

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Friday, May 1, 1970

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the Gallery where we have with us 56 Grade 4 students of the R. F. Morrison School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Tomsic and Mrs. Main. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Youth and Education.

And 74 Grade 12 students of the Garden Valley Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Messrs. Hildebrand and Janzen and Mrs. Kehler. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member from Rhineland.

And 30 Grade 6 students of the Balmoral Hall School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Curtis. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Wolseley.

And 25 pupils of the St. Laurent Adult Upgrading School under the direction of Mr. Knudson. This group is from the constituency of the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

On behalf of the members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you here this afternoon.

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate. On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Morris, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Kildonan in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Fort Garry adjourned the debate on my behalf so that I might have an opportunity to say a word on the amendment as proposed by the Honourable Member for Kildonan.

Mr. Speaker, we are somewhat concerned by the intent of the amendment which does to a serious request for information, an effective job of removing what thrust there was in the original motion as proposed by the Honourable Member for Morris. I was going to say that the Honourable Member for Kildonan had done a deft job of surgery in this connection but I think that's hardly the way to describe it. Perhaps an "axe job" would be a better way of indicating what has happened to the intent of the Order for Return.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that it has become a somewhat futile exercise as it stands under the amendment as proposed. There is no character left in the motion. There is nothing really to be gained by acceptance of the amendment, and we have in fact lost completely the intent of our request. And so, Mr. Speaker, I feel that I must at this time, with your permission, propose a further amendment and I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Charleswood, that the amendment be further amended by adding thereto - and this would be No. 3 - "Total number of Deputy Ministers (or equivalent) and total number of Assistant Deputy Ministers (or equivalent) whose merit increases have been approved."

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may have this opportunity of having a look at the amendment, and it may be advisable, Mr. Speaker, to suggest that you take the admissibility of the amendment to the amendment under consideration, because it appears to me off-hand, having listened to my honourable friend, that he's attempting to do by the back door which would suggest that it should not be done by the front door. So I'd suggest that you consider this matter and may take it under advisement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Sir, I have no objection if you want to take this matter under advisement, but I would like to draw your attention to citation 202 subsection (2) of Beauchesne, which states as follows: "As the proposal of an amendment to an amendment originates a fresh subject for consideration, a new question thus created must, to prevent confusion, be disposed of by itself. An amendment, when undergoing alteration, is therefore treated throughout as if it were a substantive motion upon which an amendment has been moved. The original motion accordingly is laid aside, and the amendment becomes for the time a separate question to be dealt with until its terms are settled." And I submit, Sir, that under that citation, the amendment proposed by my honourable colleague from Brandon is in order.

MR. PAULLEY: If I may, on the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the citation that my honourable friend has quoted. However, and I apologize for not having the precise annotation or rule before me at the present time, but contained within the same document, the Fourth Edition of Beauchesne, is also a citation which says in effect that an amendment to an

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.). . . . amendment, or even an amendment, cannot re-institute something that has been amended previously. It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that I suggest that you should take this under advisement. I appreciate my honourable friend the Member for Morris being conversant with the rules, but there are other citations too, I would suggest in all due respect to my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, that could be quoted to refute the argument of my honourable friend, and all that I am asking, Sir, at this juncture is that you take the matter under advisement - and I think this is in accordance with the established practices of this House when matters of points of order are raised. I'm not suggesting that you should not agree with the proposal of the Honourable Member for Brandon West or anyone else. All I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, is that this be scrutinized before the matter is the subject of debate in this House, and I think in this I'm following tradition historic in Legislative Assemblies in our Commonwealth.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, if I may, before you rule on the point of order that is before us, it really would appear to me, Mr. Speaker, that in reading the amendment to the amendment made by the Member for Brandon West, that it surely has to follow under the classification of being one of the more straightforward and simple and understandable amendments that we've seen in this House for some time, and that while I appreciate the Minister of Labour's request of you, Mr. Speaker, of taking the matter under advisement, that the amendment submitted, which has to be an example of clarity and simplicity, simply in asking the total number of deputy ministers or equivalents, or the total number of assistant deputy ministers or equivalents, whose merit increases have been approved, that this is a most legitimate type of request or an amendment to a request for an Order of Return. We were not asking the members of the Treasury Bench to give us that information at the top of their heads. This is asking for detailed information; we're asking for an Order for Return; and I really would -- I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that you're no doubt turning this matter over in your mind and you're thinking about it, but you've had some difficult situations to deal with from time to time, difficult situations that perhaps members from this side and other sides have caused you some loss of sleep or what have you. But surely, Mr. Speaker, this amendment on behalf of my colleague the Member from Brandon West is one that happens to be very straightforward and that really I believe, with all respect to the Chair, with all respect to you, Mr. Speaker, that you can make a somewhat speedy judgment on as to its relevance and as to its acceptability in this House. Thank you.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether my honourable friend would permit a question.

MR. ENNS: Certainly Mr. Speaker. I always permit questions by my honourable friend the Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you Honourable Member for Lakeside. Have you any objections to Mr. Speaker taking this under advisement to make sure that the rules of Beauchesne and the progress of this House are properly conducted?

MR. ENNS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, my objections are that I object to the Speaker of this House, his intelligence being challenged by not being able to accept this simple kind of an amendment. I take great exception because he is my Speaker and I accept his judgment in this House, and I know that he's had many difficult problems to deal with, so I object to the fact that his judgment in a relatively simple clarified matter should be questioned.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may further, on the point of order, I think that contrary to the remarks of my honourable friend, all I am saying is in effect not any rejection of any ruling that you may bring into this House, that you give the matter consideration, and surely to goodness my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside would not deprive me of the right of suggesting to you, your Honour, that in matters of this nature that you should take it under advisement. Surely I have the right, as an individual member of this House, and I'm sure that my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside would not deprive me as he indicated that he might by his last remarks, deprive me of the opportunity or suggestion that this be reviewed. The matter if you decide, Mr. Speaker, that the point of order that I raised is not a valid one, would of course result in the amendment to the amendment being debatable in this House and that is all that I am asking as an individual member of this House. And I am sure that my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside, now that he has reflected on his words, would agree with me that the action I am suggesting is a proper one.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, my Christian charity encompasses the lack of understanding of my fellow man. And if the lack of understanding of this amendment by the Member from Brandon West is beyond your comprehension, Mr. Speaker, I say with all due respect, and

(MR. ENNS cont'd.). . . . beyond the comprehension of my honourable friend the Minister of Labour, then surely I'm prepared to grant him leave to have you, Sir, study, study over the weekend and more, the tremendous import of this amendment, namely, that whether or not it is the legitimate request on the part of the Member from Brandon West to ask or request information from the government as to the total number of deputy ministers. . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: On a point of order. On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ENNS: . . . or equivalents, and the total number of Assistant deputy Ministers or equivalents, whose merit . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. . .

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, if you choose to take 48 hours for that occasion, well Mr. Speaker, you can do so and be my guest.

MR. CHERNIACK: Now that the Honourable Member for Lakeside refused to sit on a point of order but did make his speech, may I suggest that you reflect after some period of time and have an opportunity to read what the Honourable Member just said as being a reflection, Mr. Speaker, on your own competence. -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, it would appear to me that the amendment is in order. It's certainly put forward in a positive manner. However, I certainly wouldn't have any objection for the Speaker taking it under advisement.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, neither do I.

MR. SPEAKER: I wish to thank honourable members for their comments, and in particular those of the Honourable Minister of Labour and the Honourable Member for Morris and for their references to the relevant sections of Beauséjour. I would like to have the opportunity to refer to those sections of Beauséjour, the sections referred to by both sides of the House, and which I would like to do and give my ruling thereon after I have done so.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think that is proper.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I ask the indulgence of the House to let this matter stand. (Agreed.)

MR. SPEAKER: Private Members' Resolutions.

MR. GREEN: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, with the leave of the House, if we could go to Page 11 of the Order Paper and deal with the second readings of private bills, the adjourned debate on second reading of public bill, and second reading of public bill in that order. (Agreed.)

PRIVATE AND PUBLIC BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Second readings. Bill No. 36. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan) presented Bill No. 36, An Act to incorporate the Manitoba Sports Federation - La Federation Manitobaine des Sports, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, the Bill before you, the Bill to incorporate The Manitoba Sports Federation, is in some respects a philosophical Bill. It's a Bill being asked for by a group of citizens of the Province of Manitoba in this our centennial year for the members of this Legislature to recognize the activities and the hours of work that they have expended on behalf of amateur sports in the Province of Manitoba. I think that it is fitting that this being the year 1970 that we should recognize the efforts of these people who work for amateur sports. Without amateur sports in this province our professionals in the other fields would have no one to draw on, and while this Bill is not dealing with this matter, I think that we have seen what professionalism in sports has done to amateur sports, especially in the field of hockey here in the Province of Manitoba. I think that all members in this House will agree that the loss of the World Cup Championship here in Manitoba certainly was not due to the efforts of amateur sports here in Canada or in Manitoba but due to the professionalism which controls the amateur sports.

Now all these gentlemen are doing, and citizens of the Province of Manitoba, are asking that they be incorporated, that they could apply for Letters of Patent under the Companies Act. As one member said to me, of the people who were applying for this, that they could apply for Letters of Patent for anything practically in this province except maybe prostitution. So

(MR. JENKINS cont'd.). . . . really, members of the Legislature, what these people are asking for is that they be incorporated. The powers, the objects of the bill are before you. The head office will be at a place in Manitoba, and in this federation there are 42 amateur sports starting from archery leading up to yachting, and including the universities of Manitoba, Winnipeg, the Amateur Athletic Association of Manitoba, of Canada and the MSSAA. The terms of office for the members and the directors of the corporation are laid out; the expenses for the directors are laid out in the bill; and the filling of vacancies is laid out quite well.

I also have here before me a copy of their by-laws which I have examined, and I think perhaps if I were to just read you the four sections of the object of this federation.

(a) to provide physical and intellectual and moral development of the people of Manitoba through the participation in amateur sport;

(b) to act as a forum for the exchange of the members' views;

(c) to act as a liaison with government agencies, to bring before the government and agencies such recommendations as are approved by the federation; and

(d) to correlate the efforts of all amateur sport governing bodies in Manitoba in stimulating interest in amateur sport.

I recommend this to the House and I hope that you will give it your support and allow the bill to proceed to private members where further explanation will be made by the members of the Manitoba Sports Federation. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Birtle-Russell, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 55. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan) presented Bill No. 55, An Act to amend An Act to incorporate The Investors Group, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, as a courtesy to the Investors Group, I have agreed to submit this Private Bill to the Legislature. I don't believe it's of a contentious nature. I have some lengthy historical notes on Investors Group if the Assembly is interested in their historical background, but basically this bill is to increase the authorized capital worth of the company at the present time. Aside from that there are no other issues in the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, our side of the House has no quarrel with this bill. We have read it and we are in agreement with this bill.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on second readings. The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Logan. The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable Member for Riel, could I ask that this matter stand. (Agreed.)

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading, Bill No. 44. The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the honourable member, could we have this matter stand? (Agreed.)

PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The resolution of the Honourable Member for Rhineland. The Honourable Member for Osborne.

MR. IAN TURNBULL (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, the other day when I was speaking I had indicated that the question raised by this resolution really involved two problems. One is to provide to the children of Manitoba, to the students of Manitoba, a system of education which will be more acceptable and give to the parents more choice in selecting that education which they would like to see their children have. Opposed to that principle, a democratic principle, is the problem that any grant of public money to private or parochial schools would lead to a weakening of the public school system. In the past, the public school system has served the majority of the people of Manitoba very well. It has led to a populace that is educated, that is competent to deal with a technological society. It has encouraged, as well, a uniformity and an aspiration for the nation, for Canada, that I think is commendable.

(MR. TURNBULL cont'd.)

But nonetheless, Mr. Speaker, if public assistance was given to private and parochial schools, there still remains the problem of dealing with the public school system. There is, as I was pointing out the other day, the very likely possibility that we would have wealthy areas having very good education, both private and public, and poor areas having only public schools and perhaps these not as well supported by financial assistance and aid as they are now. Regardless of the possible difficulties that this resolution, if accepted, might create for the public school system, there still remains the very good aspects that might derive from the government considering the intent of the resolution.

These aspects I think are essential to our democracy, and I would like to quote here, by way of indicating what I mean, from the Hall-Dennis report on the Aims and Objectives of Education in Ontario. On page 21 of that report we find the following: "Democracy implies the freedom to think, to dissent, and to bring about change in a lawful manner in the interest of all. It is a flexible, responsive form of government, difficult to describe in fiscal terms. Democracy does not arise as a result of imposed or structured political practices but as a dynamic liberating force nurtured by the people themselves. It can thrive and flourish only when its citizens are free to search continually for new ideas, models and theories to replace outmoded knowledge in an effort to serve an ever-increasing populace tomorrow. To ensure its continuity, a free society must develop and promote opportunities for science, philosophy, the humanities and the fine arts to flourish side by side, strengthening and complementing each other in the search for truth. All aspects of learning must be given support, for great ideas are not the exclusive property of an intellectual elite."

The report continues a little later on, Mr. Speaker, with this: "Freedom to search for truth at every educational level is one of the stoutest ramparts of a free society. In this defense we must never yield if we are to protect our way of life."

Now those words, Mr. Speaker, lead me to think that the resolution that we have before us is perhaps not adequate to the purposes that it might fill in Manitoba. It would seem that there is every need for the total educational system in Manitoba, both public and private, to provide choice, to provide flexibility - flexibility, Mr. Speaker, not only in curricula but also in other systems of education. The curricula we have today, Mr. Speaker, has responded to the needs of our society but the response has been slow and it is not always directed as accurately as it might be.

Then, too, there are systems of education which have existed for some many years in England and in the United States and here that would seem, for many parents, to fulfill their desires, to fulfill their hopes for an educational system that they would like to see their children have. Systems of education, Mr. Speaker, such as that of the Montessori school, a system which is admirably suited for young children and children older than the 6 year age limit. There are systems of education such as the Summerhill system which is now in existence in England and in parts of California. These systems of education, if they could be supported in part by public financial assistance, would meet a very felt need amongst many segments of our Manitoba community. These schools, and the nursery schools which some communities do not yet have, might find in a modified resolution some hope for survival, some hope for extending their services to those individuals who cannot afford to pay for the private schools that exist today.

I would think, Mr. Speaker, that a flexible system of education, both public and private, should provide for equal treatment for everybody, not just treatment for those who are in private schools as they exist today or in parochial schools as they exist today, but equal treatment for all children in all types of schools with all types of curricula that meet with the approval of the Department of Education. I think that no special treatment for any one group should be the objective of government, and certainly I would think that this government, of all governments that have been formed in Manitoba, should never advocate special treatment for a few. I would think, Mr. Speaker, that this government and this party stands for equality and equal treatment for everybody.

On that basis, Mr. Speaker, I think that the resolution should contain some recognition of the fact that all parents should have the right to choose that type of education which they wish their children to have, and it should not be a privilege extended only to those with a particular religion or only to those who are of a particular ethnic extraction, and it would seem, Mr. Speaker, that the resolution as it stands on the Order Paper today is a resolution that would

(MR. TURNBULL cont'd.). . . . provide special treatment for a few, those few - there may perhaps be many of them - but those few who are bound together by ties of religion and ethnicity. I think, Mr. Speaker, that if such a resolution is to be passed and if the government is to consider the advisability of providing public assistance for private schools, that all individuals, regardless of their ethnic origin or their religion, should have the opportunity of deriving from the public purse, assistance for those schools that they would like to see established for their children to receive an education in.

As the same time, Mr. Speaker, I think that the resolution tends to reinforce the existence of what are called separate schools, that is a separate building, a building set apart for the use of particular religious groups or particular ethnic groups. I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that a separate building is really necessary. It would seem that there is every opportunity in Manitoba for the development of curricula and for the development of total systems of education side by side in the same building -- (Interjection) -- pretty close, that's right, but closeness of course is what our society is all about. No man is an island unto himself.

The instruction in these different types of schools, and instruction geared to a different type of curricula, might be achieved in the same building if the public aid that is envisaged in the resolution were to be provided for instruction and instruction only - no aid, no financial aid for capital cost or construction but just for the cost of instruction, and that of course would include grants to teachers who were qualified and approved by the Department of Education and the Faculty of Education as they exist across Canada.

The cost of such a program of course must always be borne in mind. If there is to be a proliferation of independent schools, then I think there has to be some safeguard, some consideration of just what the public money is being spent for, and today, Mr. Speaker, we have a system which does seem to provide some safeguard. I would think, Mr. Speaker, that if the system as I envisage it were to be continued, there would be safeguards in that students and parents that choose those schools which were the ones that were most successful, the ones that seemed to have, if I can use this term in relationship to education, those schools that had the highest productivity, those schools, Mr. Speaker, would attract the most students, and as the size grew the teacher staff would go up and grants to those schools would increase too, and we would have I would think some built-in control on the cost of this system.

But I think, Mr. Speaker, that what I am suggesting here should be clearly understood to not include those schools that are set up for the purpose of making a profit. It would be not very suitable I think for the Department of Education nor for the government to consider the advisability of providing financial assistance to schools that were making a profit for educating their students. I think that there is room in the educational area in Manitoba for schools to be established by concerned parents, or concerned adults who may or may not be parents, to set up schools which are non-profit, which are providing the type of education that they feel their children would like to have.

So I think, Mr. Speaker, that the resolution should be amended somewhat to achieve the purposes that I have outlined. First, I think that the resolution should be amended to enable a broader range of schools offering different curricula, different systems of education, to receive public financial assistance; that that financial assistance should be clearly understood to extend only to the cost of instruction in the school and thus, hopefully anyway, avoid the proliferation of extra school buildings and the costs incumbent upon them. And as well, Mr. Speaker, I think that an amended resolution should enable the educational system in Manitoba to have that greater choice, that greater flexibility which will achieve the expansion of knowledge and the broadening of the experience of the people, the young people of Manitoba. And I would like to return now to the Hall-Dennis Committee Report and cite this one short passage. "What is new, exciting and thought-provoking in our era is that what was once the privilege of an elite has now become the right of the multitude. How to provide learning experiences aiming at a thousand different destinies, and at the same time to educate towards a common heritage and common citizenship, is the basic challenge to our society."

And to meet that challenge, Mr. Speaker, I would like to propose the following amendment. I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from St. Boniface, that all the words after the word "granting" be deleted in the first line and substitute the following: "financial assistance for the cost of instruction provided by qualified teachers in all educational institutions of the Province of Manitoba that offer a curricula prescribed by the Department of Education."

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Honourable Member for St. Boniface make one of two

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.). . . . grammatical corrections before proceeding further. In the last line either delete the indefinite article or change curricula to its proper form, whichever. . .

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I didn't hear anything.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Honourable Member for Osborne please make -- may I suggest to him that he make a grammatical correction in the last line of his proposed sub-amendment. I do not know which he wishes to do. Either delete the indefinite article or change the word "curricula" to its proper form. -- (Interjection) -- I'm sorry, I did not hear the honourable member which correction he wishes to make.

MR. TURNBULL: That offer a curriculum.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the honourable member.

Moved by the Honourable Member for Osborne, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, that the motion -- this is an amendment?

MR. TURNBULL: The amendment should read, Mr. Speaker, I'll read the whole amendment in its totality if you wish: "financial assistance for the cost of instruction provided by qualified teachers in all"

MR. SPEAKER: There is no indication, as I see it, that this is to constitute an amendment. I take it that it is to be an amendment to the motion. -- (Interjection) --

MR. TURNBULL: Yes I did, I said all the words after the word "granting". Well I'm rather confused, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, that the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word "granting" in the first line thereof and substituting the following.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the honourable member.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Mr. Chairman, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Vital, that the. . . .

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if prior to that adjournment -- I'm sure the honourable member wouldn't mind if somebody else spoke prior to his moving of adjournment, either I myself or the Member from Radisson.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I rise to join in this debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Rhineland and the proposed amendment to the resolution of the Honourable Member for Point Douglas -- (Interjection) -- for Osborne, primarily not because I necessarily subscribe at this point in time to the principle that has been expressed in the motion of the Honourable Member for Rhineland but because I've had a number of submissions made to me, including delegations, and I wish to go on record that I am not opposed to consider the advisability of studying this very thorny problem. As I have stated to the delegation that met with me some two weeks ago, I'm prepared to study it but I am not ready to say that once accepting this proposition, that in voting for this proposition, that is "considering the advisability", that I will necessarily subscribe to this principle. As I've stated to the delegation, and I state it here, I will support the resolution at this stage but it remains for me to be convinced at a later date as to whether I will support the principle of aid or assistance to private schools.

I would like to know, and I would like to have someone explain to me, Mr. Speaker, why it is not possible to provide that type of special education which seems to be implied in the whole concept of private schools. I would like to know whether there has been any serious consideration to see whether that special type of education is not possible within our public schools. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that it is only a mechanical matter of timetabling. I cannot see why it could not be possible to work out a formula whereby these special subjects could be fitted into the school program by enlarging or adding more options of courses to the schools' curricula. Parents then would have that prior right, as has been referred to by the Honourable Member for Rhineland, and he referred to Article 26 of the United Nations Organization which states, and I quote: "Everyone has the right to education. That education shall be free and compulsory; that parents have the prior right to choose the kind of education that shall be given their children." Mr. Speaker, I suggest that by increasing - or rather by making more options for a greater choice of courses available within our public school system, that much of what seems to me is a major problem facing those proponents of aid to private schools would be resolved.

(MR. SHAFRANSKY cont'd.)

Mr. Speaker, as I have stated, I will support the resolution but with reservations. A public school has been dearly won and my fears are similar to those expressed by my colleague, the Honourable Member for Osborne, when he stated that through aid it is possible that fairly rich areas could isolate themselves and thus exclude much of the people that would benefit through education. Mr. Speaker, I come from a country where education was considered an expensive luxury. Mr. Speaker, I come from a country where to get an education you had to belong to privileged classes, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would not like to see, until we have studied this whole question, I would not like to see aid given. I say I will support the resolution based on the advisability simply to consider it. I'd like to learn for myself and then the problem could be resolved once and for all. Thank you.

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

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I've been listening to both the mover of the amendment, the Member from Osborne, and the Member from Radisson, and I have some difficulty in judging from their comments as to what their position on the resolution is. Are they for aid to private schools or are they not?

A MEMBER: They're on the fence.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, I suggest and I suspect that probably, as the lead-off speakers in this debate, will set the tenor of the debate that's going to follow on this resolution. Well, Mr. Speaker, without having done a great deal of homework, without having studied too many United Nations reports that both my colleagues have quoted from, I will attempt to differ from what I fear to be the kind of a debate that we'll get into in this particular situation and to speak to you, as our first citizens would say, without forked tongue, straight and from the shoulder.

Mr. Speaker, I don't have to suggest to anybody in this House or to any Manitoban that the question of aid to private or parochial schools is one that has perplexed Manitobans for the last 100 years. And I don't have to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that possibly if you had to single out one specific body or relatively small minority group of people who are responsible for this continuing controversy - and I say it with some regret, Mr. Speaker - it would have to be the politicians of ages past, the politicians of Manitoba, the politicians of Canada, that have had a tendency of reserving unto themselves this specific domain, this reserve, to fan up heated public opinion pro or con, one side of the House or the other side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me - and it's a significance that's not lost to me - that while most of us, when we consider most of the important affairs of public business, would rather tend to agree with the summation that a strong majority government is a position that is in the interests of that particular jurisdiction that it governs, and I certainly would subscribe to that. But, Mr. Speaker, I would like to come to you from the left field, or the right field if I wish to correct that one, that on this particular issue, on a question that has been of tremendous controversy to generations of Manitobans, that it may well prove as history passes that at this particular time that we face, that we sit opposite each other with a fairly even divided House - with some Independent members who I sometimes question of their independence, but nevertheless let's regard them as independent members - that on this kind of an issue -- you know, Mr. Speaker, I'm tempted to honestly believe that in the terms of solving this issue for posterity's sake and for history's sake, there may be tremendous advantage to all of us and to future generations of Manitobans that we may well settle the Manitoba school problem in this, or at least hopefully very shortly, by being able to react to it sanely, reasonably, recognizing that I've got nothing to gain by fanning up the emotions on whatever side that I wish to fan them up or that the government of the day has perhaps any more to gain by doing likewise, and that somehow perhaps we would be able to discuss this question without these external pressures that have always existed, that have always existed when this question has been brought to bear.

And I'm not naive, Mr. Speaker, they've existed for good reason - for good political reasons in the east and in the west, for good political reasons in the struggle that hopefully, hopefully with the election just past in Quebec, that we are beginning to make meaningful steps to resolve, in terms of the two founding nations of this country, but that have always befuddled us and have certainly been a tremendous - you know, one of the great inabilities of this Legislature since its inception to deal with constructively and reasonably.

Now, Mr. Speaker, without, as I said, without having done a great deal of research in this matter, it would appear to me that we are in the first instance not questioning an acceptable

(MR. ENNS cont'd.). . . . or a standard of education that all Manitoba children should receive. There is no question of this by those who are running private schools, whether it's the Catholic organization or the Mennonite organization or the Jewish organization or the Anglican organization or you name it. We accept -- and I must admit, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps I should have admitted it at the outset, that I speak from a prejudiced position because of my own individual support for private schools and the fact that my son attends a private school. So I should make that statement so that you accept the fact that I'm speaking from a vested interest to a degree, to the extent that I would rather make that admission now rather than have some members opposing the position stand up and tell me that.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what I was attempting to say, there is not a question of not accepting a publicly accepted - directed by this Legislature or by the Department of Education as represented in this Legislature by the Minister - curricula of education. Mr. Speaker, all children in Manitoba accept that standard. All children attending schools, to my knowledge - and I would be corrected if I'm wrong - that attend schools that are currently listed as private or parochial, accept that basic, that fundamental standard of education that we set. And we set it here, Mr. Speaker, it's not set by the hierarchy in Rome or by the Mennonite faith or by the Jewish faith, Mr. Speaker, that standard is set right in this Chamber through our efforts in directing the Minister of Education as to what kind of a general level of education we should be offering the children, the future citizens of Manitoba.

Now having said that, Mr. Speaker, I find it difficult to accept the problem that we've had over the years. If we are to pay more than lip service to what's particularly dear to the heart of my friend the member from St. Boniface when he speaks about believing sincerely - and I don't doubt for a minute that he believes it - about the mosaic of our province, about our culture; if we believe that there's a future, Mr. Speaker, in the greater mosaic of our cultural makeup in this country, in this province as exposed, or as versus to the generally accepted melting pot theory that is practised by our American friends south of the border; if we accept that on the one hand as being a national aim or national desire, or provincial desire; if we're sincere about that, Mr. Speaker, then we had best also be prepared to recognize the necessary support systems to indeed maintain that mosaic.

Mr. Speaker, I think this really is the fundamental thing, because, Mr. Speaker, I'm not that sure, I'm not that sure at all whether many people and many politicians that pay lip service to the idea of a multi-cultural Canada, never mind just a bilingual or bicultural Canada, are really prepared to accept that. Do Canadians really want to see second, third, fourth generations of Mennonite children, Mennonite children of their faith and their culture, speaking their language just as others could do. Do we really believe, Mr. Speaker, that we want to give every opportunity to further and foster the cultural traditions, the faith of our Jewish citizens and make it possible for them to do it in our schools, or in schools of some sort. Do we really believe that we want to make it possible? Not just for political reasons but really have a full and identifiable opportunity for the French-speaking people to practice their language and their faith and their cultural ideas. Now, Mr. Speaker, there's a difference if we believe it or if we're going to say we'll tolerate it until it disappears - if you follow what I mean.

Now, we recognize that we're an island of 200 million speaking - predominantly English-speaking peoples, and if we just do nothing, if we do nothing or we make no attempt, Mr. Speaker, there can be little suggestion or little doubt that we will lose that thing that sets us so uniquely apart at this particular time in history from the rest of our North American neighbours. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that it's worthwhile, and certainly it's worthwhile to me as an individual, as a member of this House, to not only support with lip service the concept of a multi-cultural Province of Manitoba and a multi-cultural Canada, recognizing the major positions that the founding people, namely the French and English community, play in the overall structure of Canada, but I believe very sincerely that it is a worthwhile objective, that we are indeed probably, in trying to achieve that objective, hanging our hooks on to one of the few significant things that will make it possible for this nation of ours to survive on this North American Continent, even though the economic ties are often mentioned as being the ones that will force our demise more than anything else.

So, Mr. Chairman, I'm prepared to accept, recognizing full well that there are members opposite, particularly veteran members of the House that can say to me: Well now, that's a fine speech to hear from a Conservative who represents a Party that hasn't rushed to the aid

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) or the recognition of this particular situation. Mr. Chairman, I personally make no apologies for that. I have my own position to acknowledge, and certainly it was one that I made very plain to the Premier that swore me into the Cabinet, when I was brought into the Cabinet, that if in fact the question of aid to private schools should become a matter of debate in this House, that my position was clear at that time back in 1966 when I was first brought into the Cabinet.

All I'm suggesting is that there's an opportunity to do one of two things. And I appeal to the members of the House. We can get into a wing-ding debate on this subject and we may well do that. On the other hand, we can take the opportunity and we can in this particular instance react with a degree of circle of one, a unity that need not bring it into a partisan approach. I'm sure the Member for St. Boniface must feel very concerned at this particular time when he - you know, acknowledging the efforts that he has often put forward in this particular direction - acknowledging, as he does, because he's a practicing politician, that there's always been a great deal of politics involved in this particular situation and it seems that we have had so much difficulty in avoiding politics when we discuss this situation.

And I'm not suggesting for a minute that I speak for all the members of my party. I would rather like to think that I'm perhaps attempting in the early part of this debate on this resolution, if I have any contribution to make, to bring a tenor of reasonableness into the debate of this resolution that I would like to exhort both the members of my party and the members of the House generally to adopt in debating this question, and certainly following along the lines of the two members that have spoke up to now on this resolution.

And while it shouldn't be without any difficulty that we accept the fact that individual members are going to have very specific concerns based on their specific feelings or their specific areas that they represent that will digress or be different from not only members of the Party that they represent or that have spoken for their party, but I would appeal that we take an opportunity to recognize, for at least during the debate on this Resolution, the fact that we have a very evenly divided House, that the responsibility of taking action, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, in this particular issue is not one that will lie either heavily on the shoulders of the government or heavily on the shoulders of the opposition, but there is an opportunity that it will lie on the shoulders of the whole entire House, that we have an opportunity to try to respond on this particular issue in a most statesmanlike manner and discuss in a serious and sane manner the advisability of providing aid and assistance to private and parochial schools in the Province of Manitoba, and thereby settling for once and for all, I would like to think, the question that has perplexed Manitobans so many years.

I come back in the close of my debate to one thing I've said earlier. It's not a question of quarrelling with the degree or the level of education or what in fact is being taught. I think that there's no question about the Manitoba Legislature, the Minister of Education for the Province of Manitoba has the right to exert the standard of education that should be accepted and should be accepted by all children of Manitoba that are in any way supported by public funds. If there was any digression from that, Mr. Speaker, I couldn't speak in any way in support of this resolution. But let me repeat that. The Minister of Education of this province should lay down the law as to what my children, what your children, or what all the children of Manitoba should be taught in the schools of Manitoba.

Now if in addition to that - the Member from Crescentwood shakes his head - if in addition to that we mean more than just simply lip service to the idea of maintaining a rich cultural mosaic in our province, then I suggest to you the idea of making that possible, and it is made possible - you may, you know, sure you may say fine, but what possible connection has that got to do with this school system? But it has that connection. It is the passing down to future generations the traditional practices of various ethnic groups, individual groups, language groups or what have you, that enriches our cultural society here.

Mr. Speaker, if we refuse to acknowledge that at this particular time, I would suggest that we don't really mean what we say, that we want a multi-cultural Canada. And before somebody says - well, you know - what's wrong, it's been going all right up to now, what's wrong now? I'll say this - and I won't put the onus on the present government - it's just the onus on the level of service that has risen to this point, that we have to tax real property, we have to tax our citizens to this extent for the tremendous expansion of social services - not the social services, but physical services in terms of roads and other things, that it's becoming increasingly difficult, it's becoming increasingly difficult, in fact it's coming to the point where it becomes impossible to run a private school situation. And in that light, I suggest to you,

(MR. ENNS cont'd.). . . . Mr. Speaker, that we either believe in the concept of a multi-cultural province, a multi-cultural Canada, or we don't, and we can signify so by our reaction to this resolution.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we're on Private Members' Day. I speak as the Member for Lakeside, not necessarily for my party. I know that there will be diverse attitudes taken within my party as probably on the other side, but it's a position that I would like to offer to the House of one of reasonableness and one of understanding for the situation that we face at this particular time. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Mr. Chairman, I move, seconded by the Member for St. Vital, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Rhineland in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gladstone, that debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the intention of the Honourable Member for St. Matthews to relinquish his right to participate in this debate?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I admit I wasn't watching very closely. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, with leave of the House - I notice this has stood once and I know that the member wishes to speak - I wonder if we can, with leave of the House, go to Resolution No. 7 so that the Member for St. Matthews will not lose his right if he gets back into the Chamber this afternoon.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, we're agreed except we're dealing with a rule of the House and we would have to have the understanding that any other member of the Legislature would have the opportunity of moving back at any given situation on Private Members' Day if this was to happen this afternoon. Just so long as we understand ourselves, I'm happy as long as it wouldn't be provided on one side of the House and denied on another side of the House, whether it was ours or some other member.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I don't want to relax the rule. What I hoped for was if it's just accidental being out of the House, because I'm certain that the member wished to speak, that if we could just go to the next resolution and come back. If the member wasn't here, then of course it would have to drop from the Order Paper, but I am of the impression that he was in the House, that he wanted to speak and I just don't know what has become of him.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'm quite happy to grant leave in this case.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, I am too, but on the same point of order, I don't care whether it's accidental or on purpose. If we establish a rule that we can go back on the Order Paper for one member, we establish the rule for every member of the House.

MR. GREEN: I respect the objection that's been put by the Leader of the Opposition and I'm afraid that the item will just have to drop from the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable Member for Gladstone, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose and the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, on the resolution that is before us, the resolution basically is stating that the government take action on the TED report, the targets that have been put before us, and in one area especially on the chapter entitled "Organization for Development".

The amendment - pardon me, Mr. Speaker - item (1) of the resolution states "The Standing Committee on Economic Development in the Manitoba Legislature", and he is asking that the other three points, 2, 3 and 4, be put into action right away. Speaking on the amendment, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce has stated that items 3 and 4 - he's not opposing that item 3 and 4 be put into action right away but that item 2 has been done. Now I do know, Mr. Speaker, that the appointment of a high-level Advisory

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd.). . . . Council on Economic Development drawn from the private sector has been set up and I would have no opposition to the amendment at the present time.

I would only like to state, Mr. Speaker, that this particular subject that has been the resolution from the Honourable Member from Ste. Rose is an exceptionally important one to the Province of Manitoba. We have gone through a debate in this House regarding the Standing Committee of Economic Development's report, which only met for what we know to be approximately an hour and 15 minutes. We believe that the Committee of Economic Development has much more work to do and it should be got at immediately. According to item No. 2, the high-level Advisory Board which has been set up, we have had no reports from them in any way, shape or form regarding the economic development of this province and there is no doubt that during the next eight months, or before the end of 1970, this province is going to have an economic problem which will be second to none. It's developing right now. I don't want to be a person that stands here and pleads gloom and what have you, but it's facing us and all the efforts of the government, or of any committees that should be set up, should be put into force immediately.

The establishment in Ottawa of an office of the Manitoba Economic Affairs, I think should be not necessarily tomorrow but could be discussed by the Standing Committee on Economics and probably decided whether it goes into action immediately, because it's a necessary thing for the Province of Manitoba to at least give the message to the people in Ottawa of our problems. The development of the applied technical and economic research capability for industry in a new institute is also something that I'm not going to stand here and say tomorrow, but it should be discussed by the Economic Development Committee of Manitoba as to whether this should be done right away.

We have the recommendations of the TED report. There is no way that you can completely disregard a recommendation from a report as extensive as this was, and if - if there is some disagreement or some reason why somebody thinks that the recommendations of this report shouldn't be put into action immediately, then let's get really down to business in a hurry and discuss the reasons why or why they shouldn't and make a decision on it and possibly - and I say that possibly with a discussion of the committee, using the TED report's recommendations, come up with a firm recommendation as to what we are going to do for the economic, not development, economic situation in the province at the present time. I know that the government has continually said give us time, we are looking at it and we are going to get this done. And I'm not here to say that I don't think they are doing anything. If I were to say that I would probably get the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources very annoyed with me and we could end up in a debate on that particular subject. I'm not going to say that, but I am going to disagree with the government on the basis of we are getting something done, etc., etc.

There was a philanthropist at a course I once attended, Mr. Speaker, and one of the things he said in this course, he said "if you're going to change you have to change," and at that point I figured I'd wasted all my money going to this course. But he's basically right. If you're going to look at a change you have to change. You have to take a firm look at your situation that you're in at the present time and there is no doubt that there can be legislation put through that will be for five, ten, fifteen years, and I would even doubt that you can have legislation that would have rules that would last that long. But there is no way that society is not going to come up with situations continually that have to be looked at immediately and something done about it.

What I believe this resolution says, the way I read it and what I think should be done, is the people of Manitoba deserve to have the government sit down with the brains that we have, discuss the reports that are in front of us and the problems that are in front of us at the present time, and make definite recommendations to help us through the economic conditions. I said I'm not a preacher of gloom, but the economic condition is there; you cannot wait for three or four years or two years. In Manitoba we can't wait for six months. We are going to have to sit down and do something about it immediately, Mr. Speaker. Therefore, I believe that the recommendations in this resolution should be carried forward just as fast as we can in a businesslike manner for the benefit of the people of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Labour, that debate be adjourned.

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

May 1, 1970

1529

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable Member for Russell, I wonder could we have this matter stand?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member appreciates....

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, that debate be adjourned.

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

..... continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for LaVerendrye. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned the debate for my colleague from LaVerendrye.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for LaVerendrye.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I will be closing the debate. If somebody else wishes to speak I guess it better be now.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the honourable members who took part in this debate. I never expected that this little resolution would create so much static but I am very honoured to see at least three of the Ministers of the Crown enter this debate and of course others. And the fact that it's perhaps a more important resolution than I thought, I don't really know what to credit this to, if it's a matter of guilty conscience or if it's a matter of real importance I don't know where the honour might lie. Mr. Speaker, I was very happy to see the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs first of all enter this debate. Of course he let us know that he was doing so and representing the Public Utilities Board and of course expressed his trust and his faith in the Manitoba Hydro Corporation. I want to assure the Honourable Minister as far as faith and trust are concerned in the Manitoba Hydro, as far as the Hydro is concerned, we have something very much in common. There is no question there. I do hope that he was not intimating that there was because I don't think he was, because there certainly is not. As loyal as both of us are to the Manitoba Hydro, I find it hard to understand that the Winnipeg Hydro, for example, have for the last ten years or so, and especially since 1966, contributed fairly large sums of money back to the taxpayers of Winnipeg. I think this gets to be quite a substantial sum. In reading this up I thought it was rather interesting that throughout its 50 years of operation the Winnipeg Hydro has been entirely -- and I'm quoting out of this book, The City of Winnipeg Manual -- has been entirely self-supporting. It does not enjoy tax exemption. In addition to paying all municipal taxes, it has made substantial contributions to the city's general fund, and it's surprising to note that since 1953 it turned back an amount of \$400,000, and then in 1963 an amount of \$1,100,000, and up to \$2,000,000 in 1966, and up to \$2,731,000 in 1968. So the Manitoba Hydro being as good business people as I think that they are, and I'm certainly hoping that they are not selling at a loss because I don't think that they would do that, I find it hard to realize that as good business people as the Manitoba Hydro are, I just don't know with the Winnipeg Hydro more than likely buying their power from the Manitoba Hydro -- and I firmly believe this, I don't think that the Manitoba Hydro is selling it at a loss -- somewhere I believe that the people of Winnipeg are very fortunate in getting this, call it a contribution or kickback. But I shall leave that -- now not in the word as far as kickback, I hope you don't accept it as that, I don't mean it that way at all, because . . .

MR. MALINOWSKI: You said it.

MR. BARKMAN: Well I mean getting an amount back from the profits and certainly not an illegal kickback if that's what's in your mind. But being a Minister of also a different sort I'm sure that your mind is clean and you wouldn't be thinking along that line.

MR. MALINOWSKI: I'm very sensitive.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Crescentwood refers to this resolution as not being just too important as far as inflation is concerned and perhaps the words or the thoughts that he gave us, perhaps if you really wanted to take his sayings real technically I could partly agree with him, and of course the honourable member states quite clearly that this type of resolution really has little effect in curbing inflation. I think the honourable member should perhaps return the favour of me bringing this resolution to the House first of all, because it gave him a wonderful opportunity of hitting at one of his favourite targets, namely the U.S.A. I hope he returns that favour by perhaps voting for this resolution but of course I'll leave that up to him. He of course is very much of the mind that all inflation starts in United States and of course we're just a small sector of North America -- and he may be partly right. I'm not just going to try and pick that apart. Being an economist I wish to take him partly at his word, but I'm rather inclined to think that the Minister, the Attorney-General, or in this case I think he was speaking as the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, I am also inclined that perhaps some of the inflation as he said started from the east, and I imagine that he meant the Federal Government. Perhaps if the two could get together some time and let me know what they come up with, perhaps I can get the answer or the solution a little better.

However, I appreciate the Honourable Member for Crescentwood taking part because he

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd.) kind of takes me out of the bushes, a little while after he mentions the fact about inflation as far as the United States is concerned. He does go on and he says he does believe, though, that the price of drugs being very important, and I agree with him on that point, should be brought down because this is one area where perhaps part of our inflation problem lies. I wish to agree with him on this basis and suggest to him that partly this resolution is based on the same theory in respect to hydro rates and gas rates, so regardless if I find it hard to understand as far as from where inflation occurs, I do agree with him that the price of drugs are certainly too high and I hope they would come down and I hope this will help part of the curbing of our inflation.

I might suggest that while the Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs mentioned the fact that the Bank of Canada is perhaps to a great extent at fault, I'm inclined to agree with that version to some extent. But the fact that I gave the Honourable Member for Crescentwood the opportunity of hitting one of his main targets - I'm sorry he's not in the House now - I do hope he does repay that by considering seriously in a few minutes from now, voting for this resolution.

I appreciated very much the Member for Fort Garry entering this debate. I appreciate his support in regard to this resolution and I certainly agree with him that the continuing spiralling cost to the consumer, as we all know, is becoming quite a desperate position to many of the taxpayers today - and as my colleague is whispering in my ear right now, certainly adds to the realms of inflation.

I think though, that the Minister of Finance, when he asked him, and I hope I can come back with that answer a little later in regard to what increase he was referring, I hope I can answer that, but I do appreciate the fact that the Honourable Member for Fort Garry took part in this resolution and I'm inclined to think the fact that he did take part helped create the opening for the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources to also take part in this debate. The Minister of course got up very intrigued and of course mentioned that he was intrigued by this kind of thinking on behalf of the Member for Fort Garry and I imagine perhaps even mentioned my resolution, although at that time I wasn't quite sure if he did or he didn't, and I want to assure the Honourable Minister that when he gets intrigued he can be very well heard even right up to this part of the House and it was rather amusing. In fact I thank him for joining the debate. The fact that he mentioned that, well naturally if you take out \$3 million from the Manitoba Hydro you'll have to replace it with some \$3 million whether it be from the Treasurer or whoever it may be. So, I can't argue with that fact at all. I hope that he wasn't suggesting because he picked out the sum of \$3 million that the rescinding of the Hydro rates or the gas were going to cost \$3 million; I think that was purely coincidental and I didn't take it that way.

But I would like to say to the Honourable Minister that while he may use that example as far as our Hydro is concerned, I think he should keep in mind -- and perhaps this was not spelled out specifically in my resolution, I think I'm partly guilty in that respect -- but I'd like him to keep in mind that I was also referring to certain private enterprises as far as these prices were concerned, and with all due respect again to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, as he mentioned that there are hearings or have been until recently, I think they're still not completed, being held presently as far as the gas rates are concerned, and I've attended one or two of these, and hearings have been held as far as the Hydro is concerned. I think we're aware that in 1968 some increases occurred and of course there was talks of the 14-1/2 percent that Hydro may be coming to, and of course we also know that they have not as yet increased their rate by the 14-1/2 percent. But I think I'd like to point out to the Honourable Minister, especially coming from that side of the House, it is an appreciated statement as far as I'm concerned, that he is concerned about large corporations, although I have a feeling that he was perhaps thinking more of the Crown corporations than he was of the free private . . .

MR. GREEN: . . .

MR. BARKMAN: Well, I give him credit then and I hope he keeps on thinking in that line.

MR. GREEN: . . . think about that one all the time.

MR. BARKMAN: I always knew he was a very honest man, and I hope he's also honest now.

MR. GREEN: I do . . . I hope the honourable member doesn't misconstrue my remarks. If he'll read what I said in Hansard I think what I said is quite obvious as to what I was

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) thinking about the corporations

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I think I get his message, but I would like to construe his message at this time. I would like to, but I shall take it in an honest way.

I think also that I could quite easily remind him that I think that the Inter-City Gas and perhaps Plains-Western Gas, they're also located at Brandon as we all know and other places, would not come in the category that he became so intrigued about. I hope that I can make this quite clear because certainly I admire his loyalty to the Crown corporations and I admire his interest as far as this resolution is concerned, although I'm not completely satisfied that he was only interested in this resolution, I would hope that the type of interest that he has shown as far as Hydro is concerned would also apply to some of the free enterprise corporations.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister goes on to suggest that there really haven't been any or many increases in rates, and to some extent he is correct. Of course, as I mentioned awhile ago we had the increase in Hydro in 1968 and I believe, I'm sure that the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs is aware, and many of the members of the Chamber are aware, I think we've had quite a few regional increases across Manitoba. I don't say they weren't necessary, but I think they appeared and I think most of us are aware, and I'm sure he is aware of this fact. As far as him suggesting that I was referring to the Winnipeg Gas Company, I must say here that I was really not, because I think he knows as well as I do that the Winnipeg Gas Company have not really increased their rates the last 12 or 13 years, and I could certainly not lay any blame on the Winnipeg Gas Company. I'd like to point out, I think he perhaps also knows this, I'd like to point out that as far as a consumer or taxpayer is concerned an indirect increase or a direct increase hurts the pocket of the taxpayer equally. I think that as far as the hearings, well the gas hearings I believe took place in Portage la Prairie, and I'd like to say that as far as these hearings are concerned, I think there is a heavy intention or a good indication - not really an indication but really a good possibility that this is the reason that they're being held down there - not down there, but being held - I think there's a very good possibility that it isn't going to take too long before these same gas companies that I mentioned will be asking for an increase. But in any case, I was referring perhaps to an indirect raise or increase in rates, I was merely going to suggest that perhaps my resolution should have been a little different and I want to point this out because it could be a little confusing. I should have perhaps made it read something like this: "That the price of electric power be rescinded and the increase of gas be disallowed after the hearings are over if such really took part." I think I might say a little bit more on that later.

I was also quite pleasantly surprised by the Honourable Minister. He tried to protect the Member for Crescentwood in regard to Canada following the footsteps of the U.S.A. in regard to inflation. I imagine their thinking is very much alike in this respect -- and the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. It just dawned on me I should have perhaps asked for the rescinding, or did ask for the rescinding of the electric power rates, and that I should perhaps have also asked for the rescinding of the drug prices, because I think the Honourable Member for Crescentwood has a very good point there, and I'm rather sorry that I did not include this and perhaps I would have had a little more support on that side of the House. -- (Interjection) -- It's a bit - yes, I think we could add a few more.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'm glad that not all the members opposite refuse the importance of the role that this government should play in regards to this very important matter. It's well and good for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs to say that the curbing should be done from the east or from the Bank of Canada or from the west - I agree with him - but this government in my opinion also has a responsibility, and that responsibility is of course to the taxpayers of Manitoba.

I want to come back as far as the increase in gas rates is concerned to clear up the matter. I would have to admit that I know of no direct gas rate increase, I mentioned a little while ago, but concerning some indirect direct gas increases -- I could just for that matter take the Town of Steinbach. They signed a contract with Inter-City Gas in 1956 for a 20-year contract and promised that after "X" number of shareholders would be connected on to their lines, that there would be a reduction in rates. This thing has occurred and has taken place, the magic number has been reached some time ago, but the rates have still not been rescinded. Perhaps it's partly due to the fact that the hearings are still going on, I don't know; but in fact the people of Steinbach have still not received any decreases in prices, and if you wish to call it an increase or not, indirectly it is. I'm very fearful that this will really never happen, not

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd.) in the case of the Town of Steinbach or perhaps in the other towns connected with Inter-City Gas or for Plains-Western either - or for both of them I should say. -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance just came in. He was also good enough to enter this debate and he goes on to say that this is really a silly motion. Well, if the Minister thinks it's so silly to try and save the consumer some money, he can be . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I of course object to that statement.

MR. BARKMAN: I would expect that you would object to it.

MR. CHERNIACK: Because it's not true.

MR. BARKMAN: You didn't mean it in that way?

MR. CHERNIACK: Did I ever suggest that I did?

MR. BARKMAN: You said in your statement that it was a silly motion.

MR. CHERNIACK: That's right.

MR. BARKMAN: And you say you do not mean it in that respect?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member did permit me to interrupt him. He asked me a question and the answer is that I said that the possibility of doing what the honourable member suggests is not possible and is silly in that sense. I never suggested that it wouldn't be advisable to try and reduce costs to consumers.

MR. BARKMAN: Well, I didn't really ask the honourable member a question, but I was glad to have this explained. Perhaps it'll clear out the statement and also his conscience, so this is fine. But in the meantime I think he knows better and I don't have to lecture on him, because sometimes when he gets up he cuts into a member in this seething sanctimonious way and I'm glad that he doesn't mean it that way and really wishes me to apply it different. Although I think his concern, and also mine, should be with the resolution and not to try and bring in different matters. The point I'm trying to make is this, I think he tried to - somewhat indirectly tried to drag in politics and I think that being the calibre of person that he is, that him and I are both much more interested in the resolution than we are in those kind of tactics.

I would like to - in fact I could add this, I think that actually the Honourable Minister with what he said in regards to this resolution, I'm not quite sure if his thoughts might not have been a little bit different perhaps a year ago or so, but I'll also leave that with him . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Is the honourable member asking another question?

MR. BARKMAN: If you wish to.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, I'll answer . . .

MR. BARKMAN: I think I can maybe tell the rest of them what you're really going to say, but perhaps we can leave it at this time. I only wish to bring out the point that I was quite sincere about this resolution and while he may think it is silly I don't think it's that silly.

-- (Interjection) --

Mr. Speaker, I do wish to apologize though that perhaps I could have worded the resolution slightly different because I realize that some of the overall increases are still perhaps some days or maybe some hours away, I don't know just when they'll take place; perhaps as soon as the hearings are over we can expect these increases.

I'm trying to hold myself back not to make any comments as far as what the Honourable Member for Lakeside said because I think he was caught between a position that was rather difficult trying to be loyal to the Crown corporation that he represented and also trying to be nice to me, so I think we perhaps will just leave that matter as it is.

So in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few facts quite clear. I think first of all I must emphasize again, I do not consider it a silly motion unless we have lost all respect for a taxpayer. And secondly, the resolution spells out quite clearly, in fact I would say very clearly, that a general agreement was reached between the Federal and Provincial Government at Ottawa to make a serious effort to hold the line on government spending, and this government, our Provincial Government, I believe will have to admit, and I agree with them, but in principle they concurred with this thinking. I think also the fact that at least three of the Ministers, and I want to thank them for entering this debate, can't completely make it a silly motion or surely they wouldn't have wasted their time on it, and I do thank them that they have joined this debate. And all the members of this Chamber, for the sake of the taxpayer of Manitoba and for the sake of in some measure curbing inflation, I wish that members of this Assembly would give this resolution serious consideration. Mr. Speaker, I'm simply asking this government to put their intention into action.

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

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for LaVerendrye, The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It seems I'm one of these members that are men of few words, but I hope I'm a man of action. In reviewing this resolution here, I realize in reading the first part of it, and I'm sure the Government of Manitoba does, that the situation which faces the rural people, the farmers of Manitoba, is in fact a very serious one. However, -- (Interjection) -- well, it may be so, but I'm sure there are a lot of turkey men that feel the same squeeze as any other farmer in the industry.

I'd like to comment on the movement that this government has made towards the Federal Government in its representations in trying to present the problem of the farmer as it exists in Manitoba today. First of all, in the early part of the year the Minister of Agriculture made representations to Ottawa with respect to the dairy policy and he made several recommendations with respect to the dairy policy as it exists. In this, he stated that if the Federal Government was going to come up with a new policy that it must and should discourage the development of surpluses which would ultimately defeat any support program which would be in effect. It was also recommended that to assist individual producers to make adjustments to improve their income position and help them establish viable dairy operations, that the program should be carried on in such a way as not to segregate the area. Manitoba producers are in a change right now; many of them are changing over from the shipment of cream into the industrial milk area.

There was also concern expressed that a national surplus of certain dairy products would in fact discourage Manitoba producers from meeting the requirements of their own province in these products, namely as it exists in Manitoba; the dairy policy which presently is in effect is adverse to Manitoba in that the dairy product supply in Manitoba is below the . . .

MR. HENDERSON: Talk to Sam about it.

MR. URUSKI: . . . the domestic needs of the Province of Manitoba. (Thank you.)

There were three points stressed by the Minister in that if a new program would be recommended, and they were stressed, that firstly there should be a type of a program implemented that would be very simple and easily understood by all producers; and secondly, that a market-sharing quota should be established on a regional basis and set out at a level equal to the 1967-68 production; and thirdly, that quotas should be allocated to individual producers on a basis of their 1968 production and any allocations they have received since that time. These are some of the submissions made by the Minister in respect to the dairy policy which is in existence.

Now we go into the area of the grain situation. During the Federal-Provincial Conference in Ottawa on February 16th and 17th, Manitoba presented a position paper on agriculture, from which I would like to quote Manitoba's position at that time in respect to the conditions in our agricultural industry, and I quote: "The farmers haven't been sitting on their hands -- (Interjection) -- on their hands. In response to economic conditions, western farmers have made some dramatic adjustments during the past two years. For example, Manitoba farmers have reduced their wheat acreage by a significant 27 percent from 1968 to 1969. This was in response to the rising wheat surpluses in western Canada. Also, in response to opportunities for the livestock industry, significant adjustments are also taking shape. On December 1, 1969, hog numbers on Manitoba farms increased by some 41 percent over the figure of the previous year. However, in spite of these kinds of adjustments, the net income of farmers in 1969 confirmed the difficult position of the industry in an otherwise reasonably buoyant economy."

This was their position paper, or excerpts from it, in February. And I go on: "The '69 net income on Manitoba farms of approximately \$97 million compares with a figure of \$122 million in '68 and compares to the most recent five-year average of \$144 million. This goes to show you the net income decline to the agricultural industry in Manitoba.

"It has also been pointed out that during the period from '61 to '68, the price of goods and services used by farmers increased by some 35 percent while the prices received for the product sold by farmers increased only by five percent. This cost-price relationship has in fact worsened during the past year."

The province made some definite proposals to the Federal Government at this conference and they urged the Federal Government at that time to initiate a program under which payments of eight to ten dollars per acre would be made to farmers for temporary withdrawal of land from production - that was at the time. This would permit the industry to reduce the present

May 1, 1970

1535

(MR. URUSKI cont'd.) burdensome surpluses of wheat which exist and would permit it to operate under more normal circumstances. At the same time this move would allow sufficient time to give further study to additional long term social and economic adjustment programs that are needed. It was at this time the Minister requested of the federal Minister that the report on the Task Force on Canadian agriculture which had been submitted to him, should be in fact tabled and become a public document.

Now there was an alternative that the Manitoba Government through our Minister of Agriculture presented at this time should the Federal Government not want to go ahead with the other suggestion. The province proposed on its own initiative, even though the limited amount of money that is available to a province of this size, it still proposed to the Federal Government a cash advance program in the amount of \$2,000, with, of course, the understanding that Ottawa would permit the province to collect first on the repayment of this when the grain was delivered.

And another alternative was proposed, that should the Federal Government not agree to this, that another supplementary cash advance of \$1,000 would be made to the Manitoba farmers by the Manitoba Government, to advance \$1,000 if the province could collect on a proportionate basis at the time that the grain was delivered to the elevator.

And failing all that, there was a third proposal that the Federal Government amend its cash advance legislation so that advances could be made on the basis of grain in storage, rather than the present system based on the acreage of \$6.00 an acre to a maximum of \$6,000 loan. As it stands now, of the 34-odd thousand permit holders in Manitoba, only 700 farmers of these would be able to qualify under this \$6,000 cash advance program; the remaining farmers would not be able to qualify as the amount of acreage on their farms would be less than this amount.

Just recently the Minister of Agriculture had made another submission to Ottawa, giving facts that Manitoba farmers had reduced their wheat acreage by 26 percent as compared to Saskatchewan of 13 percent and 18 percent in Alberta and that the summerfallow increase in this province in the same period - that was '68-69, was 19 percent as compared to seven and six percent respectively for Saskatchewan and Alberta. It was reiterated that the program that has been presented by the Federal Government would not be sufficient to induce the Manitoba farmers to summerfallow. In his brief the Minister stated that the \$6.00 an acre incentive was not sufficient and he recommended that a \$12.00 an acre payment for increasing summerfallow, if the Federal Government wanted a definite response to this type of a program.

An objection was also raised to the removal of the unit quota system because of its effect on the smaller farmers. If this delivery system were removed, it should be in fact replaced with other programs to take care of all the small farm income problems.

The Manitoba brief as presented by the Minister also stated that in order to qualify for the incentive payment, farmers should be permitted to use either '68 or '69 as the base year rather than having to use '69 as now specified, and a consideration to those individuals and regions who have already made their major acreage reductions, be further given.

It was also stated that farmers who were putting additional land into forage crop this year under the program, should be permitted to harvest and nurse the crop without losing the incentive payment and rather than ploughing it under.

It was also pointed out that for Manitoba, in order to get a quota to sell wheat, at least 50 percent of last year's summerfallow acreage, rather than 25 percent, should be permitted and it was suggested that expenditures in the order of \$300 million would better reflect the amount needed to achieve the kind of response to the program and it would also assure its success.

I've just pointed out several of the submissions made on behalf of the Manitoba farmers to our senior government in Ottawa, by our Department of Agriculture through our Minister, and in going on I feel that the first portion of this motion has in fact and is being realized by this government. However, the second portion, in reading this over, it is asked that this government call the Standing Committee on Agriculture and also to ask representatives of the Canadian Wheat Board, the Canada Grains Council, the United Grain Growers and Manitoba Pool Elevators and others concerned, before this committee so they should report their findings to this committee. This in fact is fine, but it appears to me that these same group of people are in fact presently advising, or are in consultation with the senior Federal Government and it would appear in fact funny to me, that we as a Provincial Government would call these people so they would give us advice, the same advice that they are giving the Federal Government so we

(MR. URUSKI cont'd.) in turn could give the Federal Government the same advice, and this is the part - well, it's like asking the right hand to tell the left hand what the right hand is doing; and in view of this I propose the following motion: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Point Douglas, that the resolution be amended by deleting all the words after the word "That" in the sixth line and substituting the following: "this House commends the Minister of Agriculture for his initiative and representation to the Federal Government of Canada on behalf of the farmers of Manitoba."

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I ask you to consider the advisability of accepting what has to be the most ridiculous amendment to any motion that I've ever heard. Surely, Mr. Speaker, that by all rules of this House this motion simply must be out of order.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I didn't hear the motion in its entirety but from what I heard it sounded so much like the motions that have been presented time and again on this side of the House by members of the Roblin regime that I would have thought that it would have been accepted as being one that is in accord with precedence and therefore I would think that - the honourable member of course wants you to hold it and read it over the weekend I suppose, and since the Member for Lakeside isn't here, I would think that you'd be prepared to go on it.

MR. JORGENSON: Sir, you can make your decision right now, and whatever way you make your decision, it doesn't matter to us; we're prepared to go on this.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, if I may speak to the point of order. I would say to you, Sir, that the motion really is no more ridiculous than the position that the Minister of Agriculture put the Member for St. George in at the moment, and as far as I am concerned, it is a very simple straightforward, ridiculous amendment.

MR. SCHREYER: The Member for Morris suggested that the proposed amendment was out of order because it was ridiculous, but perhaps he could be more specific and indicate why he believes that it's in fact out of order. A proposed amendment that commends government for a course of action which would amend a resolution which condemns is something which has been moved in this House many times.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, if the First Minister wants me to speak to that particular point I can do that quite readily. I don't have any references before me but the original resolution purports to ask the Standing Committee on Agriculture to be called to an emergency sitting immediately at the current session of the Legislature to consider all aspects of the problem and to recommend means of alleviating it. That is the meat of the resolution. What the Honourable Member for St. George is doing is simply deleting that portion of the resolution which negates the motion. He can do that simply by voting against it, so therefore the motion is in my opinion out of order.

MR. GREEN: . . . on the same point of order. I don't have the reference immediately before me but I know that there have been resolutions in this House that have been amended and I can remember the words: "by striking out everything after the word 'whereas' in the first line thereof, and substituting 'therefor'" and then material followed. I can appreciate my honourable friend's distaste with the resolution, but that doesn't make it out of order.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of order and the remarks made by the House Leader, the fact that somebody might strike out all the words after "whereas" in the first line of the resolution, he might continue in terms of his amendment to carry out part of the context that was intended in the motion in the first place. Might I suggest, Sir, that you have taken a very positive resolution and it's attempted to be amended by saying everything that's been done that could possibly be done in terms of the amendment. It completely negates the resolution in any way, shape or form and I too would submit that the amendment is out of order; but also recognize the fact that what the House Leader says is absolutely correct, that it is possible under some conditions. It would be possible by making an amendment in a different form and contain some of these words and still have it in order, but I would still submit that the amendment as it exists is out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: I wish to thank the honourable members for their assistance even though they were not able to make any specific reference to authority, so I will take the matter under advisement and give my ruling after I've had an opportunity to peruse same. The proposed resolution of the honourable . . .

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, might I enquire of the House whether authorities are to be anticipated on such short notice and, you know, I've been looking through the book -- I don't

(MR. WEIR cont'd.) think I can ask the Speaker, I ask the House.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, if you do wish any of the persons wishing to speak to the order to try to ask for authorities, I think it's within your power to do so. I have no objection if you wish members to supply you with authorities, I have no objection to your asking them and . . .

MR. WEIR: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to it either, but I would like a few minutes to be able to provide for the authorities rather than out of the back of my head, if authorities are requested.

MR. SPEAKER: There was no request made. The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Riel in amendment thereto, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek in further amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. BARKMAN: There's nobody left to speak for him, Mr. Speaker. I guess we just leave it, please. (Agreed.)

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. CHERNIACK: I'm wondering if I could ask -- did the honourable member say there's no one left to speak to?

MR. BARKMAN: No, I'm sorry, I would just suggest that we have the matter stand.

MR. CHERNIACK: Oh, thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): I move, seconded by the Member for Sturgeon Creek, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand. (Agreed.)

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I enter into debate merely to put an amendment that was originally intended by the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Services to the resolution proposed by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. I would therefore move that the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge be amended by striking out all the words after the word "and" where it appears in the third paragraph of the proposed resolution and substituting the following: "WHEREAS although 61 percent of persons who must resort to alternative care, such as nursing homes, are supported by social assistance and are exempt from hospital and medical insurance premiums, the remaining persons do not benefit from such insurance and all must contribute to their ability substantially more than for hospital care; THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba continue to explore with the Government of Canada the inclusion of alternative care, such as nursing homes, under the Hospital Insurance Plan." Seconded by the Minister of Finance.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The motion as amended - the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Fort Rouge, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member from Assiniboia.

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

WHEREAS contractors are faced by a multiplicity of conflicting and outmoded building codes, and

WHEREAS manufacturers of building materials are unable to achieve the lowest possible cost through mass production, and

WHEREAS the multiplicity of local building by-laws plays havoc with production in house manufacturing plants and adds costs to house construction, and

WHEREAS the National Building Code has received endorsement from many organizations

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.) such as Royal Architectural Institute, Canada Labour Congress, National House Builders, etc.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba adopt the National Building Code standardizing building, fire and safety legislation and that this Code should be made applicable to all residential, commercial and industrial building in all the municipalities of the Province.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I believe this motion is very timely, because for years now the politicians, be it municipal, provincial or federal, have been boasting about the high percentage of people owning their own homes in this country and they attribute it, the high percentage of home ownership, to the high standard of living in this country as well. Today, Mr. Speaker, I think we're becoming a nation of renters instead of home owners, and to some extent I would like to say that politicians have contributed to this. On one hand we place unnecessary sales tax or tax burdens on building materials, on land, not only provincially, we do it as well federally. We have five percent provincially, we have 12 percent federally, and when it comes in the way of land for housing, the governments have done very little to the present time in this respect.

Now, when we come to the building code, I think the situation is much worse. I know that during the Municipal Committee meetings last summer our committee has discussed the National Building Code and there has been some variance of opinion on this matter. I feel that in my opinion the Government of Manitoba must adopt a National Building Code standardizing building, fire and safety legislation and that this code should be made applicable to all residential and commercial buildings in our municipalities in the province. I think this is one field where this government can assist with little or no expenditure from the provincial purse in reduction of cost of buildings, and especially the cost of housing in this province.

One way they can do it is by adopting the national building codes where manufacturers and builders can reduce their costs. One very important limitation faced by builders is the multiplicity of conflicting and often very much out-moded building codes. I know that the manufacturers of building materials are unable to achieve the lowest possible cost through mass production, and today the only way we can reduce construction cost is by mass production, Mr. Speaker, because on one hand what you can sell in one community is prohibited in another community. The National Building Code is prepared under the direction of the Associate Committee and the National Building Codes of National Research Council, with a permanent staff in a building division, and constantly reviewing and amending all sections of the code. This code is designed to suit every part of the province.

The Government of Ontario appointed a committee to review this problem and have done a pretty detailed study on it. I would like to just turn to the report of the Committee on Uniform Building Standards for Ontario which was tabled I believe in the Ontario House last November. I know that in one area it indicates where some 543 municipalities had a building by-law, 105 had no building by-laws at all, 280 municipalities did not use the National Building Code, 209 municipalities used a short form of the National Building Code, and 159 municipalities used a long form of the National Building Code. This was the material collected from some 648 municipalities.

This is an indication, Mr. Speaker, of the multiplicity of building codes that we have in the provinces today, and I would like to indicate that the committee concluded its studies with the following statement and pointed out the advantages of such a building code. (1) It would reduce the cost of construction costs by having to build in different ways in different municipalities; (2) it would reduce the cost by short production runs, diverse inventories of manufacturers in construction under adverse weather conditions; and it would simplify the approval of new materials and methods of construction. If we are really concerned about reducing the price of construction and the price of homes in this province, this is one method that we can do it by. I would really like to stress to the government at this time to really look quite deeply into this problem and perhaps if we have to get a committee of the House or if we have to -- I believe it would have to be a special committee because I don't believe a municipal committee would have the time to deal with this problem in quite detail like the Ontario Government has done.

These were the advantages and I would like to point out that the recommendations of that

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) committee of the Government of Ontario were as follows: "Uniform Building Code" - and this was the recommendations: "(1) Commencing with the 1970 edition, the National Building Code of Canada and the supplement be adopted by the Province of Ontario to form a uniform building code that shall be mandatory through the province. This code would be called the National Building Code of Canada, 1970, and Ontario Building Code, 1970, hereinafter referred to in this report as the National Ontario Building Code."

It also further recommended that a uniform fire code be implemented. "Commencing with the 1970 edition, the National Fire Code of Canada and the supplement be adopted by the Province of Ontario to form a uniform fire code that shall be mandatory through the Province. This code would be called The National Fire Code of Canada, 1970, and the Ontario Fire Code, 1970, hereinafter referred to in this report as the National Ontario Fire Code." There's a tremendous amount of detail material and data information in this report and perhaps it would be worthwhile for some of the other members of the House to acquaint themselves with it.

Mr. Speaker, I have before me a copy of the latest CMHC estimated construction costs per square foot of buildings or bungalows in this province, and in a matter of one year - and I'm quoting from 1968 to '69. In 1968 in the first quarter in Winnipeg, the construction per square foot was \$13.99, and at the same time a year later, 1969 and the last term, the fourth quarter, that same construction per square foot has increased to \$16.00, which is a pretty substantial increase. And this happens right across Canada, almost in every major city. The same could be said for many of the other components that go to make a house, be it construction of windows or any part of a home, the costs in the last few years have been going up and up and up. I know that in the matter of a few years, when we're talking about \$12.00 per square foot construction costs, we're now talking \$16.00, which is a very substantial increase. And really, Mr. Speaker, I think this is one way that we can cut our construction costs by a pretty substantial margin.

I also see where in the province one of the first goals - this is the Winnipeg House Builders Association statement of recently, I believe April 1st: "One of the first goals is to have the province enact a National Building Code and make it mandatory for Manitoba. It has been acclaimed as one of the finest building codes in the world. It would not only help reduce building costs but provide for an acceptable minimum standard of buildings throughout the province." This is one of the recommendations from the Winnipeg House Builders Exchange.

Mr. Speaker, the cost to home owners and tenants and the cost to municipal taxpayers that pay for many of these duplicate preparations, I think seems almost inexcusable for this reason. I feel that the government must move in this direction. Almost all houses now built in Canada comply with the National Building Code because the Central Mortgage and Housing requires them to do so, so I don't think it would be such a major change. The National Building Code has received endorsement from many organizations such as the Canadian Construction Association, Engineering Institute of Canada, Royal Architectural Institute, Canadian Federation of Mayors and Municipalities, Consulting Engineers of Canada, Canadian Fire Marshals, Canadian Association of Fire Chiefs, Canadian Underwriters Association, Canadian Labour Congress, Central Mortgage and Housing and the National House Builders Association. These are all in agreement that the National Building Code should be a code that can be used right across Canada and should be a uniform building code, and still today, with all these organizations who are involved in construction and building, with all these people involved and supporting the National Building Code, we still are swamped with a multiplicity of local building by-laws, and in my opinion I feel these regulations play certainly a pretty large havoc with production in home manufacturing plants and add costs to home construction.

Our builders are working, I believe, in a very archaic environment with archaic government approaches. Can anyone imagine the cost of an automobile if they had not achieved efficiency of mass production and volume manufacturing of cars? Can you imagine the cost if each province and municipality in Canada decided to write its own specifications for each automobile in this country? I believe the price of an automobile would probably be so prohibitive, it would probably be somewhere in the \$200,000 or higher, and still we are working under the same conditions with building and construction of houses in this province.

I think we can go a long way, Mr. Speaker, in improving and perfecting a system that will give each family at every wage level a better opportunity to own their own home if we adopt the National Building Code standards. I see no reason why the government cannot move in this direction. As I pointed out, almost every organization that is involved with and has

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.) anything to do with construction, all support this recommendation. I think that the Government of Ontario has taken a tremendous step forward in adopting the National Building Code and I think we have to go into mass production. Let's assume even in doors or windows of certain houses where you want to buy a part for your house that probably has worn out, there's no standardized size that you can order from a manufacturer. In most instances it has to be specially produced or specially made, and naturally this is where tremendous costs occur. If there would be some standard codes in respect to many of the components for homes, I believe that the costs can be greatly reduced.

Mr. Speaker, you know I have been very much interested in this field; I'm very much interested to see that people, as many people as possible, can own their own home, and it's our responsibility to make it feasible for these people to be able to have accommodation for themselves. I know the study that was done by the Federal Government in respect to housing in Canada, and many of the people who live in the public housing have stated in no uncertain terms, I believe it was somewhere in the neighbourhood of over 85 percent that stated they would still prefer to own a home of their own and to live in a home that they can call their own instead of public housing.

So, Mr. Speaker, I certainly recommend this resolution to the House. I see some of the members would be interested to know what the Code includes, but this would take me a couple of hours to read it to the House. I think it would be too long, Mr. Speaker. So with the comments that I have made, I would certainly recommend this very strongly to the House. I hope that the other members will be very much interested to get involved in this debate on this resolution and I'm sure, as I mentioned, that the government will probably see fit to accept this because, as I mentioned, this is one area where it will not cost the government any money, and if it will, it will be a very small amount. But I would like to see the government move in that direction because I feel this is only one way that we can help many of our citizens to achieve something that many wish to do, and that's a desire to own a home of their own. I strongly recommend the resolution to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member will permit a question. Would the Code that you're talking about, would that be applicable, let us say, to residential housing that is built in Greater Winnipeg? Would it mean that there would be standard requirements right across the country? Is that what you're referring to?

MR. PATRICK: Yes, it would.

MR. GREEN: Can you tell me whether the building standards across the country that are in the Code, do they make allowances for different matters such as climate, terrain and things of that nature?

MR. PATRICK: Yes, they do. In fact I mentioned that I believe at the start. There's a Standing Committee studying this problem all year round and there are supplements issued, you know, for any special conditions, so this in fact is taken care of.

MR. BEARD: What conclusion did they come to?

MR. PATRICK: That the Code be recommended.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to make a few comments in respect to this resolution. First, I think it should be understood that the adoption of the National Building Code standardizing building, fire and safety legislation would certainly be in the best interests of the public in Manitoba and I think we are all in a position that we should be able to agree to this.

There are two problems that I would like to raise. One is the problem and the entire question of properly making this National Building Code such that it can be applicable to all buildings as referred to by the honourable member, and this seems to contain within itself further proof that we must re-examine the entire restructuring of municipal boundaries in the Province of Manitoba. It appears more and more clear that with the development of Manitoba into more and more of a progressive and developed society that Manitoba will have to follow the route of enquiring into its entire municipal structure in the rural areas as well as in the urban areas. Ontario and British Columbia have developed regional forms of government and it's going to be necessary that Manitoba also look at this.

Now at the present time with the massive conglomeration of small municipal units within

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd.) the province - villages, towns and what not - my concern is that legislation like this, though in theory fine, in practice would be most difficult to properly have implemented within the province. I can see for example the difficulties in a village, take any village in the Province of Manitoba, being able to set up the necessary machinery and equipment, personnel and financial wherewithal that they can within themselves, as a small unit, be able to successfully carry out this type of program.

Mr. Speaker, this again points to the whole area of the need for examining regional government, because there are so many areas where this is in fact true. Let us only examine the area of economic development - and certainly our various West-Man, East-Man or other Economic Regional Development Corporations that are being established within the Province of Manitoba at the present time indicate that things can be done better if they are in fact organized on a regional level. I think that we can refer to planning as another area where certainly things can be done better on a regional level than on a small unit level. The present municipal structure in the Province of Manitoba has been with us for many decades, but is it possible that this municipal structure within the Province of Manitoba is creating apathy, indifference, and holding back the possibility of progress in legislation at the present time in Manitoba?

These are the questions I think we are going to have to be confronted with in the very few months that lie ahead. Therefore, without question, the type of measure proposed by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia is progressive. It's social legislation. It's an improvement within the entire structure of our community. It's a necessity, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think also in view of the fact that we are going to be dealing with this plus many other areas in our Municipal Affairs Committee, that this area should also be examined by those that are in that committee, and I'm pleased that the Honourable Member for Assiniboia is also a member of that committee - I believe he is a member of the Municipal Affairs Committee - and it will be an opportunity for us to analyze this type of program along with the larger question of structure of government and how best such a program such as this can be implemented.

Therefore, the wording does concern me, Mr. Speaker, in that it states: "Therefore Be It Resolved that the Government of Manitoba adopt the National Building Code." I would suggest that the motion be amended by inserting the words "consider the advisability of adopting," and I would move such, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Transportation.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Member would care to write his amendment, please, for the members of the different parties?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, . . . sub-amendment to the amendment while we're waiting for the amendment?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister appreciates, of course, that this is to appear in Votes and Proceedings. I regret that I cannot accept the amendment in that form. Are you ready for the question?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I was going to adjourn the debate unless somebody else would care to speak on this.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, if I may then for just a moment before we close the House this afternoon. I was prompted to speak . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Pardon me, there are no amendments, are there?

MR. SPEAKER: There is no amendment before the House at the present time. Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was prompted to make a few remarks, particularly because of the introduction on the part of the Minister of Municipal Affairs in this debate, and I couldn't help but think, Mr. Speaker, that the resolution before us, commendable as it seems, you know, is the kind of resolution that legislative bodies pass and then people wake up two or three or four years later, if in fact something like this should find its way into resolution, and you know, the intent of the resolution is sound and there is nothing wrong with it, but it's this kind of resolution that if brought into legislation, we find, a few years later, ourselves hopelessly tied up in governmental red tape and with the National Codes being applied that have no relevancy for the individual and the regional needs.

Mr. Speaker, why I particularly wanted to make this statement, because I know that the Minister of Municipal Affairs in the course of his office prior to this session made several trips - and I'm referring to particular trips that he made, that he undertook as the Minister responsible for housing - and he made trips to some of our less fortunate communities such as St. Lazare, some of our Metis communities that are in extreme difficulties and some of our Indian communities that are in extreme difficulties in housing, and I would have to ask him before he considers the advisability of accepting a National Building Code that's applicable to Toronto - you know, Tuxedo, Winnipeg, Vancouver and Hamilton or where have you, that of course it also has to be applicable to St. Lazare, St. Laurent and a few other places.

Now I'm sure the Minister has come to grips at first hand with difficulty that we're having for instance with CMHC - you know, the complete problems that we find ourselves in because of the fact that we've allowed a bunch of bureaucrats to set down the rules and regulations, you know, Mr. Speaker, that says under these conditions, under these income conditions, building this and this kind of a home, yes the Government of Canada will borrow money to help Canadian citizens get into a home. But, Mr. Speaker, what is the relevancy of this at Southern Indian Lake, or at Norway House or - I don't have to go that far - at St. Laurent in my own community.

So, Mr. Speaker, I just wish to, aside from relieving the concerns that the Member for Churchill has about speaking on the next resolution - and I want to assure him that I'm prepared to hold the floor till 5:30 so that he doesn't have to speak on the next resolution - but I wanted to make these few comments because they are nonetheless apropos even if they come at the closing of the day on Private Members Day on Friday, that we should not be stampeded, no matter how good the principles would appear. Because really, Mr. Speaker, what are we doing here? We are - and I'm not suggesting for a moment that we should not be concerned about the concerns of the Royal Architectural Institute, they're probably a pretty good bunch of fellows. The Canada Labour of Congress certainly is another very worthwhile group, or the National House Builders, etc. also, you know, very worthy people.

But, Mr. Speaker, they are nonetheless vested interest groups that are concerned with a nice clean format that they can apply to their business, and their business is in the construction of homes or commercial or industrial buildings. Completely left out of this resolution of course is the concern of the individual people for whom the buildings are built, the individual communities wherein they are built, and of course the regions where they are built. I suggest that before we submit ourselves, Mr. Speaker, to any national code, that certainly a jurisdiction such as Manitoba which suffers to some degree in achieving national averages always -- in other words, what is an acceptable national code for a building in Toronto is not necessarily -- it's pretty tough to follow for an average code for a similar building in Woodlands, yet this is the kind of situation that we kind of encourage if we pass a resolution of this nature without due consideration and due concern.

Now, I don't wish to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that anything I've said would prevent me from supporting this resolution, because, Mr. Speaker, I now would like to indicate to you that in fact I do support the resolution, in the sense that if it were amended properly - and I will not attempt to bring in that amendment now - if it had the -- the contents of it is that certain codes are nationalized. My objection to it is that they be nationalized across the country without respect to the variations of regions. Now I would suggest perhaps to the mover of the resolution that if he were to indicate in the resolution a recognition of that fact then I would certainly be prepared to recognize or support the resolution. Thanks, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Boy, do I want this one. I'd like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, that debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. BEARD: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface,

WHEREAS the Government of Canada refuses to acknowledge Churchill in its incentive program for designated areas of Canada, and

WHEREAS there has never been any indication of genuine interest by the Government of Manitoba or the people of Manitoba to provide the funds necessary to further develop the Churchill Area, and

WHEREAS Churchill suffers through the inability of the Government of Canada and the Province of Manitoba to collectively arrive at a satisfactory program to improve and expand the Port Churchill facilities, and

WHEREAS the Prime Minister of Canada and the Commissioner of The North West Territories have indicated an interest in Churchill becoming a part of the North West Territories, and

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that open negotiations be conducted between the Government of Canada, the Province of Manitoba, Representatives of the North West Territories and the community of Churchill on the advisability of Churchill peninsula becoming a part of the North West Territories, and further be it resolved that this Government direct the Churchill Local Government Administrator and his Advisory Council to call for an election of such a Committee, at a Public Meeting immediately so that the people of Churchill can be assured of being involved in all meetings.

MR. DESJARDINS: I want it known I second that for him to go, but I want to stay.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if it wouldn't be more appropriate if we called it 5:30 at this stage and the Honourable Member could start . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I call it 5:30.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 Monday afternoon.