such tools.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SHOEMAKER: One minute, Mr. Speaker, only. I must confess that I did not know that the tradesmen and apprentices were not allowed depreciation on their tools until someone brought it to my attention. It was further substantiated by the Honourable Member for Carillon and the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell who said that it's under the Act. They as owners of the garage could charge depreciation on every tool in their trade, whereas their workmen, employees and apprentices, were not allowed depreciation. I think it's most unfair and I said that I would bring in a resolution, and surely to goodness since it isn't costing -- since the principle is right (a); and (b) it is not costing the taxpayers of Manitoba any money, surely I can expect unanimous consent on this one.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: I move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Honourable Member from Selkirk, that

Whereas the administration of some hospitals is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Health, while the administration of other hospitals as well as nursing homes comes under the jurisdiction of the Department of Welfare, and that this state of affairs is highly unsatisfactory,

Therefore Be It Resolved that the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of placing the administration of all hospitals and nursing homes under the jurisdiction of the Manitoba Hospital Commission.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I've had a chance to explain this during the estimates of the Department of Health and I'm talking about mostly administration now. I've repeated the same thing for the last few years. I won't speak any longer but I'll ask for a recorded vote unless I'm sure that -- I'd like to know where the government stands on this.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Welfare.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas): Mr. Speaker, I think the resolution itself is somewhat mixed up in that there's some suggestion that the Department of Welfare have some administration of hospitals and nursing homes within the province, which is not of course a fact. The Department of Health have responsibility for nursing homes, personal care homes and hospitals, and we of course are only interested inasmuch as we provide assistance to those in need in institutions where they can't provide for themselves. This is our only involvement, and to extend all of these services to a Hospital Commission I think

MR. CARROLL cont'd.) . . . . is quite wrong inasmuch as many of these homes are in areas where there may not be hospitals. I believe that the system at the present time, while it may leave something to be desired, is being improved each year with the co-operation of the Department of Health and our own department in those areas where we have some financial responsibility for individuals, and we would propose to vote against this resolution.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister himself is mixed up. I think this is the only thing. I'm not talking about licensing, and I've explained all that during the estimates of the Department of Education. I think this resolution is a good one and I recommend it to the members of this House.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the resolution lost.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, No. 35.

MR. DESJARDINS: I beg to move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Honourable Member from Selkirk, that

Whereas a universal hospitalization plan has now been in effect for ten years, and

Whereas the Hospitalization of the mentally-ill and tuberculosis patients has not been covered by the plan, and

Whereas federal grants cover only those patients hospitalized as active or acute cases, thus encouraging many patients to remain in hospital occupying active care beds longer than necessary, and

Whereas a new and more realistic cost-sharing plan that might include acute-care hospitals, extended treatment care hospitals, nursing homes, home care could be introduced reducing the total cost and improving the care to patients, and

Whereas it is felt that improvements can be made in regards to the Federal Medicare Plan, and

Whereas a new Prime Minister of our country has been elected, and now might be the best time to review all medical and hospital conditions in our country,

Therefore Be It Resolved that the Government of Manitoba request the Prime Minister to call a Federal-Provincial meeting to discuss these problems and a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to the First Ministers of all Provinces of Canada.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. DESJARDINS: Here again, Mr. Speaker, I think that this is quite clear. I've had occasion to discuss this before and explain what I wanted and I am sure that we will get support on this resolution, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, it is very unusual for me to find myself pretty well on the same position as the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, and I find it a rather heady experience. However, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education, that the resolution be amended by striking out the words "has been elected" in the first line of the sixth paragraph and substituting therefor the words "will be elected June 25, 1968."

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, there was a new Prime Minister elected some few weeks ago. The same man will be elected on the 25th. I don't agree that there will be a new man elected and therefore I am not supporting the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: I appealed the other day to keep June 25th out of the House and you've done very well until today.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I just want to indicate our position insofar as this resolution, and I confess that it had been our intention to move an amendment. I haven't it before me and I guess this criticism should be directed to me personally because it should have been here.

We have no objections at all to the general premise of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface that hospitalization for mentally-ill and tuberculosis patients should be covered by the plan. We agree that in many respects hardships are imposed upon people, particularly elderly people, because of the fact that under the hospitalization plan they are not covered for elderly citizens' care, and under the restrictive regulations of the Social Allowances Act many people in effect become medically indigent because of the requirement of paying high costs of home care and nursing care. So with that portion of the resolution we agree most heartily.

We have some reservations, however, in respect of the necessity of a review insofar as

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) . . . . the medical aspect of the resolution is concerned, because we feel that after the federal legislation was enacted that it should suffice without of necessity being taken back and reviewed once again.

However, as I indicate, Mr. Speaker, I haven't the amendment at the present time to present to the Assembly. In principle we agree with the coverage under the Manitoba hospital scheme with these other services and therefore it would be to the advantage of many Manitobans to support the resolution with reservations.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the main motion as amended?

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, speaking to the main motion as amended, I think it's absurd, because there's an absolute contradiction in it. You say, "Whereas a new Prime Minister will be elected on June 25th" then in the resolution part it is that "the Government of Manitoba requests the Prime Minister." Now who is he? Supposing there isn't a new Prime Minister elected on June 25th? Supposing the same Prime Minister assumes the roles of office?

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if I may interrupt the honourable gentleman and tell him that the matter of the motion has been dealt with, and I wonder if I might not put the question on the main motion as amended.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think I have the right to close the debate, and I don't know if . . .

MR. SPEAKER: No one suggested that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface didn't have the opportunity of closing the debate.

MR. DESJARDINS: No, I never suggested that anybody else suggested that I didn't have the right either. All right? -- (Interjection) -- It's just like I'm looking back at you if you're looking back at me or something like -- you shut up. -- (Interjection) -- I know, I know. No, Mr. Speaker, this was a very important resolution and I would have doubts that -- well I guess I can't say it's out of order, but it doesn't seem that we can go along with a resolution like that when you say a new -- there's no use having the election, there's no use having the election if you say a new Prime Minister will be elected. How can this be in order?

Now, this motion was very clear; it was a new Prime Minister of our country has been elected, and you remember that this resolution has been here for a long time. Now I couldn't have any objection if you put in that a -- (Interjection) -- How ridiculous can we be! -- (Interjection) -- That's not quite as bad.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this kills this resolution because if the same man is re-elected this resolution is no good. This goes only if you have a new Prime Minister and the present Prime Minister -- (Interjection) -- All right if he is, it doesn't count anymore. In other words, they want to meet just if the -- well, just if the NDP form the next government I guess. -- (Interjection) -- Now, this puts us in a ridiculous situation that we certainly -- I want to vote for my own motion, but I cannot vote . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Nowhere do I see in the amendment the word "new." I was just wondering what your trend of thought was.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, I've got the amendment in front of me. -- (Interjection) -- I know, but it's the main motion. Now it says that the words "has been elected" -- I've got "whereas a new Prime Minister of our country has been elected". Now it will read -- (Interjection) -- Yes, but now this is the way it will read. "Whereas a new Prime Minister of our country will be elected" -- (Interjection) -- No, it's not right, the same one will be there again. -- (Interjection) -- Oh, I thought you were impartial, Mr. Speaker, and I saw your wife at the Trudeau rally with a nice button on.

MR. SPEAKER: I must admit that the honourable gentleman from St. Boniface has been trying to trap me all session and he's done it on the last day, but there was a fly that was tickling my left ear.

MR. DESJARDINS: All right, we're having a lot of fun but we have to vote on this thing, and right now the motion says that the new Minister "will be". If the honourable the Minister of Health wants to say that an election will be held or something like that, this is fine; or if he wants to strike out the whole thing, "whereas a new Prime Minister of our country has been elected", he might say whereas now might be the best time or following the election might be the best time to review all medical and hospital conditions of our country. Mr. Speaker, can I make a sub-amendment? -- (Interjection) -- All right, well if I can, I think that the House will understand. I would like to have all the words in the last whereas, all the words struck

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) . . . . out -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: What I'm suggesting is that I get it in writing.

MR. DESJARDINS: All right. I move that in the last whereas the following words be struck out: "whereas a new Prime Minister of our country will be elected June 25th, 1968, and" - those words also, the word "and" - and it will be replaced -- I shouldn't have said therefore -- I mean whereas stays there and it will now read: "whereas now might be the best time to review all medical and hospital conditions in our country." I think that's fair enough and I think this is what we want. Right? Agreed, Mr. Speaker? -- (Interjection) -- Read it over? All right. Whereas now might be the best time to review all medical and hospital conditions of our country.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. As I understand it, an amendment was presented and it was carried. That amendment then became part of the main motion. The main motion was introduced by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, and speaking to the main motion as amended, I question the legality of my honourable friend the Member for St. Boniface of being able to amend his motion which was amended previously, and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the amendment presented by my honourable friend is without competence under the rules of this House. -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, I'm pointing this out merely for the purpose of adhering to the rules of this House, which in my opinion are most important.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I think that is the case, but we were prepared to grant leave to cure the bad wording of the section.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, I would grant leave, Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the rules of the House, as long as this is clearly understood, because I would not want to establish a precedent for this conduct in the House. I appreciate the fact that we may be getting along towards the end of the session, but even then will be no excuse for us to violate the rules unless it is done with clear understanding.

MR. DESJARDINS: I would like to make . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I think the fun and games are just about over, and I think we'd better get down to business and take care of the affairs of the Province of Manitoba. I'm sure the Leader of the New Democratic Party will realize that I am in the unfortunate position that, as I would like to take this matter under advisement and deal with it as it ought to be dealt with, I'm not in that position. We can deal with it one way or the other, and it seems to me that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface by his immediate action may reconsider what he has in mind in making this sub-amendment in order that we can get along with what is in mind.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may on that point, I'm prepared to give leave to the acceptance of the amendment by my honourable friend, but on that understanding.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank the different leaders for granting leave, and I would like to move now that the last whereas be deleted.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable gentleman has made a suggestion that the last whereas be removed. I wonder where that leaves the Honourable the Minister of Health with his amendment. Does he wish to withdraw it, by leave?

MR. WITNEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable the Minister of Health have leave to withdraw his amendment? -- (Agreed.) That takes care of that. Does the Honourable Member of St. Boniface have leave to withdraw that paragraph - the last whereas? -- (Agreed.) Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, that's not just the whereas, that's the complete two lines of that preamble.

MR. SPEAKER: Well obviously. Obviously. -- (Interjections) -- Does the honourable gentleman agree with me that the fun and games are over and let's get this finished.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains, the following resolution:

Resolved that in the opinion of this House the government should introduce legislation at this Session to make as a prerequisite to any change in the general hydro electric rates that Manitoba Hydro be required to obtain the approval of the Public Utility Board.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. PAULLEY: May I have leave of the House to delete the words "at this Session", in order -- because it's obvious that support for the resolution I'm sure will be forthcoming providing we're not going to do it to delay the session for another two or three days. My main purpose . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I wonder if the honourable member's request is met by the House? Does he have leave to withdraw those words, "at this Session." (Agreed.) The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: I'll be very brief, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the members will appreciate this. My objective in this resolution is to place Manitoba Hydro in the self-same position as Manitoba Telephone, which is of course a publicly owned corporation; and, as I understand it, the Greater Winnipeg Gas Corporation which is a privately owned corporation; also, as I understand it further, the Winnipeg Hydro Electric system, in that the other organizations have to have the approval of the Utility Board before there can be any increase or decrease or adjustment in their rates. Even the Manitoba Liquor Commission under legislation are required to apply to the Utility Board for changes in their prices paid to brewers for beer. I think that if this is a requisite and necessary procedure for these other bodies to take, then surely it should be one for Manitoba Hydro to have to take also.

The reason for this resolution that I propose at this time, Mr. Speaker, was because of the statement made by the late Chairman of Manitoba Hydro, Don Stephens, when he appeared before the Public Utilities Committee. He indicated at that time that there would be an increase in Hydro rates. At that particular time, however, in his statement that he made before the committee, he indicated that certain rates would be increased; namely, the rate, as I understand it, the rate for commercial and business would remain as they were and that domestic rates would go up.

Now, I don't think that Manitoba Hydro should be in a position where they arbitrarily decide which rates should go up and which should remain stationary or go down. I think it would be in the best interests of Manitoba Hydro and of the Government of Manitoba if they would have the adjustment of rates reviewed by the Public Utility Board in order that the people of Manitoba -- who of course are the owners of Manitoba Hydro -- would be placed in the position where they were assured of a hearing, and this is the only place in which they could have a hearing. It's my understanding that individuals can make an appeal insofar as individual rates are concerned, but such is not the case insofar as the general public is concerned.

I understand that the Honourable Minister of Public Utilities has made statements through the media of the press -- or at least it appeared in the press -- that he was a staunch supporter of the Manitoba Hydro and didn't want to interfere with them insofar as the setting of rates are concerned. I want to assure you, Mr. Speaker, in this House there's no firmer a supporter of Manitoba Hydro in this Assembly, or in Manitoba, than I am, and I'm four-square behind Manitoba Hydro, but I do think that, notwithstanding that fact, the Commission should be placed in the same position as the other commissions that are owned and operated and appointed by the public. If we call upon private enterprise -- and I'm certainly no defender of them in many instances -- but if we call upon the Winnipeg Central Gas Company to have to establish their rates on behalf of their customers, I think that it's only fair and reasonable that in the publicly owned sector that similar processes should be on.

And that is the reason for this resolution, Mr. Speaker. It's really too bad that this resolution is being presented now in the final day apparently of the Assembly, but I think that it is a principle, it is a principle that should be established, and I suggest to the Honourable Minister of Public Utilities that this is a principle that he should adopt. If it's good enough for one arm of public ownership, the Telephones, surely it's good enough for Manitoba Hydro power, and I recommend this resolution to the House.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, it's because I'm also a four-square supporter of Manitoba Hydro and because I'm certain the Leader of the New Democratic Party has not thought through to its conclusion the outcome of the policy which he advocates, that it is with much regret that I must say I am unable to support his resolution, and perhaps it would not be out of order just to put one or two points on the record at this time.

The Manitoba Power Commission was the selling authority established in 1919, and this is the first general increase of rates ever introduced in Manitoba by the Manitoba Power Commission, or as it is now, the Manitoba Hydro, and there has been no known case of an



(MR. McLEAN cont'd.) . . . . . increase in rates, either individual or by geographic location, since 1919. There have however been a number of cases referring to geographic locations where there have been reductions. Those reductions began in 1930 and have been instituted in numerous parts of the province.

The Manitoba Hydro is presently working out, following the statement which was made to the committee of the Legislature by the late Dr. Stephens, working out a proposed schedule for the general increase which the late Chairman said would be necessary, on a plan to be as equitable as possible to all Hydro customers in Manitoba. And here I want to say most emphatically that the suggestion that there will be an increase of domestic rates and not commercial rates, that statement was never made, and indeed I'm certain I can say that it will not be carried into effect. The late Chairman did not make that statement and that is a misunderstanding of what he said at the committee in answer to a question, I believe, which was directed to him at that time. But in any event, I wish to emphasize that the new schedule, which has not been determined, will be as equitable as possible to all Hydro customers in all parts of the province, and that includes both those of us who use domestic power and those of us who may use commercial for business purposes.

I want to express my confidence, Mr. Speaker, that the Manitoba Hydro will discharge its duties and responsibilities in this regard with absolute fairness and with the very highest regard for the public interests, and I have no concern that the matter will not be introduced in a very proper way. And may I just say one final point, and I recognize that it's dangerous for a politician to be making any predictions, of another confidence, that with the continued increase in efficiency and with continued increase in volume, that the new rates when they are established will enable the Manitoba Hydro to go many years before there will be any need or requirement for a further general increase, and it is in that sense of confidence, Mr. Speaker, that I must vote against the resolution which is on the Order Paper.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the remarks of the Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities. It appears as though no other member of the Assembly is concerned with the question of hydro rates. I recommend to the Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities that he once again read the statement of the late Dr. Stephens to the committee -- I believe it's on page 24 that he indicates adjustments in the general consumers' rate structure which indicates that there will be increases in the other segments which, namely, will be the individual customer throughout the Province of Manitoba.

We have prided ourselves on the development and extension of the hydro-electric facilities to all corners and segments of Manitoba, or still in the process, in some respects, developing in there, and I say, irrespective of whether or not -- and I agree with my honourable friend that possibly there hasn't been an increase in the rate structure since 1919, but this doesn't alter the basic principle that I'm trying to enunciate in this Assembly, and that is that Manitoba Hydro should be in no more preferred position than Manitoba Telephone, Greater Winnipeg Central Gas, or any other utility. Even, as I understand it in many respects, Mr. Speaker, domestic water rates have to be approved by the Public Utility Board. It's my understanding that the municipal corporations have to have approval as to the rates for lighting, street lighting, and the likes of that through the Utility Board. So I suggest, Mr. Speaker, it's a matter of principle that is involved here, in addition to the points raised by my honourable friend the Minister of Public Utilities.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I rise simply on a very quick point of privilege. The member said that no one else was interested in hydro rates. I trust he didn't really mean that; that because other members did not speak that they're not interested in hydro rates.

MR. PAULLEY: I accept the position of the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party. Possibly it's because of the lateness of the Session that there might not have been a more full debate on this very important problem. I accept, Sir, your position.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Ayes and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. For the information of the honourable members, we're dealing with Resolution No. 36, presented by the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Doern, Fox, Froese, Green, Guttormson,

(STANDING VOTE cont'd.) . . . . Hanuschak, Harris, Kawchuk, Miller, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Uskiw and Vielfaure.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Campbell, Carroll, Cowan, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Hamilton, Hillhouse, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 19; Nays 29.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the resolution lost.

The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? Is anyone going to speak on behalf of the Honourable Member for Portage?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, . . . agreed this matter stand, particularly in the absence of the honourable member?

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed?

MR. PAULLEY: . . . agree to allow it to stand too.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the honourable gentlemen. Order, please.

The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: Mr. Speaker, I think it's rather late in the Session and I would ask that this stand. I do feel that I would like to bring it back in the form of a Bill and have it thoroughly debated in committee. I think it is very important and all members should be able to more thoroughly debate it and give opportunity for representations from . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? (Agreed.) The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain,

Whereas housing starts over the past year have decreased behind the minimum requirement as recommended by the Economic Council of Canada, and

Whereas the ownership of real property has been made more difficult in recent years by spiralling construction costs, high interest rates and high taxation to the point where many citizens of average income cannot afford home ownership, and

Whereas the cost of building materials are a major factor in the building, maintaining and renovating of properties, and

Whereas a reduction in the cost of construction, maintenance and renovation would revitalize the industry and give it a much desired stimulus at the present time,

Therefore Be It Resolved that the Manitoba Government consider the advisability of rescinding the 5% provincial sales tax on building material.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, just one minute, that's all. I think one of the biggest factors in the increase in construction of housing is the 5 percent provincial sales tax and the 12 percent federal sales tax, which comprises some 17 percent, and this is the reason I brought this resolution in. I think that the governments provincially and federally have to come to grips with this problem and I think it's much overdue, that politicians have to give this problem real serious consideration and do something to bring in policy that would help more people to be able to own houses and purchase houses, because at the present time the requirement, income requirement, is around \$8,000 and not too many in Manitoba would qualify under the present CMHC loans.

And the other point; according to the CMHC special housing figures, the construction costs in Winnipeg are the highest of the prairie provinces at 13.17 per square foot in Winnipeg, 13.12 in Regina, or Calgary 12.38, Edmonton 12.93 per square foot. So I don't want to take any more time this late in the Session; I have a lot of material on this but I did want to make these few points.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I intend to support the motion. However, I feel that the greater difficulties are the high interest rate and high taxation.

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

MR. PATRICK: Ayes and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

While we're waiting, I wonder if the Sergeant-at-Arms examined that box that was brought

MR. SPEAKER cont'd.) . . . . in. There's nothing explosive there, is there?

We're dealing with Resolution 39 as submitted by the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Campbell, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Doern, Fox, Froese, Green, Guttormson, Hanuschak, Harris, Hillhouse, Kawchuk, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Uskiw and Vielfaure.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Hamilton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 20; Nays 27.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the resolution lost.

The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

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

Whereas housing starts over the past year have decreased behind the minimum requirement as recommended by the Economic Council of Canada, and

Whereas the ownership of real property has been made more difficult in recent years by spiralling construction costs, high interest rates and high taxation to the point where many citizens of average income cannot afford home ownership, and

Whereas the cost of building materials are a major factor in the building, maintaining and renovating of properties, and

Whereas a reduction in the cost of construction, maintenance and renovation would revitalize the industry and give it a much desired stimulus at the present time,

Therefore Be It Resolved that the Government of Manitoba request the Government of Canada to rescind the 12% sales tax on building materials.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, the same comments I made will apply here with the exception that I would agree with the honourable member who spoke on the last resolution. I am concerned, and part of the high costs should be attributed to interest rates. I feel the present interest rates are completely out of line and personally I would like to see the government discontinue the policy of setting 2 1/2 percent above the long term government bonds, or Bank of Canada interest rates should be scrapped and the interest rates, I feel, should find their own level.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, the government would be willing to consider a resolution of this kind at the proper time. This is not the proper time; the provinces and the Federal Government are about to engage the other in an operation to overhaul the entire taxation system of Canada, and I think it would be wrong at this time to single out any one tax of this kind and tie the hands of the Provincial Government in any further discussions that will take place with regard to the taxation system in Canada. So I must oppose the resolution at this point.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I trust and hope that what the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer indicated in the revisions, that it means that, contrary to the position taken by the government in respect of taxation, that they will start considering the Carter Commission on Taxation, which is most vital to the taxation position, not only federally but provincially as well. It seems to me that there has been a reticence on the part of the Government of Manitoba to even consult with the federal authority in respect of taxation such as suggested by Carter, and from the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer's remarks, I trust and hope that I have the correct interpretation, that they have had a change of heart and will now consider all aspects of taxation as he indicated in his brief remarks - and I commend my honourable friend for it. I only wish, I only wish that they had suggested an amendment to the resolution which would have included an assessment of the recommendations of the Carter Commission on Taxation.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I intend to support the motion because the construction industry is the one industry, I think, that's been hurt most, this last year especially, because of high interest rates and also because of sales tax, and you will find that in rural Manitoba I think there will be very little construction going on. In the city it might be different, but I know for a fact that a lot of construction will be curtailed this summer and this year because of the high interest rates and the sales tax, and as was pointed out by the Honourable the

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) . . . . Minister of the Treasury that he will not support the motion, we have no assurance whatever that this tax will be removed or that this tax will be lightened in any way, and I feel that we should at least indicate that this is one tax that we feel should be eliminated or reduced.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Lakeside,

Whereas the Manitoba Government, through the Manitoba Development Fund, advanced money to Damascus Steel Products Ltd., and

Whereas Damascus Steel Products Ltd. was the only screw nail factory west of Hamilton, Ontario, and

Whereas this company was largely financed by small local shareholders resident in Manitoba wanting to develop an industry in Manitoba, and

Whereas the Manitoba Development Fund, after advancing \$19,000, refused to assist further in spite of their previous promises, and

Whereas as a result of this refusal Damascus Steel was forced into receivership, and

Whereas the shareholders as a result lost their entire investment, and

Whereas the Manitoba Development Fund then advanced \$60,000 to the new owners to purchase the assets of Damascus Steel Products Ltd., and

Whereas the Manitoba Development Fund has since advanced further funds to the new company,

Therefore Be It Resolved that a special select committee of the House be established to sit between sessions if necessary to study all aspects of the dealings between the Manitoba Government, the Manitoba Development Fund, Damascus Steel Products Ltd. and the new company.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. I would just like to advise the House that the inspectors in Bankruptcy of the Damascus Steel Company Limited, of which I am one, are now involved in an examination of Mr. Rogers who was the representative of the Fund who is the Receiver. Now I don't mean that this has any effect on the motion (which I agree with, by the way) but on the other hand, I don't wish the House to not know that this is happening when the honourable member is making his motion.

MR. LYON: My honourable friend, I take it, is saying that the matter is, in a sense, sub judice and is not . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I have never taken that opinion and I still don't, but on the other hand I would not want the House to proceed in the absence of this opinion if people feel that this is sub judice. I don't think it's sub judice.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, if there are no other speakers, I will be very brief. This matter has been discussed in the House on a number of occasions. My colleague the Member for Lakeside brought it up originally some three or four years ago now. It was discussed at some length last year as well. The matter is still of major concern to a lot of people in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker. I think that it deserves an open and frank discussion.

I had thought of requesting a judicial enquiry, then decided the best means of getting the information out to the public was through a committee of this House. I am satisfied that there is enough concern here amongst a fairly large section of Manitoba people that it would be to the advantage of everyone concerned to have all of the facts come out in an absolutely open manner, and that it would be to the benefit of all involved, be it the Manitoba Government, the Development Fund, the shareholders and promoters of Damascus Steel originally, because there is a good deal of concern, Mr. Speaker, on the part of many people that this has not been conducted in a proper manner, and that type of discussion is not to the advantage of anyone concerned. It is not to the advantage of development in Manitoba. And the only way that it can be cleaned up is by having a full and frank and open presentation of the facts.

When this was brought up in the House on previous occasions, the government said that it was not the Development Fund action that destroyed this company, that it was incompetent management.

MR. LYON: Hear, hear.

MR. MOLGAT: That's the echoes from the Attorney-General that we hear and that

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) . . . . statement was made - and I'm quoting now from the Free Press of Tuesday, the 4th of May, 1965; the headline was: "Firm Management Incompetent. Evans." The reply given at that time by the Minister responsible, the Honourable Gurney Evans, was that the company had got into trouble because the management was incompetent; it had nothing to do at all with the way the Development Fund had first of all recommended that they would advance money, then subsequently advanced some money but never did advance as much as they had agreed to, and in my opinion, placed this company in a position that they had to go bankrupt.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have made it a point to find out about the management of this corporation and I can report to this House that the then president of the company, the General Manager and the originator of the company, a native-born Manitoban, a graduate from our University here who had gone to the United States and worked there for a major corporation, came back here to establish a company in Manitoba in conjunction with Manitoba investors, on the dissolution of the company here went to Eastern Canada, where he obtained employment as superintendent of the fastener division of the Dominion Steel and Coal Corporation at their Montreal works. He was capable enough to take over a major position for that corporation, being responsible for some 250 men as the superintendent of the division. He was there for some three years and was found to be sufficiently competent and capable that he was then promoted to be the Executive Assistant to the General Manager of the whole of the Montreal works of the Dominion Steel Corporation - the whole of the Montreal works, something between twelve and fifteen hundred men. He is the Executive Assistant to the General Manager of that operation.

This does not smack, Mr. Speaker, of incompetent management. It does not smack of an individual who is not capable of making a company work, yet that's the excuse behind which the responsible Minister of this government hid when this was discussed in the House at that time.

Mr. Speaker, I'm satisfied that this matter needs to be investigated. I'm satisfied that for the government simply to say "incompetent management" that they ought to be looking at their management. The incompetence lies in this government, not, in my opinion, in the people who were in this corporation.

MR. LYON: Can you prove it?

MR. MOLGAT: Can I prove it? That's exactly what I want you to do. Exactly, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LYON: . . . said that the government was incompetent. Let him prove it - at the election polls next time. He's tried four times and lost and he'll lose again.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, my friend has given . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I have no intention of letting the discussion get out of hand and I'm sure the Honourable Leader of the Opposition doesn't want it to, so would he kindly proceed along those lines.

MR. LYON: . . . back on the Wiedermeyer trial.

MR. MOLGAT: I didn't realize what the polls had to do with this, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: No. Neither did I.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, he's the gentleman who brought it up, but when he says it should be investigated, he's right.

MR. LYON: I didn't say that.

MR. MOLGAT: That's exactly what the members of this side of the House are saying. Let's investigate it. Get the matter out in the open. Quit hiding. Quit hiding. Get it out in the open; let's proceed and have an investigation, Mr. Speaker. That's exactly what I'm asking for and I dare the government to have it. I dare this government to proceed and have this committee. If they're satisfied that everything's on the up and up, then let them have the committee. Why should they resist? The people of Manitoba will be prepared to stand by the verdict of that committee.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I only wish to say three words: We've investigated . . .

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend has no leave to speak that I know of. If we want to continue to debate, that's fine; we can. But . . .

MR. LYON: We've investigated some of your charges before and nothing's ever happened. We know all about your charges.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend is out of order. Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend wants to open it up I'm quite happy to continue the debate. I have no

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) . . . . objection.

MR. LYON: How about Grand Rapids? Would you like to try that again?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. MOLGAT: Would you like to see a balance sheet which you refused to have me table in this House by your government majority?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I'm sure the Honourable the Attorney-General would wish to keep within the rules of the House. Are you ready for the question?

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

MR. MOLGAT: Ayes and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. For the benefit of the honourable members that may have been absent, we're dealing with Resolution No. 41 as proposed by the Leader of the Opposition.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Campbell, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Doern, Fox, Froese, Guttormson, Hanuschak, Harris, Hillhouse, Kawchuk, Miller, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Petursson, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Uskiw, Vielfaure.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Hamilton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 21; Nays, 27.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the resolution lost. The proposed resolution of the honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. DAWSON: Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the Member for La Verendrye.

Whereas there is a lack of knowledge by students about the functions and organization of government, and

Whereas this lack of political education leads to an adult group where many people are politically insensitive, and

Whereas there is a strong demand on the part of high school students for a more active orientation to political studies in high schools,

Therefore Be It Resolved that the Department of Education prepare a course of Political Science dealing with the development and operation of our system of government at the Federal, Provincial and Municipal levels which would stress the privileges and obligations of Canadian citizenship and stimulate in our youth a deep sense of national pride and purpose, and that this course be optional but be a credit course as in the case of the present Geography course in Grade 12.

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

. . . . continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker I'd like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Gladstone,

Whereas the continual rise in the cost of Education increases the financial problems facing the supporters of separate schools, and

Whereas these supporters of separate schools and the students of these schools have made representation to Members of the Legislative Assembly, and

Whereas it is the expressed aim of the Legislative Assembly to provide equal opportunities for all in the field of Education.

Therefore Be It Resolved that a special independent Committee of this House be selected, without consideration of party affiliation or religious beliefs, to

a) study the real and existing financial problems involved, taking into consideration the report of the Royal Commission on Education, the existing laws of other Provinces, and

b) report to the Legislature at its next regular session.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to be very long, but that doesn't mean that I don't consider this an important resolution, a very important resolution. It is the last day, the last hour and the last resolution on the Order Paper, but I think that it is, as I say, very important. We have had a committee - we have had a committee looking into artificial insemination and so on, and surely to God we could think that this question is important enough to accord the same importance. This --(Interjection)-- Not quite? Who said not quite. I don't consider that funny a darn bit. I think that this is, as I say, it's a problem that has existed. We have talked about everything else in this House ever since I've been elected but you do not get any answer when you talk about this.

Now this is strictly a non-partisan committee that I have in mind. It's not a committee that is starting either pro or against something. It might decide to recommend that the schools be closed; it might recommend anything; and I don't think that this would be so difficult to have a committee to sit between now and next session. I know that it's late, it was brought in late because I was expecting something from the Minister of Education, and when that didn't come I can't see why we should punish these people for another year. I think that we have to have directives.

Now I know that if this is approved we could very easily, by leave, have the resolution and the main thing of this resolution that we set up this committee, and this is what I have in mind. I have got something ready here that one of the Ministers could move if they wish, and I'll just read the part that is a little different, that applies to this resolution here. It would be: Therefore Be It Resolved that a Special Committee of the Legislature consisting of two members chosen from each recognized Party - I say two members purposely, the government would not necessarily have more members, it would be purely strictly non-political - and also Mr. Froese, be constituted to study the question.

Such a motion could very easily be introduced by leave, or be passed by leave. It would not take very long and we would be doing our duty. We know that we want to go home, we want to leave fairly soon, but I hope that the members of this House will see how important and how serious this is and pass this motion. I guess that's all for now.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface has introduced this resolution; I appreciate the fact that he has considered this to be a resolution that he has introduced on a non-political basis. I want to assure him that this is the approach that members of my group, or the group that I have the honour of being the Leader of, will approach the problem. That is, a basis of non-political direction in this resolution, and when I say that, this is the position that we have taken over all of the considerations of the matter of government aid to separate parochial schools and in the field of education generally. So I want to assure my honourable friend the Member for St. Boniface that, first of all, I agree with him that this is a non-political resolution and should be considered as such.

Having said that - and I'm sure that the Members of the Assembly will appreciate my position and that of my Party - I want to say to my honourable friend I have to reject the contention of the resolution before us. Speaking as a private member of this Assembly, I suggest that we have had a thorough and complete investigation into the matter of separate schools and the financial --(Interjection)-- who's making this speech, you or I?

MR. DESJARDINS: That is not correct.

MR. PAULLEY: What is not correct?

MR. DESJARDINS: That you have had a thorough investigation.

MR. PAULLEY: My honourable friend the Member for St. Boniface, even at this late hour in the Assembly, is lief to interject when I make a statement of fact which I consider is a fact, whether he disagrees with me or not. He has an opportunity of refuting this when he closes the debate, and if he follows what he said this morning in his criticism, as the Leader of the New Democratic Party, I'm sure, that I await with a great deal of interest the manner in which he does it.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we have had in this province, through the McFarlane Commission, an investigation into all aspects dealing with the question of separate schools in education. The facts are there. There may be some members in this Assembly that haven't had the opportunity as others may have had of receiving the volumes of the investigation of the McFarlane Commission into education, which is of course the Commission that my honourable friend the Member for St. Boniface refers to in his resolution. I suggest that we have had available to us the information - if we were interested - the information dealing with the existing laws in the rest of the provinces of Canada.

I want to assure, however, my honourable friend the Member for St. Boniface that I am not unmindful of the problems, particularly the financial problem that many householders, heads of families find themselves in taxwise in the Province of Manitoba at the present time insofar as education is concerned. I'm not unmindful at present that many people find it burdensome to pay for education of their children going to institutions that are not covered under the public treasury or within the orbit of our public school system. I want to tell my honourable friend I appreciate and I realize the position, because I am one of those parents, because of the fact that I felt it advantageous or desirable for my family to attend a separate school, it cost me an additional amount of money. Both of my daughters attended St. John's College to take Grade 12 at my personal expense when they could have taken the same year in the public schools, so I'm not unmindful of the problem that my honourable friend raises in this matter.

I have taken this stand in this House ever since the matter was first raised and I don't want to prevaricate, I don't want to evade my responsibility, but I want to say to my honourable friend the Member for St. Boniface, who has introduced this resolution, I appreciate and I realize the problem of many people that he is concerned with. I'm concerned with them also. On the other hand, however, I think that in this particular resolution that there has been committees of investigation, there has been Royal Commissions, there has been on the Statutes of the varying provinces - or the various provinces across Canada, legislation dealing with this very important matter. I do not discount the importance of this matter, but I suggest, Mr. Speaker, the solution is not within this resolution.

I agree with my honourable friend when he says that supporters of separate schools and students of these schools have made representations to the members of the Legislative Assembly. I was pleased the other day to have the opportunity of expressing my personal views to those students when they appeared before us on the steps of the Assembly. I want to say to my honourable friend that I appreciate, I realize, I understand the problem of many of the people of whom he is concerned likewise, but I cannot support his resolution.

And again, Mr. Speaker, I want it clearly understood that as I take my place in this Assembly I am not talking for my Party, because there are others within my group who may not agree with me. This is a personal matter and I respect the individual opinion of each and every member of this Assembly. This is the stand, Mr. Speaker, that I took along with maybe half a dozen or more members on the question of shared services; this is the stand that I have taken previously in this Assembly in respect of recommendations of the Royal Commission on Education. I think, Mr. Speaker, it can be fairly said that I have been consistent ever since the recommendations were first tabled in this House, and I have seen no reason at all since that time for any change of my opinion.

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

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, if I may just say a few words. I do want to say my remarks in a spirit of ecumenism. I do appreciate the remarks made during this session by the Member for St. Boniface. I appreciate his feelings in the matter. I know it's a matter of conscience with him, and we, I know on this side, appreciated his thoughtful remarks, his tempered



(MR. JOHNSON cont'd.) . . . remarks, during the course of the debates on education and other resolutions.

I would suggest though that in the last few years, as mentioned by the Leader of the NDP, a great deal of thought and consideration has gone into this problem by the administration, and as a result of this, as members appreciate, we have had the introduction of shared services a couple of years ago, which besides the issuing of textbooks and transportation on school division bus routes, while considered by some to be token advances in support of those parents whose children are in attendance at private schools, nonetheless we went one step further in opening the doors of public schools to students in attendance at private schools, and the agreements are reflecting the measure of understanding between the local trustees of the public schools and the private school trustees and we now have 25 agreements in operation at the moment. I would hope that accommodation between the two systems will become more satisfactory through this instrument of shared services, but where of course the public school authority remains in authority.

In view of this, at this time I would have to suggest we vote against this particular resolution at this time, but in doing so, in these last moments of the Session, assure the Honourable Member from St. Boniface that we appreciate the spirit and the method by which he brought this measure before the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I have made my views known in connection with this matter on a previous occasion. I do support the motion. I know the precarious position that the private and, I take it, the separate schools, are in at the present time, the financial difficulties they encounter. I feel that something should be done and I think the very least we could do would be to have a committee sit and look into the matter and make a report to this House. I know that more and more people come to the conclusion that their children will do better work in some of these schools, and at the same time they can get the type of training in these schools that they would like their children to get.

I know this is the dying hour of the Session and nothing much will be achieved by my speaking at any great length, and therefore I will only indicate that I am fully in support of the resolution.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, in view of some of the words that were mentioned by the gentlemen that spoke, the members that spoke, I think that I should close the debate. I don't intend to be long; I don't intend to get involved in personalities; I'll resist that temptation. I can say that I won't even call for a recorded vote but I don't say that this is going to be the last that you'll hear about it. There might be other years, there might be another time.

I say that I'm not too impressed by the kind words that were given that everybody feels sorry for a certain group, I'm not too impressed with that. I might say that if you feel like this, you should at least be ready to accept a committee that is going to look in and maybe bring in recommendations. I purposely left this resolution and this committee broadly vague not to force anybody in a corner. We have had committees for practically everything else. I thought that we could have a committee. It has been stated that we have dealt in this House with this. I say that this is not right, not as far as I am concerned. I was elected in 1959 and we have never discussed this.

We had a report of a Royal Commission, the McPherson Commission that's true, and that chapter was never mentioned in the House; we never looked at it at all. We waited for about five or six years, saying that something would be done in due course. A lot was done around the provinces by certain politicians but it was never -- it was always evaded. And this is what I want. I'm always ready to accept the ruling of this House, the Members of this House. This is democracy. But I would like to see the ruling. This is the one and the only thing ever since I have been in this House that has been completely evaded, and if at that time I appeared to be mad, it wasn't because I didn't have my way; it was that we could never have a vote, that this question was always evaded. We discussed shared services, but there was a statement made while being introduced, the first day that the then premier introduced it; this had nothing to do with the Manitoba; the famous or ill-famous Manitoba school question; it had nothing to do with the principle of aid to private schools; it was something else.

Since then we have talked, but what did we talk about? How often do we talk about the shifting of burden and so on? What about this tax? We have had a resolution today discussing this: what about these taxes for the home owner? I'm suggesting that we could have a

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.)... committee that is going to look into that; maybe say close those schools, but at least give directives to some people that have been waiting for 90 years or so, that are waiting because they are promised by some people that, well, maybe this will come up. I thought that maybe we could have a committee that would make a report and then the House once and for all -- if we don't want to do anything, if our conscience feels that this is justice, not even ready to debate that now, but at least that we give directives to these parents. I didn't think it was asking too much, especially in view of the fact of the changing taxes, everybody saying, "Let's review all these taxes."

These people are paying the same taxes, all the taxes, and then they have this extra to pay. So I'm very disappointed. I can say that I know that the members that offer their sympathy, I might say I know they mean it but this is not good enough. I thought that we were elected to do a job, and if we feel like this towards these people I thought the least we could do was that we would have a committee, and to me it was certainly not a political committee; it was taking it out of partisan politics. It is politics. It was suggested that this will be settled out of this House. This is ridiculous, Mr. Speaker. We are elected to govern. We are politicians and this is politics. The only thing, we are dealing with taxpayers' money and this can only be settled here, and if we want to be against it, at least I think we should tell the people, give directives to the rest of Manitoba, and this certainly hasn't been done since my election in 1959.

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

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if I might take a moment of the time of the House. It looks as though we have reached that hour, and more or less in a personal way - it may be a little out of the ordinary - however, I feel I would be remiss if I did not express the sincere appreciation of all members for the devotion to duty shown by Mr. Clerk, Mr. Assistant Clerk, and all the staff of the House as well as the Civil Servants outside of the House, on this occasion.

In a personal way, I'd like to thank them also and also thank the Honourable Members for their co-operation throughout the session. We have had our problems but nevertheless I feel we have succeeded, and I sincerely pray, gentlemen, that you all enjoy the good things of life in our wonderful province. Good health to you all until we meet again next year.

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

MR. SPEAKER: May it please Your Honour; The Legislative Assembly, at its present Session, passed several Bills which, in the name of the Assembly, I present to Your Honour and to which Bills I respectfully request Your Honour's Assent.

MR. CLERK:

- No. 9 - An Act to amend The Public Health Act.
- No. 14 - An Act to amend The Municipal Boundaries Act.
- No. 15 - An Act to amend The Planning Act.
- No. 16 - An Act to validate By-laws Nos. 3/68, 5/68 and 6/68 of The Town of Swan River.
- No. 27 - An Act to amend The Horned Cattle Purchases Act.
- No. 28 - An Act to amend The Devolution of Estates Act.
- No. 30 - An Act to amend The Department of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs Act.
- No. 32 - An Act to amend The Agricultural Societies Act.
- No. 40 - An Act to amend The Dairy Act.
- No. 42 - An Act to amend, Revise, and Consolidate An Act respecting The Congregation Shaarey Zedek.
- No. 43 - An Act to incorporate Lutheran Council in Canada.
- No. 44 - An Act to incorporate Luther Home.
- No. 45 - An Act to amend An Act to incorporate Les Chanoinesses Regulieres des Cinq Plaies.
- No. 46 - An Act to incorporate Thompson Golf Club.
- No. 47 - An Act to amend The Land Surveyors Act.
- No. 49 - An Act to amend The Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation Act.
- No. 51 - An Act to amend The Brandon Charter and to amend An Act respecting The City of Brandon and to Validate By-law No. 3930 of The City of Brandon.
- No. 53 - The Human Tissue Act.

- No. 55 - An Act to amend The Winnipeg Charter, 1956, and to validate By-laws Nos. 19389, 19466 and 19494.
- No. 57 - An Act to amend The Child Welfare Act.
- No. 59 - An Act to amend The St. Boniface Charter, 1953.
- No. 60 - An Act to amend The Electoral Divisions Act.
- No. 61 - An Act to amend The Election Act (1).
- No. 62 - An Act to amend The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act.
- No. 63 - An Act to amend The Credit Unions Act.
- No. 66 - An Act to amend The Reserve for Debt Retirement Act.
- No. 67 - The Clean Environment Act.
- No. 68 - An Act to amend The Companies Act.
- No. 69 - An Act to amend The St. James Charter.
- No. 70 - An Act to amend An Act respecting "The Manitoba Registered Music Teachers' Association."
- No. 71 - An Act to amend An Act to incorporate "The Women's Tribute Memorial Lodge Foundation."
- No. 72 - An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act.
- No. 73 - The Noxious Weeds Act.
- No. 75 - The Condominium Act.
- No. 76 - An Act to amend The Psychiatric Nurses Association Act.
- No. 77 - An Act to incorporate Home and Research Centre for Retarded.
- No. 78 - An Act to incorporate Home and Research Centre for Retarded Foundation.
- No. 79 - An Act to amend The Income Tax Act (Manitoba), 1962.
- No. 80 - An Act to amend The Winnipeg Charter, 1956 (2).
- No. 81 - An Act to amend The Real Property Act.
- No. 82 - The Winnipeg General Hospital Act.
- No. 83 - An Act to incorporate The Westminster United Church Foundation.
- No. 84 - An Act to amend An Act respecting the Incorporation of The Town of Thompson.
- No. 85 - An Act respecting The Town of Russell.
- No. 86 - An Act to establish The City of St. James-Assiniboia, to establish The St. James-Assiniboia School Division No. 2, and amend The St. James Charter.
- No. 87 - An Act to amend The Surrogate Courts Act.
- No. 88 - An Act to amend The Election Act (2).
- No. 89 - An Act to amend The Controverted Elections Act.
- No. 90 - An Act to amend The Education Department Act.
- No. 91 - An Act to amend The Trade-Schools Regulation Act.
- No. 92 - The University of Manitoba Act.
- No. 93 - The Manitoba Centennial Centre Corporation Act.
- No. 94 - An Act to amend The Public Schools Act (2).
- No. 95 - An Act to amend The Trustee Act.
- No. 96 - The Manitoba Agricultural Credit and Development Act.
- No. 97 - An Act to amend The Social Allowances Act.
- No. 98 - An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act (2).
- No. 99 - An Act to amend The Teachers' Pensions Act.
- No. 100 - An Act to amend The Civil Service Superannuation Act.
- No. 101 - An Act to amend An Act to incorporate The Sinking Fund Trustees of The Winnipeg School Division Number One.
- No. 102 - An Act to amend The Manitoba Medical Services Insurance Act.
- No. 104 - An Act to amend The Municipal Act (2).
- No. 105 - An Act to amend The Winnipeg Charter, 1956 (3).
- No. 106 - An Act respecting The Town of Souris.
- No. 109 - The Statute Law Amendment and Statute Law Revision Act, 1968.
- No. 110 - An Act to Validate Certain By-laws of The City of West Kildonan.
- No. 111 - An Act to incorporate Banner County Racing Club.
- No. 112 - An Act to provide for the making of Grants to The Brandon General Hospital.
- No. 113 - An Act respecting The Town of Steinbach.
- No. 114 - An Act to amend The Attorney-General's Act.
- No. 115 - An Act respecting the Relocation of the Seine River.

(MR. CLERK cont'd.)...

In Her Majesty's name, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor doth assent to these Bills.

MR. SPEAKER: We, Her Majesty's dutiful and faithful subjects, the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba in session assembled, approach Your Honour with sentiments of unfeigned devotion and loyalty to Her Majesty's person and Government, and beg for Your Honour the acceptance of these Bills:

No. 39, an Act to authorize the Expenditure of Moneys for Capital Purposes and to authorize the Borrowing of the same.

No. 54, an Act for granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for the Public Service of the Province for the Fiscal Year ending the 31st day of March 1969.

No. 65, an Act to authorize the Expenditure of Moneys for Capital Purposes and to authorize the Borrowing of the same.

MR. CLERK: His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor doth thank Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence, and assents to these bills in Her Majesty's name.

HONOURABLE RICHARD S. BOWLES Q.C. (Lieutenant-Governor): Mr. Speaker and Members of the Legislative Assembly. The work of the Second Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature has now been completed. I wish to commend the Members for their faithful attention to their duties including many hours devoted to consideration of Bills and Estimates, both in the House and in Committees. I convey to you my appreciation of your concern for the public interest and for the general welfare of our Province.

I thank you for providing the necessary sums of money for carrying on the public business. It will be the intention of my Ministers to ensure that these sums will be expended with both efficiency and economy by all departments of the government.

In relieving you now of your present duties and declaring the Second Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature prorogued, I give you my best wishes and pray that under divine guidance our Province may continue to provide the things which are necessary for the health, the happiness and the well-being of all our people.

MR. McLEAN: It is the will and pleasure of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor that this Legislative Assembly be prorogued until it shall please His Honour to summon the same for the dispatch of business, and the Legislative Assembly is accordingly prorogued.