

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
9:30 o'clock, Friday, July 23, 1971

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees. The Honourable Member for Logan.

REPORTS BY STANDING COMMITTEES

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Third Report of the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs begs leave to present the following as their Third Report.

Your Committee has considered Bills:

No. 37 - An Act to amend The Municipal Act.

No. 75 - An Act to amend The Local Authorities Elections Act.

And has agreed to report the same with certain amendments, as agreed to by the Committee.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. SPEAKER: Ministerial Statements. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

TABLING OF REPORTS

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I wish to lay on the table the Annual Report of the Clean Environment Commission for the calendar year, December 31st, 1970.

MR. SPEAKER: Any further ministerial statements or tabling of reports? Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills. Oral Questions. The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

ORAL QUESTIONS PERIOD

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture and relates to an outbreak in what is thought to be encephalomyelitis strain or virus in the southern part of the United States affecting horses. Has the Minister considered any restrictions as to the movement of horses that have possibly been exposed to this virus into Manitoba? I am thinking particularly possibly of racing stock or harness horses that might be moving from that area, or rodeo horses. Has he considered any restrictions for Manitoba in this respect?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SMAUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): Well, Mr. Speaker, I've not been made aware of the problem so I couldn't answer that question at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Word has just reached us that Ross Thatcher has passed away. I wonder if it would be in order to observe a moment of silence in respect to the late Premier of the Province of Saskatchewan.

* * * * *

MR. SPEAKER: Oral questions. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Opposition) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question is really supplementary to the Minister of Agriculture and I accept his reply that he's not aware of the situation, but I think the situation warrants, if he will accept this as a question, the matter being taken as notice and some information being supplied the House, not necessarily what the province will be doing but what joint action may be required with the Federal Government in connection with this.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I can look into the matter although I think the honourable members opposite ought to appreciate that there are provisions within the federal authority that allow for this kind of situation.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY - GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I was hoping that we would be able to proceed with the

(MR. GREEN cont'd.)second reading of bills. Looking at the names of the members who are holding them, it appears that none of them are here at the present. I wonder if any of them are being held for other honourable members. Well then, if that's the case, Mr. Speaker, perhaps we'll go to third readings and proceed with the second readings as the members come in.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: If the Honourable Minister would call Bill 99, I'll speak on Bill 99.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition. Bill 99.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney did not complete his address in connection with Bill 99. At the time that he concluded, I believe he had been referring to the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund and asked of the Minister certain questions which at this point may be clear to the Minister but are not clear to the members of the Opposition, and some clarification will be required either in the House on his summation at the end of second reading, or in the committee, with respect to how it would operate, particularly the situation where a hit-and-run case would take place and there would be a claim at that point as to what the implications would be. And Mr. Speaker, we have considered, and there will no doubt be other speakers who will be speaking from the Opposition side on a specific of the bill, not on a particular section but on the principle involved in one specific area. It would appear that the wisest course in any case, Mr. Speaker, would be to have the bill go to committee for the detail summary and analysis so that the sections can be understood fully and the implications can be discussed and possible suggestions for improvement in the bill itself.

But there are a number of basic principles that have to be discussed in relation to the bill, and some of the honourable members - the Member from Birtle-Russell particularly - have mentioned this already. The Highway Traffic Act and the manner in which the enforcement division conducts itself with respect to the Highway Traffic Act, was designed before the consumer protection laws were developed in this province and, as a result, we do have a Consumer Protection Branch that in fact acts as a department to protect the consumer and to protect the interests of the consumer. And the question seriously must now be considered as to whether certain sections of the Highway Traffic Act, as a result of the amendments that are being proposed, should in fact be referred into the Consumer Protection Act where it more properly could be placed and where it more properly could be supervised. At this point it is being supervised as part of the over-all police power in enforcement of the Highway Traffic Act, and because the line is a fine line, it may very well be that, as we deal with certain sections, the recommendation for reference to the Consumer Protection Act in some cases may be considered by the government and may be a better result than what is being proposed here specifically. There are, Mr. Speaker, some doubts as to the intent with respect to the production of the identity card or the licence . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sorry to interrupt the honourable member. I wonder if the small caucuses that are going on would tone down a bit. I have difficulty in hearing the Honourable Member from River Heights. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, there is some doubt, there is at least some possible confusion of the intent with respect to the licence and the production of the licence as requested under the Act. My assumption is that the Minister intends that the licence would be produced when a person is driving a vehicle, but there is a possibility of an interpretation which would suggest that a policeman could ask for a licence from an individual while he was just simply walking down the street, not in his vehicle, in which case if that power is given, I don't think that's the intent of the Act, I don't think that's the intent of the identification care, and I would think that this should be clarified in the actual committee stage so that the legislation will be clear in this respect.

Mr. Speaker, the question of the change which would make a doctor obligated to in fact report the information is a pretty fundamental change. Mr. Speaker, we're at a period of time when we are looking at the values that we have established, the traditions we have followed, and there is no doubt there are changes that are required. Now I do not know and I would be interested in hearing from the Minister whether there are any other jurisdictions that have changed the law as he is proposing here, and I wonder whether he could then indicate, if this is the case, whether any better result has occurred because the law has been changed than has occurred so far with what I believe is only two cases that have been reported by doctors.

The relationship between a professional, whether he be a doctor or a lawyer, and the patient or client - and I could cite other examples of professionals and individuals - is considered to be one of confidence and confidentiality, and the obligation to report on such a patient

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) is basically repugnant, is basically repugnant to the tradition that has been built up, and Mr. Speaker, it would be easy to cite example after example in the case, say, of a lawyer, where a certain situation could arise and the same rationale that is responsible, the exact same rationale responsible for the proposal by the Minister, could be applied in the legal situation where the lawyer then should be required to report to the authorities the information that has been passed on as a result of the client-lawyer relationship. I don't think we've reached the point where we want to basically change that because this is too darn fundamental to the way in which our society has developed, and I can go over, and there have been . . . of private discussions with some of the members on the opposite side in connection with this, and we can cite example after example. Some become very obvious and some may become examples in which the public may feel there certainly is an obligation on the part of a professional to indicate to the authorities the information that has been handed to them. But on the other hand, there are others that are not as clear in terms of public attitude, and this is where the breakdown would occur.

As an example, for a lawyer who has a situation in which a client comes to him and indicates that he has been guilty of an offence. Is there an obligation on the part of the lawyer to immediately inform the authorities that that individual has come in and told him that? And this is a situation that was cited by a member on the opposite side, where someone comes to a lawyer and indicates that a child has been abandoned. Is there an obligation on the part of the solicitor to immediately indicate to the authorities that the person has indicated to them that a child has been abandoned? For the person who is a professional and who has someone come to him, whether it be an accountant or a lawyer, and indicate that there has been something which is a breach of various acts that have been committed and asks for some way in which to have his situation resolved and protected at this point, what is the obligation of the professional at that point? And what has happened is that in this proposal, as simple as it may appear to some, and even to the Minister of Transportation, we are now dealing with a very fundamental principle, and the question that has to be asked is, are we prepared to breach the tradition that has been developed on this particular situation with the probability that the results will not be very much better than they are today? Now that's the real situation. Is there any test or measurement that would indicate that the result will be any better than it is today? And even if that were the case, I don't want my remarks to suggest that that would mean that we would be in favour or I personally would be in favour of it, but at least there would be some measure in connection with this.

Mr. Speaker, the suggestions in the legislation with respect to what we consider safety items is commendable on the part of the Minister and, as has already been indicated in the House, the reality of Manitoba being able to set rules and standards for Canada and for the rest of North America I think is such that one really questions whether the improvement can be best achieved by this manner. But what the Minister has done is highlighted the necessity of change and the necessity of additional safety precaution and additional safety measures, and for that he is to be commended; for that he should not be criticized. What is required, though, is something more, and that's the ability of the government to use its position to try and bring together the other provincial governments to be able to hammer out together some reasonable propositions that they are all prepared to agree on and that the Federal Government is prepared to agree on, which will set a uniformity of standard in Canada which would be a greater protection and which will accomplish a better result than what is being proposed here.

Now the argument may be that this is a start but, on the other hand, if no other provincial government follows this procedure, the accomplishment is not that great. If, on the other hand, the Minister was to use his office, the Minister was to use the office of the Premier to try and convene meetings, caucuses, in which this problem can be discussed, in which in fact the investigation, the study that the department may or may not have undertaken can be presented properly in a way that the logic of the presentation is so apparent that action will be forthcoming from the other jurisdictions, then, in effect you can accomplish the aim that's being proposed. The likelihood, though, is that at this stage it may not accomplish that specific area.

Mr. Speaker, there are certain sections here which indicate and give the registrar authority without defining clearly the basis on which that authority is to be exercised. And as a matter of fact if we go to the particular clause, this question of the doctors and the obligations of a doctor, because there can be such a variation in opinion in any given situation and because in effect that authority has not been defined and the regulations or the obligation is not

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) clearly understood, one wonders whether the discretion -- (Interjection) -- Well the problem -- this is an interesting position. The Minister has said judges and magistrates are in the same position but the registrar is not considered, I hope, to be a judge and the doctor is not considered to be a judge - the registrar is not to be considered a judge in that sense, surely not. There's a discretion to be exercised but the exercise of the discretion surely must be within certain parameters and within a certain ability and within a certain judgment, and surely what we are attempting to do is to define it within the certain area. And who is to judge the doctor? Is the doctor to judge the doctor or is the government to judge the doctor? Who is to judge a doctor's opinion of what a patient is capable of? There are so many - well there are thousands of variables that enter any given situation of diagnosis, that how are you going to be in a position to set the kind of standards. Well the question of what we suggest is whether - and again I have to go back to the Minister and there is no point of our talking about this back and forth because - we can continue this, I have no objection to it, but realistically, this is what has to happen in the committee and this is why I'm suggesting again that it goes to the committee and this is why I'm suggesting that the question has to be discussed, again: have other jurisdictions tried this and what results have the other jurisdictions had? Are they any better realistically, and if they are not any better then what's the point of making the change realistically, because really what's the point?

Mr. Speaker, this is a very brief contribution to the Act, there are approximately 60 pages, several sections involve the auto insurance act, several set some standards in which there can be questions specifically of their application to particular situations and it will be our intention to deal with this by presenting each kind of situation to have some understanding from the Minister how this is to apply. We will allow this to go to committee stage; and again we recognize as well that we are in the last stages of the session, but this will require a detailed study and we would hope that we will be given the opportunity for some detailed explanation with the people who are the advisors to the Minister; and at the same time we will introduce some amendments; and further, we will discuss in general, both in the committee and probably in the reporting stage, by way of the amendments, the application of the Highway Traffic Act to our people and whether in fact there are some more fundamental changes that should be considered and introduced at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. J. R. FERGUSON (Gladstone): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I just have a section or two that I'd like to deal with very briefly. This is quite a large Act and coming in at this time of the session it's, I don't expect, going to get the proper perusal it possibly should.

The section that I think is going to affect a lot of the farmers in rural Manitoba will be clause 169 (1), which states that "a farm truck may be used by the registered owner, member of his family or his employee for the transportation of produce or products of the farm other than milk, eggs or livestock." I don't really know what this is designed to take off the road, the transport of milk and eggs is normally done or to a great degree is done by the companies involved and to a degree the farmer, and it's in the case of auction marts and this sort of thing which is local transportation. In many cases the one farmer will have a small truck, a half ton or something that you can put a box on and take an animal to market. This is kind of a partnership deal possibly with a neighbour and this bill will make this illegal, even to the effect that if you took a case of eggs or a can of cream into town for your neighbour this would also make you liable to prosecution. I feel that at a time when as much pressure is being put on agriculture as there is at the present time that I can see no particular reason why this particular clause would be in the bill. I think it is just another punitive measure as far as the agricultural segment of our economy is concerned.

I don't think that there are any other sections that I want to cover, Mr. Speaker. This is the one that I think particularly will affect my area and I would like to bring it out at this time. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Is it the understanding of the Chair correctly that the motion will remain in the name of the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney? The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, can we expect the honourable member to be here this morning and speak to it this morning. Well then I would say that with leave of the House if the honourable member returns this morning that we would want to come back to it. If he doesn't return this morning then we would like to call it perhaps at 12:00 o'clock so it can be spoken to by the Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, the reason that the honourable member is not here is that he is in fact doing some homework for one of the other bills that he now has and my belief is that he will be here to be able to speak on the other bill and this bill . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Leader of the Opposition could look at the list of names -- I wonder if I can get the attention of the Leader of the Opposition. If he can look at the list of names he will see that we are unable to proceed with second readings, with the exception of one, that is the adjourned debate of the motion of the Honourable Member for Flin Flon on Page 7 of the Order Paper, which is in the name of the Honourable Member from Swan River, and I wonder if there is anything that can be done about getting some of these second readings off. Bill 117, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, I have perused this bill and it looks straightforward; and again I must say that the limited time available doesn't give the full examination a bill such as this should have; however, in view of the circumstances we are prepared to let this matter go forward to committee.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Bill No. 65 can be proceeded with . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Osborne. The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this debate for my colleague, the Honourable Member from Fort Rouge.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Chairman it was of great interest to me to see this bill proposed; I am very pleased that there was a group of citizens who are interested in taking some strong measures towards improving Manitoba's situation regarding Mental Health Research.

During the debate on the estimates, particularly those of Health and Social Service, or Social Development Department, I had mentioned the fact that Manitoba showed up very badly in comparison with other provinces in this area, that Saskatchewan was spending two to three hundred thousand, Alberta \$100,000, that Manitoba was spending only \$9,750 per year. Even the Federal Government is apparently doing very little in this area, having expenditures of only something like \$84,000 a year. This is unfortunate. We all know that mental illness is increasing rapidly and particularly amongst school children. The pressures and the strains are great and the numbers of disturbed children in our schools are increasing drastically every year. Presumably if we were able to look after them and have them rehabilitated before they reached maturity, they would then still be able to live normal lives.

With the bill itself I have just some questions concerning the membership of the Board. There is provision that specific areas of expertise should be represented but there is no guarantee that a number of psychiatrists would be involved. Perhaps this is taken for granted but it does seem strange that this provision has not been written in. Then, too, there is no mention of pharmacology and with the present drug abuse problem being a major contributing factor to the disturbances that young people are subjected to, it does seem that it would be advisable to have someone on this Board who has a good understanding of the effects of drugs on the mind. Similarly, one might consider insuring that there are lawyers, even an accountant on this Board. However, I don't think that this is so serious as to delay passage of this bill.

The quorum of five out of eighteen seems a little low and there is no mention of the numbers of people who might compose a professional advisory committee. However, presumably here there would be various areas of the health field represented, particularly psychiatrists.

In the provisions for filing an annual report, it seemed that it would be a good thing, in our opinion, that the report should be filed in plenty of time so that it would be available to be tabled at the session of the legislature which would be held in the spring. I believe that requires something like 60 days prior to the beginning of the session.

With these comments, Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to see this bill move forward and applaud its intent.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, apparently there is an error on the Order Paper and that Bill No. 111 should be in the name of the Honourable Member for Assinibola rather than the name of the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek. I recall myself that the Honourable Member for Assinibola was on his feet and I interrupted him. So if we can call 111 . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs. The Honourable Member for Assinibola.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assinibola): Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief on this bill because I haven't got too many objections to it, in fact I'm in favour. But the point that I wish to raise is I understand the Minister promised that he would be establishing a committee to deal with the national building code, and I'm glad that the national building code is incorporated in the bill because this is an area that I have been prodding the government in this House since 1968. I feel that it is in the right direction, and if I may say that you have almost every organization dealing with any form of construction, be it the Royal Association of Architects or the engineers or the National Builders Association, the real estate boards, some thirty organizations right across Canada have all indicated and have all requested the governments right across Canada to bring in a uniform national building code in the provinces right across Canada.

Now there is a variance and the code in itself is only a minimum standard and it takes into consideration all the geographical regions; for instance there would be a variation in the building code in say a place like Churchill, Manitoba or anywhere up north so the changes could be made. In that respect I feel that there should be no fear on any of the members in some way that this will effect some of the smaller communities in the province.

Now the point that I'm really interested, Mr. Speaker, is we are all concerned about home ownership and we have realized that our homes have gone up in price considerably and to some extent - I'd say to perhaps somewhere in the neighbourhood of ten to fifteen or twenty percent - it is because there isn't any standards in any particular area, there is a multiplicity of local building by-laws all over this country. In fact I understand in Ontario they had something like 400 municipalities and each one had a different standard or different building code, so you could quite easily or readily see the problem this creates when every little municipality has a different standard so I feel this is certainly in the right direction. I am very happy that the Minister is bringing it in because to some extent I feel not only that it may bring the construction of certain buildings down in price but it also will remove the duplication of different standards and building codes that we now have throughout the provinces and different municipalities.

The other point that I really was concerned about, Mr. Speaker, is supplement No. 5 of the building code dealing with architectural barriers, and I have brought this to the House before, that today in Canada we have somewhere in the neighbourhood of one out of seven people who have some permanent physical disability and I know that the Federal Government has accepted the supplement No. 5 respecting all of the federal buildings and I would hope that the Provincial Government would do the same, because even at the present time many of the government buildings do not specify or make provisions for the handicapped people, so I feel this is in the right direction. The only concern I have is that the Minister promised when the report came in, the municipal report that dealt with this during the period in between the last session, that he would be having a committee established made up of quite a few organizations to deal with this particular subject, and to the present time I don't believe that the committee has been established so I would hope that he will do it soon.

So with these few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared to let the bill go and I am in full agreement as far as a national building code is concerned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Bill No. 118 I believe is ready to proceed.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Education. The Honourable Member for Emerson. It says Lakeside here.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, at the outset I'd like to suggest that the Honourable Member from Lakeside did adjourn the debate for me and it is with his approval that I speak at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

MR. GIRARD: I don't have a lengthy contribution to make on this bill, Mr. Speaker, but there are some matters in the bill which do present some interrogation or question marks and I'd like to have some clarification. I regret that the Minister is not here at the moment but I suppose I could repeat some of these matters to him privately in the hope of getting the kind of answers that we are looking for.

The bill provides for a rebate of \$50.00 per resident on the taxes that are paid on that particular property or one-half total of his tax bill unless that one-half is less than the \$50.00. I suggest at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that this kind of game is hardly the kind of thing that I see as a sound and reasonable way of paying for school taxes. I understand it has been done in the past; it will likely be done in the future; but may I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the motivation for this kind of act is not sound school financing. It must be some other motivation, but I don't want to read too far into it.

This is one way, Mr. Speaker, that without increasing a specific tax we can just omit a certain portion of those people that pay school taxes, and I submit that this is tantamount to an increase of \$50.00 on the business property taxes. I think we could announce this kind of legislation as saying, instead of saying "government reduces taxes by \$50.00 per resident," they could well say, "business to pay \$50.00 more than residents on property taxes." While I'm in accord with this kind of thing in certain matters, I suggest to the Minister that he might well have to consider in a short time his definition of what a business is. I can understand that large corporations might well be able to afford this kind of payment, but I also suggest that small businesses that do not include a resident are going to be pushed a little harder in the future than they have been in the past. It's well to say that, no, it's going to be the same because, you know, because we're granting, we're paying back for the others. I suggest to you that the rate of levy will be set on the burden that the people can assume, and with that \$50.00 rebate there will be a gap which will likely be filled in a year or two and consequently will push up the small businessman a little more in the tax bracket and the differentiation will be a little greater; and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that he should well consider what he defines as a businessman so he doesn't put out the corner barber and the corner grocery store while trying to get money out of Eaton's and Hudson's Bay.

There's a portion in the act that I find a little hard to accept and that is the portion that determines by regulation what will be considered the Public School Finance Board's portion and what will be considered the municipal portion of the \$50.00 rebate. I would like to see, I would like to see, Mr. Speaker, some clarity in that area and I would further like to see a little less flexibility left to the Minister himself. It would be nice for a municipality to know just exactly what portion of that \$50.00 will be coming their way; if it's the portion based on assessment, what is it based on and how will it be determined. I would like some clarification in that area.

The Municipal Act, which governs the payment of monies from municipalities to school boards because of the levies that are set forth by the municipalities collecting for the school boards, are included with dates of payment, and it would seem to me justifiable to include in this bill some dates by which municipalities or school boards can expect those monies from the Provincial Government. I know that there is provision for advancement, but we lack the specific date by which the school board can gear itself and say, on such and such a date we will be receiving X number of dollars from the Provincial Government as per that grant. I know it might be a little cumbersome because it ties some people down to a certain date, but let's look at it from the receiving end, Mr. Speaker, and I suggest that it's a little confusing for a school board or a municipality who's trying to operate on a certain budget, not knowing exactly when that money will be submitted to them, and in the handling of their cash situation it would be very helpful if those dates could be incorporated. I wouldn't like to suggest at the moment what date they should be, but I think it would be easy enough, with the help of the Municipal Act, to arrive at specific dates that would help the management of municipal and school business.

The bill also incorporates an idea that is very noble, but I suggest will be very unworkable, and that is the idea of having the rebate paid to reduce the taxes of the landlord, but he in turn has the moral obligation of transferring this back to the renter in the form of decreased rent or whatever the case might be. And I hate to see the kind of legislation, Mr. Speaker, that is suggesting morality but has little teeth in it, and I can't suggest how we could include teeth in this kind of legislation. It's a noble thought, it's probably a good suggestion, but it

(MR. GIRARD cont'd.) hardly belongs in the Act, Mr. Speaker, because it's really an unenforceable kind of thing.

I would like to say that the prime point I want to leave, the prime or the most important idea I would like to leave with the Minister, is that really, in spite of the good intentions and in spite of the glamour that might go with this bill, it certainly does not get at the root of the problem of school taxation; and if we look at the constituency of Emerson for a brief moment, you will find that the school tax problems are not based especially on the mill rate. I realize that the mill rates have to be high because, as I've said several times before, the assessment per pupil is low, is one-third approximately of the Winnipeg School Divisions as they are, but the real problem, Mr. Speaker, that plays havoc with a taxpayer, the property taxpayer in the constituency of Emerson, is a game that seems to be played by the Assessment Branch of the government and this game was pointed out so clearly by the Member for Rhineland a few days ago when he said on one parcel of land where he paid a \$425.00 bill last year, this year he's going to have to pay \$1,700 and some. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that I have some similar situations in my constituency. There are some farmers who might not have to pay four times as much but they will have to pay twice as much, twice as much taxes, and it might not be very effective for them, you know, to increase their taxes by four or five or six hundred dollars and then say, "Well, look, we're giving you a \$50.00 rebate," and the end result in that kind of situation will be that you harm him more than you help him. The intention might be good all right, but the help is very insignificant and the damage is great.

As I compare the taxes that are paid on property and residents in the city, I have no hesitancy, Mr. Speaker, in suggesting that for the very same house, the very same kind of building taken from the city school division - and I leave you the choice of that particular school division - and you transfer that same building in the same situation, the same condition, to any area in my constituency, and you will find that without the services of sewage and without the services of the fire protection and the post office and the paved streets and so on, those very people, that very building will end up paying more money in property tax than it will with all the amenities that you have in the city; and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that \$50.00 will not cover the difference. And so we are not getting at the root of the problem when we're doing this kind of thing.

What we need, Mr. Speaker, might well be the kind of equalization across the province that the Minister has brought about in Metro Winnipeg. I'm disappointed, of course, that he thinks it's important to equalize school costs in Winnipeg but unimportant in the rest of the province. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the right way of doing, the right way of remedying the situation, would have been to increase the general levy, as I have always advocated, increase the general levy to a point that you have the kind of a lowest common denominator that he used in Winnipeg, and provide an opportunity for the divisions that have a low assessment per pupil, to decrease their special levy, which is the very thing that is garring them right now.

I think this bill ought to be supported because we can't really vote against motherhood, we can't really vote against a donation of \$1.00 per acre to the farmer; but I suggest the two are very closely related in the effect it will bring. We don't want to vote against a donation to someone but we'd like to point out that, really, it's insignificant when it comes time to consider the total bill that the taxpayer has to pay; and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister give this matter careful consideration so that he will understand that this cannot be the answer and something a little more substantial should be brought forth, not at this session, but early in the next.

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

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, as the Member for Emerson has said, it's difficult to vote against motherhood and therefore it's difficult to vote against this bill, but one can't help but be amazed at the government going back to this form of financing education which we basically had several years ago and which we were able to get away from only after having rammed through all the problems associated with it, and I think basically you have to, first of all, ask the question: why does the government want to go to such an inefficient means of financing education, to go to all the expense of collecting the money, sending out tax bills, and then computing a rebate to be given out at the municipal office and subtracting it from a tax bill that has already been sent out, and then in the final analysis, in the case of the person who lives in the apartment block, only hope that this might be passed on back to the tenant,

(MR. GIRARD cont'd.) when in fact all you have to do is to change one or two of the other variables which the Minister has at his disposal in financing education, and he can do it with far less cost to the taxpayer, far less cost to the public administration, and with far more effectiveness from a school financing point of view?

I don't recall, in 1967 or thereabouts, I don't recall even the Minister supporting the principle of the school tax rebate system that was in effect at that time, in fact the same amount, the only difference being that the rebate was sent directly to the home owner and wasn't deducted at the municipal office. In fact I would think that, as I recall his remarks, the remarks of the government at that time when they were in opposition were that it was a ridiculous way of financing education, and in 1967 the method was dropped because basically it wasn't a good method of financing education. However, there was pretty good politics in it and I suspect that maybe that's why the government has gone back to reintroduce to the people a direct contribution towards their home owner taxes, a contribution that wouldn't be necessary if the government had kept the Foundation Program up to where it should be and we wouldn't be trying to take out of the left hand pocket and put back into the right hand pocket \$50.00 for every person that is a dweller or qualified to be a home owner.

So those are the basic questions, Mr. Speaker, and I think the Member for Emerson has covered the topic very well. I only rise to ask the question of why the change of heart in going back to a system of financing education that showed up its difficulties not more than four years ago and was dropped as an ineffective way of financing education and now the government is going back to this as an alternative to the problems that are faced in the city, in the country, everywhere where school taxes are paid.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): I'd just like to say a word on this particular subject, because I was around here at the time that the rebate was brought in and I remember so well the criticism we got because Duff Roblin's name was on the cheques when they were mailed out. We got chastised and chastised, and chastised some more, and it was the wrong thing. Eventually it was changed to deducted from the taxes at the municipal source and eventually that was dropped in favour of a higher percentage of the government pickup. Now we're going back to the same old story; in fact it's a little different though, and I want to explain what I will get out of this great policy. It so happens that on the 47 acres which my farm buildings are located on, the taxes on this are \$36.00, and when you figure it out I'll get \$9.00. But yet -- \$9.00, half the school taxes; half the school taxes. I get \$9.00 out of this great policy. But, Mr. Speaker, that isn't the total. I'd like to tell the honourable members that I'm paying a lot more school taxes than \$18.00. So what is that doing? -- (Interjection) -- What is yours?

I can see where the farmers in the Province of Manitoba are not going to get hardly anything out of this great policy, and they're still going to have to pay an increased sales tax to raise this \$22 million which is the total amount to be paid out. The farmers are going to get the worst of this deal, and I'd like to re-emphasize that, so we're back to where we started. The farmers in the Province of Manitoba are paying a great share of the cost of education; they will continue to pay it even though this policy is brought in, and I can't see for the life of me why the government don't take another look at it, because if they're going to bring in a policy it should be fair to all people in the province. Why should a man who's got a one-room suite, self-contained suite in the City of Winnipeg, get a better share of relieving the cost of taxation on schools than a man who owns a thousand-acre farm? My goodness the farming industry is hit hard enough but you're going to say to the farmers of the Province of Manitoba that they got to raise that \$22 million along with all the other people in the province of Manitoba. And if they're going to have to raise that \$22 million along with everybody in Manitoba, why shouldn't they get their equal share of that 22 million. So I say, Mr. Minister, -- (Interjection) -- 22 million? Well I think that's what it is, I saw it in the paper, 22 million, isn't it? Well if it isn't 22 million it isn't going to do any good. Just a simple fact of life. You've got to either make it worthwhile or drop the whole thing. Drop it. So it means a 1-1/2 percent sales tax, Mr. Speaker, 1-1/2 percent sales tax on 22 million; if it's 12 million, 1 percent sales tax. So how are you going to raise the money? You're going to hit the farmers both ends. You're not going to give them any money but you're going to take it out of their pockets. Farmers pay more sales tax than any other person. -- (Interjection) -- Two million dollars? Oh it's more than that. Mr. Speaker, I'm getting lots of advice from both sides

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd.) here. At this time of the morning I don't think I need much advice because my head's not that serious, but I was saying, we've been trying to make it a fair policy and I will admit in three or four school divisions yet they still have the same rebate system, Point La Bosse, Rhineland and others, and how are they going to operate under this, are they going to get a double rebate, where are they going to fit in?

I think, Mr. Minister, that before you start to involve apartment blocks, self-contained suites and all that, take a second look at this. I know they're playing great politics and this is why I'm up because I want to be playing politics too. I'm playing simply because I got a lot of farmers in my area; and the farmers aren't going to agree with this, the farmers aren't going to agree with this. I might as well get in on it, because the next election, the next election - we were the ones that brought in, we'll give you, every apartment block owner, we'll tell you you've got to share that with every tenant in that apartment block. And I'll bet you there's a lot of them in Winnipeg here. I'll bet you there's a lot of them. And I tell you, not only will this help, Mr. Speaker, in the next provincial election; there's an election this October, there's an election this October. It's going to be fought with political parties and my goodness the first thing - our party is all in favour of handing out on the first day of January a reduction in your costs of education even though you don't own one square foot of land, not one square foot of land.

The policy of this government, Mr. Speaker, is to discourage people from owning land and that's the policy. You get better treatment if you don't own land in this province and this is not what this province is built on. This province is built on for people to enjoy their own little parcel of land, and I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the government through my little efforts here today will encourage people to own land rather than to have a little wee room in a big 30-storey apartment block over here on Roslyn Road. This is not the way to live, Mr. Speaker, this is not the way to live up in the clouds. Give a person some encouragement to live on the ground floor. This is the kind of policy that should be encouraged in the province. My goodness, I got enough land on my farm that would house 100,000 people maybe to put houses on. But nobody wants to live on it because they all want to live up in the air. And they're encouraged to live up there because they're going to get a reduction in school taxes. Mr. Speaker, this is entirely wrong. This is entirely wrong. -- (Interjection) -- I am going to vote against it, I sure am; and I tell you there's good politics in it, too, for me. Good politics, good politics. I found after 13 years in here, Mr. Speaker, that if you're going to play politics you might as well go all the way, all the way, all the way.

Mr. Speaker, farmers in the Province of Manitoba are going to get very little out of this plan and as I mentioned before, they're paying the great cost of the education in the rural parts of Manitoba and they will get very very little out of this and -- (Interjection) -- yes, repetition is the staff of life, Mr. Minister, repetition is the staff of life. -- (Interjection) -- Well the rules are pretty broad, I've been here a long while.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to vote against this because it's wrong. The policy should be treat everybody the same. That should be the policy. Encourage people to own their own property. That's all I got to say on this particular subject.

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

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief. I do wish to make a contribution on this bill and you know what a change takes place in a couple of years time, because when we were in the Opposition and so were the New Democratic Party, and at that time the Minister of Agriculture used to say that the Diefenbaker's acreage payments were no good because it wasn't the solution to agricultural problems. So just before the by-election, what did we get? We got, you know, acreage payments. \$1.00 per acre and a maximum of \$100, which was very very small help, was very small help. So now, we used to debate the \$50.00 rebate on the same basis and at that time the NDP Party were in support of the Official Opposition, which was the Liberal Party then, and they said the same thing. You know, it was strictly political; the present Minister of Labour used to say it's gimmickry and it doesn't solve the problem. Now I take the position I will support the bill, if it means a reduction in my tax and it means reduction in the education tax to my constituency, I can't help but support it. But, Mr. Speaker, this doesn't solve the problem. What we need is a complete tax reform, this is what's required, and you know, . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I realize we have a pioneering spirit in here but the

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.) pow-wows are getting too loud. Could we have them toned down. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What I was saying, what we need in the Province of Manitoba is a complete tax reform so that we would have the education tax taken off property, that we would have the welfare tax taken off the property. When the NDP were on this side of the House they used to demand tax reform in all debates two or three years ago, now they've had time - at least they had two years of time - to implement some tax reform and really this isn't tax reform, we're going back to the same thing that we had before, we're rebating the people \$50.00 per hour or half of your school tax or an apartment, which in reality in a year's time or two year's time, your education tax will increase and really you're back to the same place where you were before; you really haven't got any tax rebate or reduction. My inclination is, Mr. Speaker, that really this is no solution to the problem. I think this is just a stopgap and what we're getting, we're getting bits and pieces of legislation that does not solve the problem.

Now the other day, the Member for Rhineland I guess pointed out quite well that his tax on a quarter section of land, which is only 160 acres, went up from \$400 to 17 or 18 hundred dollars. Well if your tax is \$1,800, \$50 rebate is a very small amount. It certainly will be of very little help to any man that's paying \$1,800 tax on his piece of property or on a quarter section. The same thing will apply to many farmers in the Province of Manitoba. The other point, it will not be of much help to many of our senior citizens. I think it will be of some help but not what the resolution that I had before the House here a year ago, two years ago, and some three years ago, when I called for \$2,000 reduction in assessment to every senior citizen who was receiving Old Age Security and the supplement and I asked for \$2,000 reduction in assessment which would have meant at least \$100 reduction in school tax or \$100 reduction in total tax. So in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, this is a very small measure. This is not tax reform that the government talked about or the members of the NDP Party talked about when they were on this side of the House, were demanding the government of the day to have a complete tax reform in the Province of Manitoba so that we would relieve the property owner, that the services should be charged to the property and not educational and welfare tax. So I am not completely satisfied that this is a satisfactory answer to the problem.

The other point that I wish to raise, Mr. Speaker, to the members of the House, the one principle in the bill which says that there will also be a reduction of rent to tenants in either apartment houses or in houses and I see that this principle - nothing wrong with the principle, in fact I'm in favour - but I see some complications and I see some difficulty. I'm talking from experience. In many houses when there's a good tenant in many instances he is probably receiving at the present time a reduced rent, I would say anywhere in the neighbourhood of 20 to 25 percent, because he is a good tenant and the landlord has not increased his rent to the maximum or what it should be because he's getting the benefit in reduction in rent. Now if the landlord will be required under this section to rebate 50 percent of the reduction in school tax to the tenant, and I think that the principle has merit, but if he will be required to do this I see where many a landlord will immediately start to say, well look I'm not getting the full rent and will start increasing the rent in many of the apartments or in the residential houses. I think that we're trying to correct this situation or improve the situation to many of the people, on the other hand we may increase rent to many of our people.

The other point that I wish to raise, I don't believe that this is the solution. I don't think it does enough for our senior citizen who, as I mentioned before in this House, some of them are forced out of their homes because they are unable to pay the property tax. These people have made tremendous sacrifices to their families, to themselves, to be able to retire in dignity in their own home and who today are forced out because of the property tax that have been skyrocketing, that have been increasing year after year and the \$50.00 tax rebate in this instance is not sufficient. So it will be my intention, Mr. Speaker, in committee to increase the rebate to our senior citizens to \$100 to the ones who are receiving senior citizens pension and the supplement, because I feel that \$50.00 is not sufficient to these people. I think they're in tremendous need, they're in very difficult circumstances in many occasions or in many instances.

I know from experience, that I have talked to quite a few people, in fact I have visited people and I have mentioned before when there are two people living in a house, the husband and wife, the circumstances are not that serious but if one of them passes on and there's only

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.) one pension cheque comes to that household which has to pay the upkeep, and the property tax, this person is unable to afford to keep up the home. And when I'm talking about homes, I'm talking about very small and modest properties. I'm talking about houses that are valued at between \$8,000 and \$12,000, so I'm not talking of say very expensive homes or people who can afford it. I know of instances right now where women or men are raising on a 25-foot lot at the back of the house vegetables and are trying to sell them, to market them, putting their few cents they collect from this source of income in a jar so they say we can pay the property tax to the City Hall. That's the serious situation these people are in at the present time.

So I would say that a \$50.00 rebate or 50 percent will certainly be of some assistance to our senior citizens, but I say it's not sufficient and it'll be my intention in committee to increase that to \$100, and my other point is that this is not the total solution to the problem. I think that we need a complete overhaul of our taxation system in the province. We need tax reform and may I remind the members on that side when they were on this side of the House they demanded tax reform, tax study on every occasion so I'd say the government has now had an opportunity for two years and perhaps they will give this problem more attention that we would have a proper tax reform in the province. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, I do support the bill. I think it's of some assistance to the people that certainly need this relief.

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

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, not having finished complete examination of the bill, however, I think it is fair to say that I endorse the principle of it. Certainly this is being practiced in other provinces in western Canada, so it's nothing new. It's also something that has been done in the past in Manitoba and is still in effect in the multi-district divisions. I was rather afraid that the practice in the multi-district divisions might be disturbed by this but I'm assured by the Minister that this is not the case, that that will not be affected and that this will be in addition to what is already being done in the multi-district divisions. If it were not, Mr. Speaker, this would mean that it would have the effect of lessening the amount that the multi districts get in the way of financial support for education. And earlier this is what I had in mind discussing, the position that it would put the multi districts in, because you are well aware that we passed legislation earlier on in the session where we're giving further support to the unitary divisions and not to the multi-district divisions. I'm referring to the \$18.00 per student grant.

Mr. Speaker, we need support for education in rural Manitoba, and I think in all of Manitoba to be fair, and in this respect this bill will give some relief to the homeowners. I am in a way very gratified to see the legislation come forward. I wish it had come forward earlier in the session so that we would have been able to assess the situation from the very start. We have been getting it in piecemeal form, some earlier in the session and then also during the session when we discussed the estimates, when the change and the formula was brought in, and now we have this bill before us. As I said earlier, I do support the bill and I hope that the Minister at some time or other will also see fit to give some more support to education in the multi-districts as well.

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

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Youth & Education) (Seven Oaks): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will be closing debate. I thank honourable members for their contributions to debate. I promise not to be long. I'll try to deal with one or two points raised by members, which I think there's a commonality about some of the remarks they made. I don't profess to say that this is the answer to all the ills of education. I didn't say it when I introduced this bill but I think it's a giant step forward and as I did say, it's the second phase in a commitment we made with regard to the financing of education, or helping the ratepayer finance education - let's put it that way - because this is really a shift; it's a shift in taxation. The shifting is from one set of shoulders to the other. We are shifting it away from property tax on to the Consolidated Fund. That's all it is. I make no pretensions about it being anything else, and it is a shift and it is a successful shift.

The Member for Assiniboia claims that we need a far greater tax reform and so on. Well, be that as it may, the fact is that the simple suggestion that only senior citizens should be looked at, only senior citizens need some alleviation of cost, is something that I didn't accept last year and can't accept this year. Certainly senior citizens too needed some amelioration in the

(MR. MILLER cont'd.) . . . taxes they pay on property, but it doesn't follow that because one is a senior citizen one has more difficulty to pay his tax bill than somebody with a family of five or six, a younger person who still has children going to school and has expenses to meet. So, with all due respect, I don't think that is the major problem nor is it one that we should concern ourselves with only. -- (Interjection) -- Well, that's the gist of the way I read the member's remarks.

So far as the Member for Killarney is concerned, I can assure him the farmer is not the forgotten man here; the farmer will be getting his rebate the same as everybody else. If the member tells me all he's paying is \$36.00 in school tax, well I'm almost sorry I introduced this because he's not paying enough, and I think we should somehow try to make sure he pays more, his fair share.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, the Minister is misrepresenting. I said on the parcel of land where my buildings. I own a lot more land than that; I'm paying about \$400.00 school tax altogether - \$400.00 school tax.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. MILLER: In that case the honourable member, if he read the bill, will be very delighted to know that he can gather together all these huge assets of his, add them all together, and he can then get a \$50.00 rebate. So now he'll vote for the bill. He's not entirely being left out.

Mr. Speaker, the other suggestion made by the Member for Emerson is that somehow they were playing a game; that the assessors of the province will now go out into the province, will raise everyone's assessment to defeat and thwart the purpose of this tax credit. I think that's a very unfair statement. The assessors go through the assessments, which they are obligated to do, every year in different parts of Manitoba, and the assessments if they go up simply reflect land costs, land sales in the area, and it's really the relationship, the equity as between assessment in one area and another that counts - it's not the assessment in itself; because if the assessment goes up, then the number of mills required to raise so many dollars would have dropped accordingly. I don't think that's the problem at all.

To the Member for Riel, I say this is not a step backward that he suggests, that we opposed the rebate system. In 1967 when the Foundation Program came in, we approved of it, and this is an extension of it and to buttress the Foundation Program. If we were to eliminate the Foundation Program and go back to the old days, the old type of financing, and only use this as a means of equalizing or shifting taxation, I would agree with him, but we are using the Foundation Program. We have no intention and haven't scrapped it. If anything, we have done more to improve the Foundation Program in the last eighteen months than has been done in the previous three years. In 1970 we added close to \$500,000 to it. This year we added about \$6 million to it. We've altered the ratio as between what property will pay and what the province will pay and now, in addition to that, on top of all that, we have now introduced this bill which will mean a meaningful shift from property tax, real property tax, to the shoulders of the province through the Consolidated Fund. I urge all members to support this bill.

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

MR. GIRARD: I wonder if the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The debate has been closed. The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: I wonder if he could explain just a little more, in brief, the matter of assessment.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Questions should be of clarification on the debate that took place. If the honourable member wishes more detailed information, I am sure he can find another area when he can have it in committee.

MR. GIRARD: Mr. Speaker, he didn't mention the matter of assessment . . . and I would like to know - if there is a way that we can see justification in quadrupling the assessment in one year.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member is placing an argumentative question. The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. MILLER: Argumentative or otherwise, Mr. Speaker, if the assessors, in their wisdom assessing it, feel that there should be quadrupling, then I don't doubt they'll do it, and the person whose land had been quadrupled would, if I were him, appeal that assessment and appeal it as strongly as possible if I felt I was wronged. If I, in the final analysis, feel that

(MR. MILLER cont'd.) it is correct, then of course I don't appeal and I assume that some don't appeal.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Bill No. 112, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable the Attorney-General. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, Bill 112 is the bill amending the Statute of Law, and there are many sections in this bill, many provisions affecting the various different departments, and I would have hoped that some of the Ministers would get up and give explanations on amendments that concern their particular department. I notice, for instance, that we are amending the Gasoline Tax Act, and surely enough if it's a matter of taxation the Minister of Finance should have an explanation of why we are now required, or will be required, to bond our tax collectors. Is there a situation here that we are not getting the revenues? What are the losses in this connection? I think we should have an explanation from the Minister on this point. I see he's not in his seat, he's not present, but I think the bill should be held in committee here or in the House until we do get an explanation.

There are other areas here that I had marked down that I should probably refer to, but they are so numerous that I felt that I didn't want to burden the members of the House at this time in going into the details of these various amendments. There are such matters as change of name of certain associations, and the one I refer to is the Urban Association. They are changing it - I don't know, has this anything to do with the matter of bringing in the unicity bill and as a result they are changing their association's name, but certainly, Mr. Speaker, I think there should be explanations by the government because, as members here, we don't have the time to check all the details of these sections and the provisions in it, and I think it's not fair at the last day of the session to be confronted with a bill of this type and without proper explanation.

So, Mr. Speaker, I did go over some of them. I haven't checked all of them and I would appreciate hearing from some of the Ministers.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Bill No. 114, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, a few brief comments in respect to this bill that's before us - and I know it's starting to sound like a broken record, but this government does deserve to be chastised again and again and again for bringing 90 percent of their legislative program before the House in the last five days after the speed-up motion has been evoked and when the House Leader is in a pretty enviable position as cracking the whip over our heads and when we can do only but make meek protestations about the position that we find ourselves in complaining about the amount of real and serious legislation that we have to try to deal with. However, deal with it we shall.

Bill No. 114, the Communities Economic Development Fund Act. Mr. Speaker, I find it very difficult to be critical at the outset of any new venture that persons in government attempt in the aid of a region, in the aid of a people, in the aid of in this specific instance, isolated communities where obvious help has been and will continue to be required from time to time.

I could question, Mr. Speaker, the method that this bill sets out, how this help should be forthcoming. I could suggest that it surely could be done with existing organizations and structures. It certainly could be done, Mr. Speaker, by striking off an arm of the Development Corporation, of the present corporation that we have, the former MDF. However, I can't really quarrel, Sir, with the objects of this Act, to provide financial or other assistance to the existing economic enterprises or to economic enterprises to be established, the Community Development Corporation, to emphasize and to encourage expansion, the strengthening of small to medium sized economic enterprises which are locally owned and operated, etc. etc. in our isolated communities.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that if this government chooses this particular vehicle in the setting up of this specific agency to do this we are really at this particular time I think taking the position that we could only wisely take, that is to hope, bless the new fund in their

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) new venture in this particular area, and we'll have to come back a year from now or two years from now or three years from now and pass judgment on its performance one way or the other, and it is only on that occasion that we can perhaps even pass a much more critical judgment as to say that there was a fundamental error made in approaching the particular problems that they face in the United States with this kind of an instrument, but it's not our intention, it would be foolhardy for us to do that at this particular time.

Mr. Speaker, let me pass on a few specific concerns, again recognizing that on second reading we don't wish to speak in detail on the particular sections of the bill. I have some concerns about the powers invested in the Board; it seems to me to be a judge, jury and crown prosecution function all wrapped up in the one instance.

I have a greater concern over a small clause which indicates that MLA members of this Legislature may be appointed to the committees that are to be functioning under this Board. It would seem to me that particularly in this area where we have isolation to some extent, you are asking, or making it possible for a member of this Legislature to have a pretty direct hand in the handing out of perhaps major sums of money within his constituency. That's not a bad situation to be in, Sir, if you happen to be an MLA of the government side; that as I understand, this fund will operate from a basic amount of money of some million dollars. It really seems to me that if you wanted to read it in its cruder form that you are putting in a position that an MLA - and we would have, Mr. Speaker, to suggest quite correctly that it would hardly be an MLA from our side of the House, it would be an MLA from their side of the House who in effect is going to be put in the position of handing out cheques among his constituents, to his communities or to the business enterprises in his constituency in the isolated communities in the north. I don't know whether, Sir, that was in any way willfully intended but the possibility certainly exists by the specific section 25 (5) that states that MLA's can be members of this organization, serve as committee members. I say that that is a -- (Interjection) -- pardon - I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that I'm up for nomination as the MLA member on this million dollar development fund program.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister to reconsider that particular section. However, I really doubt whether the government will do anything about it. Their ethics with respect to what the elected official should do and should not do are distinctly different from ours, so I would suspect that that clause will stay firmly fixed in the bill and I want to indicate to you only, Mr. Speaker, that there are these kind of objections that we find scattered through the bill. We have some worry or concern about the necessity of the setting up of an entire new bureaucracy in this area, but we do not quarrel, Mr. Speaker, with the purposes of the bill; we will be in a better position next year to examine the intent, its operations and its functions at that time, and we will be supporting the bill. However, I wanted to make just those few reservations within the bill itself that we think are objectionable that we will be moving specific amendments to at the committee stage of the bill. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to Bill 114, I would say at the outset that in principle the Liberal group support the bill. Earlier in the session we had on the Order Paper for some time a resolution which had the same end result, really. For some time now the need has been there that there should be a special group or a special body who have no other preoccupation other than looking to the development of the north and of remote communities.

I am inclined to agree with the Member for Lakeside when he zeroed in on the section where a committee is being set up to hear appeals where the board has turned down an application for a loan. Now when I examine the back benches on the government side, I note that there are very few members left who have not some sort of a side appointment and I note that two of the members anxiously waiting are northern members, so we would place one of these members, if he were the MLA appointed to the committee, to second guess the judgment of the board, we could be placing this northern member in the very difficult position of having to confirm or deny a loan in his constituency, and the pressure would be intolerable in my estimation, Mr. Speaker, on this member, so I think that this is a very bad section in the bill. It would only be a matter of time until the member, the MLA, if he was a northern member, could be justly or unjustly accused of exerting political influence on behalf of his constituency, so I think that with that one exception the intent of the bill is laudable. Time will tell whether the objects are

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd.) carried out but at least it's a good attempt to try and help under-capitalized and under-developed areas in the north and the remote parts of the province, and when we reach the committee stage, if the government hasn't already made the change that I suggest, I shall be moving an amendment to delete that part of the bill which says that an MLA shall be eligible to sit on the Appeal Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, again I have not had the time to make a full examination of the bill. However, I wish not to delay the proceedings and therefore I will make my remarks at this time.

It seems to me that we are getting a conglomeration of credit agencies of the government in Manitoba. We have the Manitoba Development Corporation; we have the Agricultural Credit Corporation; we passed legislation at this session in connection with the Co-op Promotion Board monies, some 128,000 that are there since the 1920's and which monies are being lent and the earnings from that money are being spent for the promotion of cooperatives. We set up another agency - I forget the name of that one - just recently. Now we have this Community Economic Development Fund which is to be administered by the Development Corporation, and I have no objection to that as far as the administration part. We did set up a mineral exploration company under Part 2 of the Development Corporation, and we have all these different kinds of agencies of the government providing credit by various means.

The bill presently before us sets out the various terms as to how a business is to be conducted and some objections have been raised by the members in connection with an MLA sitting on the committee. There's also provision here for special reports of borrowers who feel that they have been grieved or wrongfully treated. I do hope that when reports of this type are made that not all of them are kept secret but that we, as members, will also get to know what is happening and how things are progressing.

In the matter of obtaining equity in various corporations, there is also provision here that audits be made and also which would show the equity position through the purchase of shares of the company. Certainly, if we're going to obtain equity in any company, I think this should be shown and this should be a matter of record for members of the House so that we will know at all times how much equity we do have as a government in the various companies that are being set, or Crown corporation, whatever they may be, that do borrow money from the various agencies. I think we're getting a proliferation of these agencies and that's what I take exception to. I think we don't need that many different types of agencies, because what is there to prevent a certain company or a corporation from being financed by one of the government agencies and then going to another government agency and get financing from that as well? I don't think this is a healthy situation and maybe the Minister can reply to that; if that is not possible then well and good.

There is also provision here for the different types of forms of loans. As I said earlier, I haven't had a complete examination because of the shortage of time and I would have liked to check it out much better than I have. However, I will let it go to proceed and then raise further questions in committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce will be closing debate.

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry & Commerce) (Brandon East): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the remarks of honourable members in the Opposition. They brought up a number of very worthwhile points and a number of suggestions which I think deserve consideration, and consideration will be given to these suggestions.

I agree with the Honourable Member for Lakeside that it is too early to pass judgment, but pass judgment we will, as time goes on, as to the success of this particular fund. I want to make clear -- from some members' remarks, at least, it seemed that we were setting up another bureaucratic structure. This is really not the case. In fact, I'm not suggesting that all members misinterpreted our intentions or the principles outlined in the bill . . . --(Interjections) -

As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, there is no intention to set up a separate organizational structure as such. The staffing will be vested in the staff of the Manitoba Development Corporation. Really, what we are setting up is a board, a separate board, to administer the fund, and of course the purpose of that is in this case to enable people who will largely be affected by the lending policies exercised under this act, namely representatives from these remote

(MR. EVANS cont'd.) communities, representatives of disadvantaged people and so on; and I might add that this legislation is in response to many requests made by organizations representing such people. In large measure the powers given to the fund here are parallel to those given to the Manitoba Development Corporation and you will see, as you compare the two acts, that there are many many parallels throughout.

With particular reference to sections 25 (4) and 25 (5), I think there is probably no disagreement with the necessity or the desirability of an independent review committee. I would only point out - and this is to guarantee or to ensure to the prospective borrower that every consideration has been made and has been given to this particular loan application because very often, at least I've found this, very often particularly with small loan applications, there's a lot of misunderstanding as to why the board of the Manitoba Development Corporation has decided to decline a loan application and it may be wise to have such a committee which would enable people to at least have the satisfaction that another outside group has reviewed their particular application at their request - I would point out that the question of the MLA being a member of the committee is not mandatory. It says, "may be appointed." It doesn't follow that an MLA will necessarily be on the committee. However, I appreciate the honourable member's remarks and we will take them into consideration and we will no doubt discuss this in some detail in the Law Amendments Committee.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether Bill 99 can be proceeded with now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, there's a few things I want to -- pertaining to operation of farm tractors and also the operation of farm trucks, and I realize that driving a farm tractor that anybody any age can drive it so long as you're on the field, it's when you go on the highway. On the insurance applications it definitely says that the liability insurance does not cover anyone under the age of 16, and most of the farmers now carry liability insurance to protect them because they're not licensed, tractors are not licensed now, so they naturally have to carry a farm liability policy to cover any employee who might be driving farm machinery on roads. And I realize that many farmers know that part of it, but many people don't carry liability insurance and are not informed of this. I wonder whether there will be some notification to the farmers through the weekly newspapers or something of that after this Act is passed, some way of getting this message through to the individual farmers, because many farmers have sons 14, 15 years of age who are driving a tractor, and they won't naturally think of the danger they might be in through an accident on the highway, a particular highway. They think that they will not be involved.

Another - the operation of the farm truck, and many farmers have been in the habit of exchanging work with neighbors. They'll haul their livestock to market, each one, they'll take two loads from an individual farm, because farmers at different times have livestock to move so they'll each help each other; but under this particular section of the act he won't be able to haul livestock but they can haul grain and things; they can haul their neighbor's grain. Now I wonder, does this cover people who haul, say, when they exchange work, does this cover them if they don't charge? I don't know whether there's anything -- say a person didn't charge for hauling your neighbor's livestock to market, whether they'd be liable under this act. I just wondered, because most of the work that's done between farmers and between neighbors is done without any particular charge.

Now under a section in the act, which has been a major change, has been on speeding fines, Mr. Speaker, and under the previous act the magistrate had to follow the particular section because it stated out for 70 miles an hour as so much, and 80 and 90 and 100. Under this particular section on Page 32 here of the bill it mentions that -- I guess I haven't got it but I remember it anyway, that it's a minimum fine of \$2.00 per mile over the speed limit or up to a maximum of \$10.00 per mile; at the magistrate's discretion, and I can understand - I don't know how the magistrate's going to sort this out, whether he's going to use the minimum or maximum or something in between, but this is what the magistrates have been asking for is more leeway in their discretion on the individual case.

I can see where if you were driving 100 miles an hour that should be up to a \$400.00 fine, a maximum of \$400.00, or over that would be greater. But I imagine the magistrate from now on, it'll be up to their discretion. Now I think the reason that the Minister brought

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd.) this other change previous in, because each magistrate had their own idea how to base the fine on, and if you had an easy magistrate in Souris as compared to the tough one in Killarney, well, you'd want to have your charge heard in Killarney maybe, you know, compared to Souris, so this -- no, I mean vice versa. It could work out that way. So I can see from now on that people might have to decide where their case is going to be heard. I would think that a few dollars, a few dollars would be in my . . . up to 70, and I imagine they'll increase the speed goes; when it gets up to 80 miles an hour the magistrate will likely use discretion on that. But it'll be interesting to see the different thoughts that the magistrates will have from now on according speeding. I imagine many members in this Legislature will soon be finding out, after this act is passed, because many of us have that privilege of going a little too fast at some inopportune times, especially where they have these radar traps on No. 2 Highway, and I have them memorized so good now that nobody will ever catch me, I think, on No. 2 Highway, but they might catch me on some other highways in the province of Manitoba. Pardon? Well, there's Cypress River and Rathwell are the two places that they have to be careful of, in case anybody wants any information in this House. The particular driveways, I can tell you the driveways too that -- behind a bush.

Mr. Speaker, I think that's all I have to say on these particular points, that the drivers of various automobiles from now on will have to be careful with their various automobiles on tires, bumpers, licenses, their -- I forget, there's one other part of the automobile too that they have to be -- noise, yeah, mufflers. Now I wonder if the Minister could inform us what type of machine they are going to use for noise, like, to assess noise. I was just reading this morning of these bombers that are going to come over our southern part of the province and the Premier gave me a map this morning, and these particular B 52 Bombers are going to come over at 500 feet, and I don't know whether -- I'd like to have one of those machines down there the next six months in the Killarney- Boissevain area to assess the noise that they're going to create when they come over to see whether they are breaking the law or not. I know they're not driving on the road but they're not far off at 500 feet.

Mr. Speaker, I know that these changes will be of great help but the one that concerns me the most is the medical profession having to tell, give reports to the Motor Vehicle Branch of any cases that they might see fit, I mean unfit, that come to their office, and it will be up to the medical profession to assess this in the way they see fit. But I can see many problems attached to this particular section and I hope that the Motor Vehicle Branch, when they receive these reports or asked to assess them that they do not overdo their responsibility, because I know the responsibility will be left on their shoulders, whether to cancel the license of that individual driver or not, and I hope that they use discretion with their responsibility. Thanks, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

. Continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Highways and Public Works.

HON. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Minister of Public Works and Highways)(Thompson): Well, you're right, Mr. Speaker, it's about time. I've been waiting for several days to speak on this bill and I notice the tone of criticism is a little more muted today and that probably they may be concerned that we're going to get that new legislation to apply to the Legislature about the noise level, but the last few days when I listened, I was very angry and had I spoken at that time I'd have had some nasty things to say about those feudal huns who attacked me and the bill personally. I don't mind if they find something wrong with the legislation, Mr. Speaker, but I think it's unfair and improper for them to attack me as if I drafted every word into it and that I'm responsible for everything in that bill. They know very well we have the committee set up which includes the RCMP, the City Police, the Chief Magistrate, the Registrar of Motor Vehicles, and a member from the Attorney-General's office, who have looked very carefully, and the intrepid charges that were made against those individuals by the mental Chihuahua from Sturgeon Creek and the mental midget from Charleswood, if they made those charges anywhere else they'd be charged with contempt of court, saying the thing about the people who are involved here, the Chief Magistrate had some responsibility about some of the things in this bill, and they've got the nerve to come in here and make the type of statement like the Member for Sturgeon Creek, that I must have a heart as cold as a microphone to bring in the legislation. Well, if that's true, then I have to say to the Conservative Party that they must have a heart as cold as a street walker to have allowed this slaughter to go on for ten years without doing anything about it.

They say, they have accused us for bringing in our nightmares, my nightmares into legislation. Well, you can't even give them points for originality on that one, Mr. Speaker, because to me a nightmare is the situation we've had for ten years under the Conservatives where the test poll went like this every year, and you could predict with Biblical certainty that next year X percentage people would be dead. Because of this government, over one hundred people are alive and well in Manitoba today and this trend is going to continue, not to mention the hundreds of people who are not crippled and not vegetables and filling our hospital beds, laying in chairs or on stretchers, looked after by the public purse for the rest of their lives, and I'm told that the cost of looking after a vegetable from an accident runs anywhere from \$150,000 to \$300,000 for their lifetime. That was paid out of the public purse. We are trying to do something about that.

The Member for Birtle-Russell said that we are bringing all kinds of punitive action against the senior citizens and we are doing this because we want to take all these bad drivers off the highways so we will have cheap auto insurance. Well, I'm sure that's the end result. We're trying to save lives, and I have stated on many occasions, Mr. Speaker, that it's my intention to make every drunk in Manitoba a pedestrian, and I make no bones about it. I've said it outside of the House, I've said it on the air, and I'm saying it here, and I said it at the Ste. Rose by-election. We have no intention to allow drunks to make our highways unsafe. The people of Manitoba pay \$60 million a year a build, rebuild and maintain highways. If they have spent hundreds of millions over the years under the various governments, surely to God they are entitled to go out on a highway without being in danger of being run down by some lunatic or some drunk or some speeder. I think it's everybody's responsibility to get these guys off.

I was criticized for writing letters by the Member from Charleswood, trying to make out like it's such a terrible thing to say to somebody, "You are breaking the law," and he brings in the letters into the House chastising me for writing letters to people. Well, Mr. Speaker, just the other day a citizen was given an award by the Chief of Police for helping him catch a couple of people who were breaking in. I suppose, using his criteria, that guy should have been criticized instead of given a medal because he helped catch two guys who were breaking in.

I remember last year I was passing through from The Pas to Swan River, and we came upon a vehicle in the ditch. We got out to see if we could help that person. When we got there we found he was stone drunk and he was trying to get out to get back onto the highway. We drove to the next town, phoned the RCMP in Swan River. The police came out. By this time somehow he managed to get out. The police picked him up; they found that he was a suspended driver and he was drunk. The Member for Swan River, who is here today, had a front page story saying "Minister helps police" or something to that effect. He wrote the whole story; we didn't hear him criticize. He thought it was a pretty good thing to report this type of a person. He was charged, paid \$200 fine, and his license was further suspended, I believe.

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd)

You know, this is the type of thing that shows the total and complete bankruptcy of the Opposition when they can't argue or discuss or debate a bill on the merits of the bill, that they have to get personal, and when you start bringing in letters into the Legislature, then I suggest it is getting personal, but if they want to bring in letters, Mr. Chairman, I can dig into the files and find out, bring up letters that are going to make them look awful sick. I have a letter in my possession which I am going to read, which is relevant, and this letter came into my possession when we were in the Opposition in '69. We could have used it in the campaign but we didn't. This letter is dated February 9, 1959, and it's addressed --, it's from the Progressive Conservative Association of Flin Flon and the person who wrote it is E. Lyon, Acting Secretary, and here is the letter:

"Dear Mr. Willis: At a recent executive meeting of the Flin Flon Provincial Conservative Association, a lengthy discussion re the crosstown highway for Flin Flon took place. This was one of the main planks of our last provincial campaign and, while we do not anticipate any action, we intend using it again during the next election campaign."

Now, isn't that something?

"Enclosed you will find a press release on the above meeting which is for your information." This was to the late Honourable Errick Willis, Minister of Public Works, and his reply dated February 23, 1959:

"I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of February 9th last with regard to the crosstown highway for Flin Flon." (This highway, incidentally, was built in '68.) "I have asked the engineers to give me a report on the matter and I am hopeful that something helpful will be done. Yours faithfully," and it's signed by Mr. Willis.

The helpful part of it was putting stakes in before the next election, which is typical of the Conservative Party. Every time there is an election, the engineers go out and they put little stakes along the highway all over the province. After the election is over, they pull up the stakes and forget about it until the next election. And they've got the gall to come into this House and try and make me out like a cold-blooded, cold-hearted villain, and may I further point out, Mr. Chairman, that the legislation we are proposing is in effect in that land scandal-ridden Ontario. The Tories brought in this legislation, their own party, and as much as I would like to take credit for originality, I cannot, because that legislation about vehicles, derelict vehicles, has been in effect for two and a half years. The doctors reporting on their patients has been in effect for three years and last year - we phoned the Ontario government yesterday - we found out that the doctors made reports, 3,500 reports on their patients. Out of a total of about 3,000,000 drivers there were about 3,500 reports made by the doctors on their patients saying that in our medical opinion that man is a hazard to himself and therefore should not drive. The law came into effect three years ago. The figures we have are for last year, which we phoned to the Ontario government yesterday and that was the figures they gave us.

The only sensible question and comments made were once again by the Member for Assiniboia. He had some pertinent questions that he asked and I am going to attempt to answer them. Before I do, I'd like to just pass comment on what the Member for Lakeside said, and his statement was that if we passed this bill we would be irresponsible. Well, all I can say to him, Mr. Speaker, that would simply be consistent with their ten year record, because only irresponsible government would allow the things to go on in Manitoba when they were in power and the traffic fatalities inclined under their leadership.

The Member for Birtle-Russell was concerned about the confidentiality of a patient, and some of the other members said it's not right to force the doctor in effect to squeal and tattle on his patients. Well, you know, we have today, the Member for Souris-Killarney was honest enough to say yesterday that the insurance company insisted that he pass this on if he finds something. That's not terrible; that's only proper. He's doing that person a favour by doing this; by taking him off the road. The Member for Birtle-Russell complained that we'd taken a bunch of people off the road in his constituency and he was trying to leave the impression that we've got a campaign to get rid of the senior citizens, the people who built this country; we're going to run them off the road. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is a cowardly and despicable thing to say, because all it does is frighten old people all over Manitoba, and it's all the more contemptible when it's peddled outside of Manitoba. To me it's inconceivable that a party should stoop to the level of frightening people, old people, with these bogies. And the bogey they used for years of Socialism, last year they were scaring the businessmen because this government is driving industry out, now they are using the bogey that this government is going to run the senior

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) citizens off the road.

Well, I'd like to tell this House that where the senior citizen is concerned this government is a lot more considerate. We have eliminated the parallel parking in the rural towns, because a lot of the old people have never parallel-parked and in the towns they go to they don't have parallel parking, which would indicate that it's really not necessary to know that. We have changed those rules. Under the old system, a senior civil servant had to have a minimum, I believe, of 20/40 vision or they couldn't get a driver's license. We have changed that, and they can get a restricted license within a radius, I believe, of 15 miles for driving in the day time. So if they want to make that kind of charges, Mr. Speaker, I think the record will show that we are treating the senior citizens much better than they were.

And as for the doctors reporting, I'd like to indicate for the record that the Medical Association of Manitoba passed a resolution at their annual convention last year, asking that compulsory doctor reporting be brought in. They felt that if it was voluntary, as it is presently, that they'd be put in the position of squealing on their patients; and let's face it - a doctor is just as human as anybody else and the guy keeps coming back to him for 10, 15, 20 years, and now he's suddenly put in the position where he must report him and get him off the road; and the patient in many cases will plead, you know, "Please don't report me. I'll try not to drive too much," or "I'll stay out of the cities." And the doctor, to protect himself, some of those that I have talked to, used to write a letter indicating that "In my medical opinion, he shouldn't be driving," and he said, "I'm going to hold this letter in my file and I'm going to send you a copy. Now what you do with it is your business, but I can tell you right now, if you get in an accident I'm going to bring that letter into court and say look, I warned you, I'm not going to be responsible for your death or for the death of anybody else." That is the situation we have had for years. The doctors have asked for it and I simply can't understand the Opposition. They've been trying to make a big issue on it. I haven't heard one doctor - and I know there are doctors opposed to it, as there are to Medicare; I don't know what their numbers are, five percent or ten percent, eight percent, there are probably eight percent that are opposed to this, but whatever number are opposed to it, I haven't had one single doctor phone me or write that he is opposed to this piece of legislation. Why is the Opposition trying to make some hay out of it? I can't answer that question. -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. BOROWSKI: We are complying with the resolution they passed last year, the Manitoba Medical Association, and may I say in Ontario it wasn't the Tories that were ingenious or clever or compassionate when they brought in that law on their own; it was the medical profession that went after the government and said, "We want you to put that law on your statute books so it doesn't ruin the doctor-patient relationship." That's how that law got on the statute books. And insofar as guidelines are concerned, I am certain that if this government brought in guidelines under that section, telling a doctor under what circumstances and what conditions he should report it to us, they would really call us dictators. They'd say, and properly so, "What does the Minister of Highways or any of us here know about medicine? We don't have a doctor in our Cabinet. What do you know about it? How dare you tell a doctor when he should take and tell a person he is safe or unsafe on the highway?" Doesn't it seem logical that we accept the doctor's word when he gets hired for International Nickel, and he has to go through a medical? Doesn't it seem logical that this doctor has the same brains and intelligence and the patient's interest at heart that he would tell him that you either can drive in his opinion or cannot drive? Do you really want us to bring in regulations? And if you do, if you are serious, then in Law Amendments I would ask the Opposition to bring in amendments, draft them up and bring them in, so the doctors will know and the public will know exactly where the Conservatives stand on that important issue.

Another item that was mentioned and I take strong exception and it should be recorded here, is that the mental Chihuahua from Sturgeon Creek again said that the doctors would stoop down to selling certificates. Could you imagine a charge like that? That they would sell medical certificates for \$50.00 to people who wanted to drive. Now isn't that an incredible charge to make? I'll bet you if I made that charge they'd ask the Premier to fire me. I'm certain they would. And yet for them, it seems they can say anything they want to in this House. They can insult judges and magistrates and the Attorney-General and doctors, and that's fine. But God help us if anybody on this side - and that's why I said the last time I spoke that we should have a Bill of Rights for the government side, because if you listen to them, although

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) we're the government we have absolutely no rights. They have all the rights. But I think that shows the hypocrisy that they've been preaching across Manitoba.

The Member for Rhineland was concerned about the 14-foot wide trailers, and I'm sorry to say that we have had broken agreements. I suppose this could be expected from politicians. The Ministers of Highways from across Canada met in Victoria last year for a two-day conference, at which time we agreed, all the Ministers except I believe Nova Scotia - yes, I believe Nova Scotia - because their development fund had given money to a trailer manufacturing company to build 14-foot wides, so he says we can't agree with that although in principle we agree that you should not allow 14-foot wide trailers on the highway because the highways and the bridges are simply not built for this, especially the cloverleaf. Anybody who's ever been on a cloverleaf and watched a long truck or trailer go, knows what a hazard that is. In any event, with that one exception we agreed there'd be no 14-foot trailers.

The Minister of Highways in Alberta, the gentleman that he is, informed me a month later that his Cabinet would not buy that provision, that they are going to allow with grave restrictions, and I think the restrictions were that they had to have a pilot car in the front and a pilot car in the back for the safety of the public, but they would still under those conditions allow it. The Liberal Government of Saskatchewan, now late Liberal Government of Saskatchewan, simply broke their agreement without the courtesy of telling us, just as they broke their agreement on car purchases during the campaign; they went ahead and purchased cars because the dealers were putting pressure on and I believe in one case the dealer threatened to withhold election funds unless they opened up the car purchasing. They broke that agreement which was made with the three premiers and they broke this agreement. We have requested a meeting with the Saskatchewan government, the new Minister of Highways and the Premier, along with our Premier and myself, to meet and discuss several issues. One of them is the 14-foot wide; it's a real problem. It's difficult to say to a factory that - I believe we have a factory in Transcona - it's difficult for us to tell them you can't manufacture 14-foot unless you want to ship them by flat lowbed or - I'm sorry - by train, when we know that they can go to Saskatchewan and Alberta and pull these trailers. I know Ontario, to their credit, stuck to their agreement and they will not tolerate 14-foot from any area, so we don't have any problem from the East but we have a great deal of problem from the West, and that's an area that we're going to be meeting on as soon as the session is over, and come to some agreement, do we allow 14 foot, do we allow 14 foot under certain restrictions like Alberta with the two pilot cars, or do we ban it completely?

The driving of farm tractors. When I left the farm the tractors, I think the highest speed a tractor could go was about eight miles an hour, and I remember driving a tractor when I was probably 9 years old, and the worst that could happen -- (Interjection) -- poor endorsement. If I made a mistake, the worst that could happen was the tractor would run into the bush or into the swamp or in a creek or a slough and stop. The tractors we have today are high-speed tractors. I think anybody who farms knows that those machines can go awful fast, and because they have fluid in the tires and very hard, any little bump could easily upset it and throw it out of control. If you look at the statistics, accident and death statistics on tractors, it's pretty appalling, so we are restricting in here, in this legislation, from kids under 16 to drive tractors on the highway. If they drive it on the land, if you work on the land you're usually on low gear or second gear and that's not bad, and in any case they're not endangering anybody else but themselves. Anyway, the danger is very small there. So all this legislation does is prohibit operation of these high-speed vehicles on highways. If the member feels that it's a hardship, I agree with him, but it's a greater hardship when you take a father's driver's license away - and it happens too - and he has to hire somebody else or he has to get his wife to drive him to and from wherever he's going. It's a hardship. You know, you can't have laws that make any sense and not expect any hardship when the application of those laws is imposed.

The last item I'd like to mention, Mr. Speaker, deals with the \$1.00 a day penalty. I don't know which member from the Opposition complained about it but I really thought that of all the things we've got in this bill, that that is one that I would get some bouquets for. This is -- you know, we brag about many things. I have said that this is the best province to live in and of course, you know, that's my political bias. It's certainly the safest province to live in as far as highway accidents and it's a province where you have the least chance of landing in jail. Now that's not because we have bad police or bad judges. It's because of the

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) application of the laws, and this thing here will mean that citizens like you, or the Minister of Finance, or anybody else, will not end up in jail like a criminal because he can't pay a fine. This is an innovation that I really expected all kinds of support from the Opposition, but they're complaining. Is it better now -- I think the Attorney-General has released the report to the Press where 650 people ended up in jail last year because they couldn't pay the fine. They weren't criminals; they just couldn't pay the fine. We are saying, instead of putting these people in jail, which costs this province about 5 1/2 thousand dollars a year to keep them in there - and I think it's around \$10,000 in the federal Pen - that we'll simply take their license away. If it's a \$30.00 fine you lose your license for 30 days. Is that a terrible thing? Do you really think that is worse than making that innocent - or not innocent; he's guilty of a charge, but he's not a criminal - making that man go to jail? Which is the crueler of the two laws? I'd like the members of the Opposition to consider that before they get up and criticize that this is some type of a vicious penalty dreamed up, or a nightmare of this government. I think that's one of the most progressive things that we're doing in that bill. It's not going to save any lives but it's sure as heck going to keep a lot of good people out of jail. Thank you.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Bill No. 119, Mr. Speaker. The number is omitted on the Order Paper, but . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance. The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I'll be very brief on this bill because the first three sections were removed from this bill, announced yesterday by the Minister of Municipal Affairs. There's only a couple of sections in this here that I'd like a little more explanation on here to clarify. Section 17, and while it explains it here, for excess policies written by private companies above primary policies written by other private companies, the amendment recognizes with the implementation of the public automobile insurance plan, any excess policies will be excess of the plan. Now the one question I would like to ask: if a non-authorized driver was driving a car, under your policy your primary insurance would not be covered, now where does the excess coverage come in? Does that have to assume any part of the primary coverage? This is a -- I just forget, there's two qualifications, authorized and licensed, or something to that effect anyway. You have to be qualified. Now, there's going to be many drivers either unauthorized to be driving cars, or stolen cars and other cases that are going to be involved in the province of Manitoba from the 1st of November on.

Now one other section here is Section 22, present Section 267, gives unnamed persons right of claim for accident benefits in auto policies insured by private insurers. The proposed additional subsections provide for the order of priority among insurers where a claim may involve two or more insurers and its uniformity of insurance legislation of other provinces. And this is a little -- Section 22 here. I'm just trying to locate . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I would suggest to the honourable member we are on second reading, which is in principle. He's dissecting the bill again section by section. I'm sure he can find the proper way of debating the question without referring to the sections specifically and reading them all into the record. The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. McKELLAR: Well, Mr. Speaker, I agree with you, but in this bill, particular bill, it is in some other bills associated with insurance, you're not dealing with one principle and I would imagine every section has a different principle, and this is the problem in insurance. It's a specialized industry and it's specialized principles involved in each section and I bet you there's 40 principles in this bill, at least 40 principles, and the problem is in debating a bill like this that you can't debate it on one particular principle because there is no one -- the only way you can debate a principle, whether you're for government automobile insurance or whether you're against it, and this is dealing with private insurers. This is for private insurers, this bill on dealing with excess insurance and what all they are asking for is their right, the private insurer to be allowed to sell excess insurance from the 1st day of November. And the question I asked of the Minister of Finance some days ago, that they needed this right here on this bill -- (Interjection) -- That's right. Oh yes, that's quite true. I want to thank the Minister of Finance for looking after this particular, this bill because without this right, they

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd) wouldn't be legally operating within the rules and while they could I imagine - the bill could have been passed in the next session of the Legislature and made retroactive. But it isn't right and I'm glad that the Minister of Finance brought this bill in. -- (Interjection) -- That's why it's here, yeah. I always appreciate the Minister of Finance. He's always - you know he's one of the better Ministers on that side. I give him credit. Yeah. If I had my pick - I appreciate -- at least he's straightforward, I know what he's talking about. -- (Interjection) -- Yeah. He takes my taxes. He takes my taxes and he doesn't make any bones about it. He collects them and that's it.

But let's get back to the principle of this particular section. Section 22 on the last page of the bill dealing with Subsection 267.1 and (1) and this is -- this particular section here, there's an explanation here in the draft form that you gave me; but I had a meeting this morning with some of the insurance companies who are going to be selling excess insurance and they'd just like this particular section to be clarified a little more, if it's possible, in order that they could . . . They won't be appearing before committee on Law Amendments Committee because there's no necessity for them to do that.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the House Leader.

THIRD READINGS

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, could you go back now to the first page of the Order Paper and deal with the third reading amended bills in order. That is starting with 64 and continuing.

MR. SPEAKER: There is only one question I have to ask of the House Leader. Those denoting amendments proposed, does he wish to have those taken up at the same time?

MR. GREEN: Can we proceed with those which have no amendments in the meantime?

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Highways. The Honourable Minister, No. 31.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm referring to the first page of the Order Paper. I believe that Bill 64 is the first one.

MR. SPEAKER: Right, I'm sorry.

BILL NO. 64 was read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 31. The Honourable Minister of Transportation. 69. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW presented Bill No. 69, the Co-operative Association Loans and Loans Guarantee Act, for third reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a few points that do concern me a little bit about this bill, Mr. Speaker, and I must apologize for the fact that I haven't raised these points earlier. There's something in here that causes me concern and it seems to be the borrowing that will now be available to co-operatives, and the fact that they can borrow money from the Province. There's no guarantee that, or there's no legislation here which ensures that they have to repay it, Mr. Speaker. We don't know what the rate of interest is going to be, what the maximums are going to be, or what the minimums will be, and as I said before the fact that - as far as I can find in the Act, Mr. Speaker, there is no section which makes it mandatory that a co-op will have to repay the loan. No terms are set out here and it will no doubt be covered by the regulations, but it does cause some concern to me at this time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I always assume that when one borrows money the meaning of the term borrow means that it must be repaid. But nevertheless, notwithstanding that, Mr. Speaker, I think I should acquaint the honourable member with the fact that for many years, in fact I believe since 1964, monies were not completely repaid under the previous program, which was in existence up until this time, because of the fact that the Co-op Promotion Board monies, or loans, that were lent to new and developing industries in northern Manitoba, were presumed to be an instrument of social development not only an instrument of finance, and it was recognized by the previous government for some ten years, and indeed by us, that this is still the case, and it will happen in this instance, Mr. Speaker, under the new program where we may have losses. And it is to be expected.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Apparently the Attorney-General has some commitment and would like to have his bills called. So if you would go over to Page 2, call Bills No. 66 and 77 to start with.

BILLS NOS. 66 and 77 were read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Bills No. 31-47 inclusive, Mr. Speaker.

BILLS NOS. 31(1), 33, 45 and 47 were read a third time and passed.

MR. GREEN: No. 53, 61 and 70.

BILL NO. 53 was read a third time and passed.

MR. IAN TURNBULL (Osborne) presented Bill No. 61, The Dental Association Act, for third reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words, that I'm not in accord with some of the provisions of this Act as it is being passed on third reading. All I want to do is register my opposition in this case. I won't be able to amend it, but I just want to have this on record. Thank you.

BILLS NOS. 61, 71, 102, 60, 68, and 74 were read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister.

I would now consider a motion to go into Committee of the Whole House on Bill No. 110 to be proposed by the First Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following bill: No. 110, an Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act (2).

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): Bill No. 110, an Act to amend the Legislative Assembly Act. (Section 1 was read and passed.) Section 2 --

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, there is an amendment here. I apologize for the fact that the amendments are just being distributed now but they're very minor I can assure my honourable friends, very minor. If we are now on Section 2(59) sub. (1) -- 59 sub (1)(b) -- there's an amendment there simply deleting the word "greater" in the third last line of 59 (1)(b) at the top of Page 2, and that is in accordance with the decision of the Municipal Affairs Committee to recommend the change of name to City of Winnipeg from City of Greater Winnipeg. It's just a . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: City of Winnipeg?

MR. SCHREYER: That's right, Mr. Speaker, to put the formal motion, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that the proposed subsection (1) of Section 59 of the Legislative Assembly Act as set out in Section 2 of Bill 110 be amended by striking out the words: "The City of Greater Winnipeg" in the second line of clause (b) thereof and substituting the words: "The Metropolitan area as defined in the Metropolitan Winnipeg Act or the City of Winnipeg."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pardon me, before I -- did I say 59 (1)(a) passed? 59(1)(b) as amended . . .

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I just moved that amendment. Let us take it as having been moved with respect to 59(1)(b) so it's before the House now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 59(1)(b) passed, as amended; 59(2)(a) passed; 59(2)(b) passed; 59(2) passed; subsection (4) of Section 59, repealed and substitute Section (3) passed; 59(4) passed; 59, subsection (1) of Section 63 amended, Section 4 passed; subsection (1) of Section 64 repealed and substitute Section (5) passed; 64(1)(a) --

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, there is an amendment to come forward with respect to 64 (1)(b) -- Excuse me. No, 64 (1) -- well, it's not clear, Mr. Chairman. I just

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) need to take a couple of seconds to . . . Mr. Chairman, just to help clarify I will read the subject matter of the proposed amendment, "that Bill 110 be amended by renumbering Section 6 as printed as Section 7."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well then we've finished 64 (1)(b).

MR. SCHREYER: Well, I'm afraid not, Mr. Chairman, because that's precisely where the amendment comes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh.

MR. SCHREYER: I thought that I knew my way around the drafting of statute law and amendments but I frankly admit this has me puzzled. The motion reads as follows, if I could just read it through once for clarification; "that Bill 110 be amended by renumbering Section 6 as printed as Section 7; the first section numbered 7 as Section 8 and the Section numbered 7 as 9 and by adding thereto immediately after Section 5 thereof the following section: - Subsection (2) of Section 64 amended; subsection (2) of Section 64 of the Act is amended by striking out the word "twenty" in clause (a) thereof and substituting therefor the word 'forty'." The intent is clear although frankly the problem here is the internal reference to numbering that's causing the problem. May I explain to honourable members the intent here is simply to bring the per diem expense that may be incurred by Mr. Speaker, to make the allowable per diem in line with that payable to other members of the Assembly.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairman, I think . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: I'm not sure that the amendment really accomplishes the objective, because I think that there is possibility that there may have been some other errors in printing, obviously there are two sections 7 here and this is one of the corrections that is intended, but in addition to this the reference that's specifically mentioned in the motion is not necessary because it's already expressed in the bill so that I wonder -- the motion itself if it's moved is frankly meaningless, at least a portion of that, not the renumbering portion.

MR. SCHREYER: May I ask the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Chairman, if he's suggesting that the intent of the proposed amendment already lies in the Act and that no amendment is needed?

MR. SPIVAK: That's my understanding of it on the basis of reading it. I don't think that the correction is required; but there is a renumbering required because you have two Section 7s here.

MR. SCHREYER: Perhaps the best procedure would be if we could go on -- we hold this section in abeyance and someone can go and get the Legislative Counsel who drafted this. By leave, if we could go on then to subsequent sections.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Agreed) I have asked the page boy to get the Legislative Counsel. Subsection (2) of Section 66, Part 3 added; Section 6 passed; 66(3)(2) passed; Sections 66(4) and Section 66(5) added; Section 7 passed; 66.4 passed --

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, in connection with Section 66.4, that there is again a very minor amendment. The way the draft bill reads "that the mailing privilege shall be available once during each session" and we wish to substitute the words "in respect of" for the word "during."

Accordingly, I move, Mr. Chairman, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, that the proposed section 66.4 of the Legislative Assembly Act as set out in Section 7 of Bill 110 be amended by striking out the word "during" in the third line and substituting therefor the words "in respect of."

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, I think that the recommendation of the changes is a correct one, but I wonder if the First Minister could indicate the basic time limit because it's in respect to the session - either we spell it out in legislation itself or there should be some clear understanding of what we're talking about in terms of a time limit.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, yes, Mr. Chairman, the intent is that every member of the Assembly should be entitled to have franking privileges for the sending out of one report on the session, and the way it was drafted in the bill, it left the impression that the report actually had to be sent out during the session; in other words it had to be deposited in the mail before the session was actually prorogued. Obviously if it's to be a report on the session it would come better a matter of a few weeks, two or three weeks after the session, and accordingly the words "in respect of" are being proposed here. So that we're talking in terms of an intent of anywhere up to 30 days after the session, one mailing in respect of each

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) session, and I don't think that the Leader of the Opposition would argue that it matters all that much whether it comes on the last day, a week before the last day, two weeks after the last day or even a month after the last day.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, there's no quarrel on our side. I think it's an excellent suggestion and there is no objection to it. I think, though, what we're concerned about would be the question of a time limit now, it would be better probably not to spell it out, but there should be some distinct understanding. Thirty days may sound reasonable and is a reasonable period, but it's not necessarily reasonable in relation to the timing that when we want -- so therefore it's a question of maybe some outside limit that would be reasonable under the circumstances which will allow the flexibility that the members

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I can allay any fears the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has in this respect. There is no stipulated time limit, the important thing is that under the terms of the proposal the member will be entitled to one mailing in respect of each session, and it's up to his judgment whether he wants to do so immediately after prorogation or if he wants to wait three months after, but he can't have two mailings per session.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: I, too, think it's an excellent suggestion but I was wondering what was in the First Minister's mind with regard to rural members taking this month that he suggested after the

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Boniface.

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Chairman, I have a concern and rise only to get clarification at this point. I wouldn't want this, and I'm sure it's not the intention here, but I hope that this will not be a loophole where once, like we did in '69 let's say, once an election is called that this could not be done, I know that as soon as an election is called, they are no such thing as members, but I hope that it's not going to be a loophole to say well I prepared this during the session, I'm a little late in sending it, and this could be sent during the campaign. I hope that this is quite clear.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 66.4 as amended passed. Now the First Minister - I am told that the section, the one by leave, we can go back, it is part of section 64 (1) that comes in immediately after section 66.3(2). Pardon me. If we can pass 64 (1) and comes immediately after 64 (1)(a) and (b). So 64 (1)(a) -- passed; 64 (b) - The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: I'm not clear on the situation here. I wonder if

MR. CHAIRMAN: If we can pass section 64 (1) the amendment proposed by the First Minister comes immediately after 64 (1). 64 (1)(a) and (b) after subsection (2) of section 64. Section 64 (1)(a) passed. The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, on 64 (1)(a) when it speaks of the indemnity for attendance of committee members, I take it that this is all inclusive and that the per diem allowance mentioned in 59 (4) does not come into consideration under this, that this is strictly the allowance for committee meetings?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: To answer the member for Rhineland. The per diem that is referred to in 59 (4) is the per diem expense allowance while the member is living away from home while the House is in session. The reference in 64 (1)(a) is for the per diem to cover expenses, etc., while the member is attending a committee meeting that is meeting intersessionally, that is between sessions. So it is two very separate things.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 64(1)(a) -- The Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. MCKELLAR: I'd just like to say a word. The problem -- I don't disagree with what the First Minister is doing, but the problem that we as rural members have had on this particular section, in the past I tried to get away without paying income tax on the first year or two, that I was a member - like when it was brought in. The Income Tax reminded me in no uncertain terms; we pay income tax on that money for living in the hotel. I'm just wondering if the Premier, I don't know whether there is any argument that he can put up to the income tax people at Ottawa, but it seems ridiculous having to pay income tax on money that's supposed to be used for living expense in a hotel. It's a problem, it cuts it down from about \$20 down to about \$14, that's all we end up with \$20, now it's \$15 down to about \$11, this is what we get, you know, by the time our income tax is off it. I know in the past there was nothing that could be done but I just wonder if the First Minister can put an argument up to the Income Tax people in Ottawa on our behalf.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I think I can and I think I have a solution for the Honourable Member's problem. The reason there was a problem in past years with respect to the living away from home per diem allowance is that up until now the expense allowance portion of the member's total emolument was 50 percent of - the expense allowance was 50 percent of the amount of his taxable indemnity but you will note that in this Bill we are increasing the taxable portion only. The expense allowance is remaining at \$2,400, therefore it becomes only 33 percent and therefore I think now you will have a case for the Income Tax Department that the per diem living away from home allowance should be considered a legitimate tax exempt allowance simply because you are below the 50 percent mark now with respect to the ratio between the expense allowance and the taxable portion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 64 (1)(a) passed; 64 (1)(b) passed; 64 (1) passed; 64 (5) passed.

MR. SCHREYER: . . . there is an amendment to be moved here somewhere.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's adding a new section after this to the particular bill, the amendment. The First Minister - that Bill 110 be amended by renumbering section (6) as printed.

MR. SCHREYER: Will the Chair please advise at what point that amendment should be moved?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It comes in now.

MR. SCHREYER: Very well, Mr. Chairman, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Resources that Bill 110 be amended by renumbering section (6) as printed as section (7); the first section (7) as section (8) and the second section numbered (7) as (9); and by adding thereto immediately after section (5) thereof the following section: Subsection (2) of section 64 amended; subsection (2) of section 64 of the Act is amended by striking out the word "twenty" in clause (a) thereof and substituting therefore the word "forty." I hope that's clear to my honourable friends.

I will explain, Mr. Chairman. The explanation is quite simple although the draft may not appear to be. There's two points involved here. The first is to simply renumber certain sections that were numbered incorrectly; the second purpose of the amendment is to bring Mr. Speaker's per diem allowance in line with that payable to other members of the Assembly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Passed. The Message?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, before you put the vote on that, I have a Message that His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the proposed amendment to this bill, recommends it to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Subsection (2) of section 64 amended; section (6) as amended, passed. A new subsection (7). Section 66.5 (1) passed; 66.5 (2)(a) - . . .

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, on this particular section I note that we are using the term "caucus." In the rules it says that a recognized opposition party means a party other than the official opposition represented in the legislative assembly by four or more members. I fail to see why the change in the wording. Is it that we are trying to accommodate some people in a special way by not being a recognized party but rather that they can group together as a caucus and thus be entitled to the allowances here? I'd like to have an explanation on this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, it's not as though the Member for Rhineland doesn't have a point. I believe that he does; and in some ways you know, it's too bad that with the passing of time parliament is formalizing certain things that previously had been left as behind the curtain arrangements. I say to my honourable friend that it wasn't until after the time of William Pitt that parliament recognized even parties, prior to that, there was no recognition of parties, recognition of caucus, I admit, there has been no formal recognition of caucus as such in any act of parliament or Legislative Assembly Act but the member will appreciate that the whole point of this section is to provide a certain means whereby caucuses and individual members of this House may have research and secretarial assistance. My honourable friend will note that in the case of an independent member or a member of a party less than the number stipulated in the Legislative Assembly Act for purposes of recognition, nevertheless is entitled to the same allowance for research and secretarial assistance as anyone else; except that it's payable to him individually rather than to a person designated by caucus.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 66.5 (2)(a) - . . . The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, there is no thought then of changing the rules to accommodate that particular section, nor is there any intention to change the estimates in the future

(MR. FROESE cont'd) to give the leader of the second Opposition Party an allowance, that it could be a caucus allowance or the term caucus used in the rules, is there?

MR. CHAIRMAN: 66.5 (2)(a) -- passed. 66.5 (2)(b) -- passed. Section 8 -- passed. Section 9 -- passed. Preamble - passed.

MR. SCHREYER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland is wondering where the Section 9 is. By virtue of the amendment we passed about three minutes ago, Section 7 became Section 9. There was a renumbering amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill be reported. Committee rise.
Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre that the report of the Committee be received.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried. BILL NO. 110 was read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, we're hoping to go into Law Amendments Committee immediately after the House meets this afternoon after the 2:30 sitting, so if any honourable members know of any persons who have anything to say on any of the bills, I would urge them to communicate with them and the Clerk will communicate with anybody who has notice of who wishes to present anything on those bills.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I take it the House Leader is about to move adjournment of the House. I wonder by leave if I could ask for a slight housekeeping chore to be performed; namely, by leave again to request the substitution of myself and the Member from Birtle-Russell as substitute members for the Agricultural Committee for the remainder of this Session only, in place of the Member for Rock Lake and in place of the Member for Virthen.

MR. SPEAKER: (Agreed)

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, 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 Friday afternoon.