

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 7 students of Grade 9 standing of the Sansome Junior High School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Barchyn. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

We also have 22 students of Grade 6 standing of the Allard School who are the host to the Melita School who are the guests. These students are under the direction of Mr. Sheldon. These schools are located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia and the Honourable Member for Arthur.

And we have 75 students of Grade 6 standing of the Cecil Rhodes School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Graham, Mr. Fuz and Mrs. Reynolds. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Logan.

On behalf of all the honourable members of the Assembly I welcome you here today.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports. The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

TABLING OF REPORTS

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, as acting Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management I would ask leave to table the Annual Report of the Clean Environment Commission for the calendar year ended December 31st, 1971.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other Ministerial Statements or Tabling of Reports? Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills. The Honourable Attorney-General.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. A. H. MACKLING, Q.C. (Attorney-General and Minister of Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services) (St. James) introduced Bill No. 90, an Act to amend The Trustee Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Oral Questions. The Honourable Member for Riel.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Health. In view of the unconditional ban on DDT announced by the U.S. Environment Protection Agency I wonder if he can advise the House of the regulations that exist in Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Development) (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, this question would be more appropriately asked to the Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should redirect the question to the Minister. In view of the unconditional ban on DDT announced by the Environment Protection Agency in the U.S.A. can the Minister advise what the regulations are that apply in Manitoba?

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is asking a detailed question. There are many regulations pertaining to the use of insecticides, pesticides, etc. and other chemicals, but I believe this is public information and it's available to anyone who wishes to do a little investigation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management in his capacity as Minister responsible for the Water Control Board and ask him if he now is able to answer the question that I posed the other day with regard to spraying for the grasshopper infestation along provincial waterways and provincial drainage ditches?

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'm still awaiting a reply from departmental officials.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the First Minister. In view of the fact that the Honourable James Richardson announced a policy for more Federal Government purchasing in the west, will the Minister be meeting with the Federal Minister to see to it that Manitoba gets a fair share of this new policy?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Well, Mr. Speaker, such meetings in fact have already taken place. The Minister of Supply has indicated to me on two occasions I believe that an effort was being made to get a better regional distribution of the purchasing carried out by the Federal Government, and in particular by the Department of Defense which seems to have the most regionally biased purchasing policy of all Federal Government departments, so that the answer to the honourable member's question is affirmative. Such meetings have taken place and there will be follow-up meetings.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the statement that he has made to the press in regards to the Feed Grains Commission in establishing feed prices could the Minister indicate to this House at what price level will feed grains be established whereby the producer will sell to commercial buyers?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Rock Lake should know that when board marketing is implemented that the Board is charged with the responsibility of setting prices on a daily, weekly or otherwise basis.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. In view of the decision taken by the American Government finally to ban DDT when will this government ban the sale and use of DDT and its other destructive relatives which are used in Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, there are really two parts in which I can give my answer. The first part is that it's my understanding that the decision taken in the U.S. was taken by the Government of the United States and not by the government of any particular state. Applying the same general guideline here it would seem that appropriate action with respect to the use of pesticides and herbicides, etc. ought to be similarly carried out by the Federal Government, the Government of Canada.

The second part of my reply is that it is my understanding -- I will have to check this but it's my understanding that the Government of Canada has already placed DDT on a restricted use list if not a complete ban, I'm not certain that it's a complete ban but it's definitely on a restricted use list, and has been I believe for a matter of, oh, three or four years now.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Are we to understand then that this government has no policy unless Ottawa puts forth a policy first?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, as I have said from time to time in this Chamber, there are some matters of policy concern that are national in scope and where the common sense of it would imply that if a matter is to be done it be done on a national basis by the Government of the country as a whole. That doesn't mean that there have been no studies carried out by the appropriate provincial departments, but insofar as possible it would be desirable to act in national unison in a matter of this kind.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Health. Inasmuch as the U.S. Government has indicated that the reason for the ban is associated with cancer development in human beings, I wonder if he could undertake to have the people of his department advise him and the House whether or not there is any knowledge that can be passed on that the public should be made aware of in a formal way. --(Interjection)-- No, between cancer and DDT.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I will endeavour to get all information available in this

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) province and bring forward the knowledge of the officials within the Department of Health and Social Development to the members of this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Health and Welfare. In view of the report of the Minister of Labour yesterday on the improved employment situation in Manitoba would the Minister advise as to the effect of the reduced pay-out of welfare in Winnipeg for the months of April and May; what effect that it has had, that report that the Honourable Minister gave us yesterday. Probably the Minister would take it under advisement but I would ask him if he would give serious consideration to it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour is a member of the same Cabinet as I am and we try to have the same figures available to us pertaining to the unemployed within this province and those who are unemployed but employable that are on social allowance because of financial need are considered. So far as the figures asked for by the honourable member pertaining to social allowance paid to individuals within the province for the months of April and May, these figures should be available very shortly and the honourable members will be kept abreast of statistics thereof.

MR. BILTON: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Honourable Minister of Health and Welfare liaisons with the Honourable Minister of Labour in order that the House and the province may be advised as to whether or not the eloquent report that the Minister of Labour gave us yesterday is having any affect on saving welfare money throughout the province?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, because of the rules of this House I'm requested to make a very short answer and my answer is: yes, definitely has.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. J. R. FERGUSON (Gladstone): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture. During his estimates I asked him if there was going to be sufficient chemical available to combat the expected grasshopper outbreak. I checked today with two major distributors, as a matter of fact just now, Shell Oil and Green Cross, and there's no chemical available in the city. I would like to know where the supply he said was available is, and if it can be put out inside of 24 hours?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, my latest report is dated about five minutes ago and that report is that there are ample supplies on hand for whoever may wish to acquire them, and that if anyone wanting those supplies would contact my department they could be advised as to who has these supplies and follow up from that point on.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I would like to elaborate further on the question of chemical for grasshopper control because of a question put in my absence a day or two ago. That is with respect to the price differentials as between the United States and Canada in the distribution of the chemicals. I want to advise members opposite that the chemical is not identical and therefore there is reason for some price differential in that respect. However, I am concerned about the exploitation that does exist with respect to the price of the chemical that we are using within Manitoba as between the price to the public sector and the price through the private channels to the farmer. There is more than 100 percent variation and for that reason we are taking -- for that reason, Mr. Speaker, we are taking steps to assure, to assure that next year there will be a public distribution of chemical at cost.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture and ask him if his department would be prepared to issue a directive to the grasshoppers to ask them to desist in their destructive rampaging until supplies are brought into the province.

Sir, I should like to direct a question to the Attorney-General and ask him -- and ask him ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. If the question is going to be in the same vein as the previous one I must indicate that it's out of order. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: No, it is not, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well.

MR. JORGENSON: I would like to ask the Attorney-General if he could advise the House--

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) this is pursuant to a question that I asked yesterday -- if he could advise the House what section of The Human Rights Act prevents the Minister from tabling reports of the Human Rights Commission.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: If the honourable member will again peruse The Human Rights Act he will recognize that after an inquiry a report may be submitted to the Attorney-General and the Attorney-General may refer the report back for clarification, and then on the basis of the recommendations the Attorney-General may then make some recommendations, or I should say make an Order. The reports are still under consideration and as and when an Order is made then it will become public. It will be to the public that the report will be made and then it will be open for discussion in the House.

MR. JORGENSEN: Sir, the Minister is referring to Section 11 (2) of the Act and there is nothing in that particular . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . section that says the Minister . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. The honourable member is well aware no debate is allowed during the question period. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs. He's not in his seat, perhaps I can ask the question of the First Minister. In view of the Federal Government's announcement in respect to housing program and housing policies will this government give consideration to giving grants to people on low income so they can purchase homes outright?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, that is one of the requirements of the new policy that has been announced by the Federal Government. I can advise the honourable member that meetings have taken place with officials of the Department of Urban Affairs, Ottawa and the Government of Manitoba, and that in addition to that I was speaking to the Federal Minister only yesterday in an effort to gain further particulars. The announced program, as announced by the Honourable Ron Basford, has not yet been legislated; it does not exist yet in fact and there is some considerable uncertainty as to when it would go operational. But in the event that it did, one of the seven components of that program would involve some countervailing provincial grants as well as CMHC money.

MR. PATRICK: Perhaps I can ask a supplementary. I wonder if the First Minister is aware that in Ontario they're able to purchase homes at the present time, the tenants in the low rental housing, they can purchase low rental housing units at the present time.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, that may well be but if it is the case it has nothing to do with the announcement that was made just the other day by the Federal Minister, because I repeat the program that was envisaged in that announcement is not yet operational and will not be for I should think quite some time yet.

I can advise the honourable member as well that under certain programs here in Manitoba it is possible for tenants or users of low income housing to purchase as well. I think in particular of the remote housing program under which quite a number of units are being built, etc.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce, relates to a news service bulletin of today's date by the Minister reporting that Nu-Steel Industries Limited of Winkler have installed new equipment in their plant. My question is, Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the Minister is making this announcement on behalf of the company can it be assumed that MDC has taken an equity position in this operation?

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, no, it cannot be assumed that the MDC is taking an equity position or giving any financial assistance whatsoever. But it can be assumed, as in the case of many industrial developments in this province, that the Manitoba Department of Industry and Commerce has assisted this particular company, just as my good friend from La Verendrye knows, at the sod-turning yesterday of a new plant - we're happy to see it in Steinbach - the Department had a considerable influence in assisting to get that plant going, helping with initial contacts, giving advice, helping to get DREE money and so forth. So to that extent we are involved in helping.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the Minister's reply, will it then be a service available to all private industry in Manitoba, an announcement by the Minister if new equipment is installed?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I think whenever we get new industry in Manitoba or expansion of existing industry it's good news and everybody likes to hear about it.

And while I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Brandon West did ask me a specific question the other day: Was the Department of Mines and Resources assisting in the Pan Arctic Oil Company in any aerial surveys in northern Manitoba? The answer is no.

The Member from Rupertsland asked a question with respect to assistance to the Fishermen's Co-op at Island Lake and at God's Lake. Unfortunately I gather he's not here. However, I'm advised that there seems to be no problem in these particular areas which the honourable member has referred to. In fact I'm advised that the fishermen are well organized this year and are obtaining maximum utilization of the lake and its fish resources. An on-site training instructor will be in both locations however in the very near future to provide any assistance that the fishermen may require. I can only reiterate that there seems to be no problem and in fact the fishermen have indicated to us that they seem to be satisfied with the present situation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. Are the employees of the Lord Selkirk unionized?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure whether that should be addressed to myself or to the Minister of Labour. I would imagine that at least those employees involved in the naval aspects - if I can use that expression - the operation of the boat, the captain and so on, I believe they belong to the appropriate union organization, but whether the steward sector are in a union I'm not aware of.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Another question on the same subject, Mr. Speaker. Is it MDC policy to discourage union activity on the vessel?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, of course it is not MDC policy to discourage union activities with regard to Lord Selkirk or with regard to any other subsidiary of the MDC. I'm advised by the Minister of Labour, not only that, it would be a violation of the Manitoba Labour Relations Act and he would personally see that they were sued.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, some few days back the Member for Arthur wanted to know whether the province made any representation to the Canadian Dairy Commission and the Canadian Government on the question of representation on that commission. I want to advise the Member for Arthur that since the signing of the market share agreement, we are now in a position to put a man on the advisory committee to the commission so that we do have a direct link in communication with it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): I'd like to then direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Is there any difference now with the representation on the Commission than there was when Mr. Cox was on as the regional member for Manitoba?

MR. USKIW: I'm afraid, Mr. Speaker, the member did not understand my point. I had indicated earlier that the membership of the commission is unchanged but at this point because of Manitoba's entry into the market share agreement we have a member on the advisory board to the commission, as does every province that has entered the market share agreement, so that we do have representation in the policy area.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I would like to also answer a question put to me by the Member for Rock Lake and that has to do with whether or not the date of March 17th under the Manpower Program could have been extended. The answer is that the federal people felt that it was a Winter Works arrangement and they did not wish to extend the program beyond March 17th, or the applications. Also, the member wanted to know the participation within that program and the figure I have here is that we have had 86 farmers applying for a total of 113 working positions of which, I believe, 50 - no, 70 employees were brought into the program.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I direct a supplementary question to the Minister. There is

(MR. WATT cont'd) no change now in our representation on the Dairy Commission insofar as Manitoba is concerned than there was in 1969?

MR. USKIW: Well again, Mr. Speaker, I guess the honourable member did not hear what I had to say. I indicated to him on more than one occasion that there was no change on the commission and that the only change in the structure is an advisory committee composed of provincial representatives.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, on this particular subject here, can the Minister of Agriculture indicate to us how many cows are in production of dairy milk in the Province of Manitoba at the present time?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: I haven't had an opportunity to do a count in recent days but if the honourable member really wants the information I'm sure the Department could furnish him with it.

MR. EINARSON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, which I hope will be significant. If the Minister would like to take that first question under advisement, could he also indicate what is the increased number of cows that will be in production in 1972 as opposed to 1971?

MR. USKIW: I think the Member for Rock Lake has a crystal ball as competent as I have and if he can tell me an answer to that kind of a question I think I would invite him to sit over on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. LEONARD A BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, my question is also to the Minister of Agriculture. Does the Manitoba Government, or is the Manitoba Government considering a policy similar to Saskatchewan with respect to limiting farm land purchases to provincial residents only?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: That is a matter of policy. I can indicate that we have not given it any consideration to date, that is not officially or otherwise.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, I have been advised from my constituency that the plague of Bertha army worms is now evident in the on-coming year. It was quite a problem last year and I'm asking the Minister of Agriculture as to whether or not he's been alerted and as to whether or not he intends to do something about it before it really gets under way?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, that is another item that we have had some discussion on in recent months. It seems apparent that there will be another outbreak the extent of which is hard to determine, but we are taking steps as a department to assure quantities of chemical to be on hand for any eventuality. Now I think it's a matter of an estimate as to what quantities may be required and of course members opposite will appreciate that error of judgment is quite a possibility in this regard. It's very difficult to know the amount of product that might be required. On the other hand though there appears to be ready access to supplies in that it's quite a common chemical used in the United States and last year even though we appeared to have an emergency here in Canada it was really not difficult to move products in from Texas within a matter of hours.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In the event of the matter getting out of hand is the Minister anticipating compensation for loss of crop?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The question is hypothetical. Orders of the Day. The proposed Order for Return. The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - ORDERS FOR RETURN

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Fort Rouge that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing:

All correspondence between the Land Acquisition Branch of the Attorney-General's Office of the Province of Manitoba and Aronovitch and Leipsic Limited, from December 1, 1971 to April 30, 1972.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Is it agreed that I say something, Mr. Speaker? (Agreed) Thank you.

(MR. MACKLING cont'd)

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for me to know what information may be sought by the honourable member. I am therefore not in a position to accept this Order for Return in its present form because I assume that in land transactions there is very often confidentially involved as to the amounts of offers and so on and parties that are involved and therefore I am not in a position to accept this. If the honourable members wishes to transfer it to debate that's fine, and in the interval if he can specify, I'll be glad to try and determine whether or not it may be possible to accede when it's up for debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might rise here on a point of order. Normally the practice is to simply state whether or not the motion is acceptable. I have no objection to the Minister outlining the reasons why, but I wonder if the suggestion that I made earlier in dealing with these matters -- I think I made it to the House Leader -- if it may not be possible for the Attorney-General and the Member for Charleswood to meet after here to determine just what could be acceptable and then the Order for Return could be resubmitted. If that is acceptable perhaps that arrangement could be made.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): I think, Mr. Speaker, and I agree with the Honourable Member for Morris that we have had some preliminary discussions on the possibility of changing the rules pertaining to this very point. So I would suggest if we just allow the resolution to stand, I think that would be the proper procedure for the purpose of the record to allow it to stand and then the honourable members get together before proceeding with it. I think it should be recorded as being stood.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: ... Pardon? --(Interjection)-- You know my honourable friend after the education I'm giving you you won't even ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. May we proceed with the Order Paper. --(Interjection)-- I agree.

MR. PAULLEY: There was a slight interruption. Mr. Speaker, would you kindly call Bill No. 55.

GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (BUD) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, we've had a number of interesting legislative routines proffered to us in the present session by various members of the government side. We've had the blunderbuss routine which has been brought to much of the legislation in the field of labour and labour conditions by the Minister of Labour. We've had the hat and the rabbit routine which has been referred to before by the Honourable Member for Inkster. We've had the comedy routine between the Member for Thompson and others on the government benches with respect to the First Minister's resolution having to do with consideration of aid of a public nature for separate and public schools, and indeed the performance of the First Minister himself in that area of ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I wonder if the honourable member would inform me if we are discussing Bill 55?

MR. SHERMAN: We are now coming, Sir, to the lullaby routine of Bill 55 which is before us today in the name of the Minister of Finance. What it is in essence, Mr. Speaker, is a lullaby of this government designed to soothe the taxpayer and satisfy him, lull him to sleep and make him believe that he is getting an advantageous accounting where tax burdens are concerned, when in fact, when in fact the burden that he carries at the present time is only being shifted from one shoulder to another. The harried taxpayer has, as I see it where this legislation is concerned, Mr. Speaker, dragged himself off to bed, been soothed to sleep by the education tax rebate provisions provided for in the Income Tax Act amendments before us and incorporated in this bill, but meantime he'd be wise to keep one eye open for the two-dollar bill and the petty change that he left on his dressing table when he dragged himself off to bed. For when the Minister has finished his lullaby and his soothing nocturnal medicine I would suspect that in stealing quietly from the room and leaving the taxpayer to go to sleep the Minister's other taxation measures will remove the \$2 and the petty change that the taxpayer

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) left on his dresser along with the Minister's person himself.

Mr. Speaker, the main economic and social issue worrying Manitobans today is the high rate of taxation of all forms facing them. While the anger and the debate and the dispute may often seem to be concentrated here in this Assembly it is not the case. The fact of the matter, Sir, is that most of the anxiety, most of the worry and most of the debate really exists outside. It arises outside and reflects itself through the members duly elected to take the case of the people to the floor of this Chamber. Most of us who rise to speak in this Chamber, if not all of us, are merely responding much of the time to the needs of the people in our constituencies, to the needs of Manitobans in general, to the needs of our own individual constituents and that applies just as much when we are questioning the fiscal and taxation measures of the government as when we are considering steps along the path of social progress. When we rise to dispute and criticise and question the fiscal policies and the taxation measures of this government we are being, Sir, as much the custodians and the watchdogs of the people we were elected to represent, despite the critical posture which we take in debate, as we are when we rise to propose resolutions of our own in the areas which we deem right for social progress of when we rise to compliment this government or any other government on social progress that it enacts. The pressures against the taxation policies of this government are created outside and reflected and articulated here simply through the logical fulfilment of our roles as members of the Opposition.

It's interesting to see how some of these pressures have altered the temper and the tenor of life in this Chamber and life in this province at the present time, Mr. Speaker. This particular government has decreed tax increases with I think worrying regularity since it came to office and as a consequence of those decrees and those tax increases it has found itself in an ambivalent position almost throughout the life of its tenure in office and it has found itself alternately self conscious about the tax increases it's introduced and hyper-defensive.

Opposition critics like my colleagues and I who stand in the Chamber to question and examine and scrutinize the tax policies and the tax increases introduced and the tax changes introduced by this government and who attempt to evaluate responsibly the tax policies that are introduced by the Minister and his colleagues are often labelled as reactionaries and demagogues and spreaders of doom and gloom, Mr. Speaker; when in reality all we are attempting to do is fulfil the role of opposition members in the House and reflect and articulate the anxiety and the pressure which I say to you, Sir, has built up outside this Chamber to a far greater degree than it has done inside the Chamber.

The definition among government members of one who fulfils his legislative responsibilities in this vein is doom spreader or gloom spreader, prophet of gloom - that is one of the most commonly used appellations which the government applies to us when we say that they are carrying the province deeper into debt, that they are mortgaging the future, not only of the present generation but a generation or two of Manitobans to come, that they are inhibiting and limiting the small and medium business community to the extent that new jobs are no longer being created at anywhere near the rate needed to absorb and satisfy and take advantage of the young people of talent and exercise that our academic institutions are graduating every year. But one who objects in this vein or criticises the policies and programs of the government, who is opposed to regimentation of income, to regimentation of production or regimentation of sales, or to real property taxation, which really strikes at the hardest, Sir, against the middle and lower income groups is a spreader of gloom or doom or reactionary, is someone who is doing a disservice in the eyes of this government to the people of Manitoba, because he or she is not sitting here applauding the steps and the measures that they are taking.

Well I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is a distortion and a misrepresentation both of the purpose of the opposition and of the work of the opposition in the lifetime of this legislature, and particularly during the present session. This government says that every group of Manitobans who doesn't agree with them is somehow either a special interest group or representative of a special interest group. Every group of legislators here, every group of citizens, every group of medical people, every group of manufacturers, every group of trade unionists, every group of farmers who resist the taxation increases and the spending programs which those taxation increases are designed to support, introduced by this government, is somehow doing a disservice to the Province of Manitoba and to the people of Manitoba in general, and is somehow specifically and singularly representing only a special interest or a vested interest group.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, there is a common thread uniting many groups of Manitobans at the

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) present time where the tax load and the fiscal policies of this government are concerned and it has nothing to do with any vested interest - any special interest but one. The one special interest that all the critics of the government's programs have is that they are Manitobans who are interested in staying here, making this one of the best places in the world to live in, one of the best provinces in Canada to raise a family in and to follow one's line of work in and that they are fearful that the policies being followed and practised by this government are limiting their potential and the province's potential. That is the only vested interest that the critics of the Minister of Finance and his colleagues represent; that is the only vested interest involved in this whole dialogue, Mr. Speaker.

The simple truth of the matter is that every single Manitoban who pays taxes has a special interest. I am sure that the Minister of Finance would agree with that statement in essence. Every single Manitoban who pays taxes under this administration or any administration has a special interest. We say that that special interest is impaired by the taxation programs and policies of the New Democratic government presently in office, notwithstanding the kind of sugar-coating, the kind of soothing lullaby that is implicit in legislation such as Bill 55.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I know the position of the government; certainly the position of the Minister and his colleagues on the front benches, that the tax burden that I talk about, and that Manitobans themselves are concerned about has got to be interpreted, has got to be interpreted and understood in the context of the government's spending program. Well that's fair enough in terms of political semantics but it seems to me, Sir, that that puts the onus on the wrong end of the equation, because the government's spending program has reached a point where only a runaway extravagant taxation program could fit the kind of expenditure programs on which they are embarking, could support those programs. And to say that, to suggest that, or to even believe whether they define it or not, that the tax programs in this province have to be interpreted in the light of the spending program that the government has embarked upon, is a neat application of a reverse kind of psychology which can do little but damage the chances of our economy in the years ahead.

The reply which we would have to that kind of a position is the reply which I have stated by implication already, and that is that the equation should be turned around or at least examined from the reverse direction and let us take a look at the spending programs that we believe are justified and justifiable at the present time and make them fit the kind of tax burden that Manitobans can carry, the kind of revenues that reasonably and conscientiously can be extracted from Manitobans through taxation programs, income and other. So the onus really comes down in considering legislation of this kind, Mr. Speaker, to where it has been since the session got under way in the opinion of many of us in the Opposition, and that is, to the honesty and the logic and the justification of this government's spending programs. Naturally, if we are into an inflated environment of spending, we are going to have to have an inflated environment of taxation to support it. And I suggest to you that the government spending programs have been grossly inflated since they came to office.

In the three years that this government has ruled the destinies of Manitobans, the spending approach, the spending climate of the province has been grossly and artificially inflated and it follows logically that to support that kind of a program you have to have grossly inflated taxes, grossly inflated tax loads and tax burdens. That doesn't say that it's responsible government, that doesn't say that it's right. It simply says that it follows mathematically. This is the position that Manitobans are in and that this government is in. Nobody here - no responsible Manitoban would challenge the Minister of Finance's right or the right of any of his colleagues or right of anybody in government to raise revenues necessary to meet responsible considered spending programs. But we part company with this government, Mr. Speaker, when we are asked to accept the fact that this government has carte blanche to raise the kinds of revenues it needs to support any kind of spending program which is may deem in terms of its doctrinal or philosophic approach to life in Manitoba should be embarked upon or is justified. This is where we part company and the Minister of Finance and the First Minister certainly are aware of that after three months of debate in this Chamber, much of which is centered around precisely this fulcrum of legislation which has revolved precisely around the question of government spending and the ability of the Manitoba taxpayer to support it.

If the government demonstrates its ability to spend wisely, justly, justifiably, then any responsible opposition members would stand in support of the measures the government deem necessary to raise the finances which would be involved. But we don't believe that this

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) government has demonstrated that kind of ability. We don't believe it's demonstrated the ability to plan its spending, to program its policies for Manitobans with that kind of realistic hard-nosed ability based on the productivity of the province and the one million people who live here. The real question really, Mr. Speaker, is the question of whether the policies and the administrative changes brought in by this government have been sufficient, Sir, have been sufficient to justify the raising of the additional hundreds of millions of dollars annually, and it does run in, taken on a comparison basis in 1972 against 1969, to hundreds of millions of dollars annually. And the answer to the question is, no, the government has not demonstrated that the policies and the administrative approaches and the businesslike ability that it purports to bring to the business of government justified those hundreds of millions of dollars annually being sought for spending in the public area, annually being sought from taxpayers in order to support the programs.

Bill 55, Mr. Speaker, promises a limited form of indirect tax relief, but as I said at the beginning of my remarks, it constitutes in my estimation nothing more than a government lullaby which is designed to soothe the taxpayer, make him feel comfortable, whereas no remedy to his problem is being offered, no remedy to his problem is being offered. In fact, if one wanted to be cynical about it, one might say that it's designed to soothe the taxpayer and make him feel comfortable at least until after the determination of the vote in this Friday's by-election in the constituency of Wolseley.

The bill itself, Sir, cannot be viewed in isolation from other tax measures of this government and if we look at the record we see that it is justifiable only, only on the grounds that it is a necessary measure taken in the total context of the government's financial program to bail them out of the spending difficulties that they have got themselves into.

In fiscal 1970/71, Mr. Speaker, total expenditures in Manitoba were about approximately \$450 million. For 1972/73 they are approximately \$575 million. That's an increase of - what? - 28 percent, Sir, in two years, 28 percent in two years; an increase of 125 millions of dollars in government spending. And that's in direct day to day operations of government; I'm not even taking into account the capital spending program which has skyrocketed with similar extravagance.

In that same period 1970/71 to 1972/73, that same two-year period, welfare spending has risen approximately 60 percent. Part of that is because we have experienced the highest unemployment in a decade, but only part of that; a great deal of it has been the result of a lack of control, a lack of management over the programs and policies and administration of the Department whose responsibility it is to administer welfare to Manitobans. Sixty percent in welfare spending - that's the increase in the past two years, Mr. Speaker. Our provincial rate of personal income tax is 42-1/2 percent of the federal tax payable and that's the highest rate in the country. It's a full 12 percent above the corresponding rates in BC and Ontario. Our corporate tax rate 13 percent, that's the highest in the country. It's shared only by Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker.

Our most recent provincial budget introduced by the Finance Minister a few weeks ago provides for an additional 12 million dollars that's to be extracted from the pockets of Manitoba taxpayers in the coming year to help support the spending programs that have gone up so exorbitantly, an additional \$12 million that will be obtained from the new five percent sales tax on production machinery, the new increased taxes on liquor and the increased taxes on cigarettes and tobacco. From production machinery it's approximately \$7 million, that's the calculation; \$2 million expected from the liquor tax increase; \$3 million from the cigarette and tobacco tax increase, for a total of \$12 million -- coming again, Mr. Speaker, from where? From the dressing table of the Manitoba taxpayer who is being lulled and soothed to sleep and into a false sense of security by the gratuitous Minister of Finance who says in Bill 55 that he's doing something for the taxpayer, that he's giving him a break and that he's relieving him of the burden and the load that he's been carrying.

Mr. Speaker, the dollar amounts taken in comparison for the years under review are even more disturbing than the rates. We've talked about rates but let's look at dollar amounts. And it's the dollar damage to the economy, to the people who make the province go and to the people who pay the taxes that really counts. It's the dollar damage that matters in this argument. And the dollar damage is this: in the last full year of Conservative Government in Manitoba roughly \$54 million in personal income tax was realized in Manitoba. In 1972/73, Sir, almost \$142 million of personal income tax were expected from this source. --(Interjection)-- The Minister of Finance says I've left out Medicare. Well, Mr. Speaker, that's an

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) interesting interjection. The Minister of Finance has mentioned Medicare and the change in the financing of the Medicare program and the change in the form of the Medicare premiums so often in the lifetime of this Legislature that I wouldn't think that anybody here or within earshot, or within eyesight of reports on this Legislature could ever forget the gesture, could ever forget the program that this government introduced two years ago when they changed the method of financing Medicare from the public to the ability-to-pay principle. So I'm sure that the fact that I haven't mentioned it in my remarks this afternoon will be forgiven by the Minister and by many Manitobans because they've heard it a million times before.

In the last full year of Conservative Government, Mr. Speaker, the corresponding figures for corporate tax take in Manitoba was \$21 million and the corporate tax take in the 1972/73 fiscal year under the present administration in Manitoba was \$38 million. So when we're talking dollar amounts we're talking at the personal income tax level of an increase between the last year of Conservative Government and 1972/73 of from 54 million to 142 million, and in the corporate income tax field from 21 million to 38 million dollars. That's the --(Interjection)-- Would the Minister permit me to finish and then I will certainly attempt to answer a question. But those are the mathematical facts of the matter, Mr. Speaker, in the area of dollar damage, in the dollar amounts being paid by Manitobans. The population of Manitoba has increased somewhat, fractionally, in those years to be sure, but it has only been fractional and by no stretch of the imagination can it compare statistically with the increase in the amounts of taxes being extracted now by the government of the province to finance itself and its programs.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion let me just stress one other point. That is that although I've talked about the extractions that I think really take on rather voracious proportions, the extractions from the taxpayer's pocket that have been undertaken by this government, those extractions, Sir, have not been just confined to the major tax categories to which I just referred, income tax of a personal and corporate nature. They've hit everybody; they've hit everybody in the area of what might be called nuisance fees, nuisance taxes. They've hit everybody in the area of permit costs. Here's a simple sample rundown of some of the categories in the line-up of taxation increases for Manitoba in the general sense of the word would include, Mr. Speaker, the increases in land titles fees and land transfer fees that have been introduced by this government, the increases in camping permits and park fees that have been introduced by this government. Park fees in the last year of Conservative administration produced less than \$600,000 in revenue, Mr. Speaker. This year they'll yield over a million dollars, and there are many other nuisance fees in that category that amount in effect --(Interjection)-- Well they amount in effect, Mr. Speaker, to another form of taxation.

The point we're trying to make simply is that this Bill 55 and similarly gratuitous offers of relief that have been proposed in this Legislature by the Minister of Finance are nothing but substitutions, are nothing but counterbalances for the tax increase in one form or another that have been loaded on Manitobans ever since this Minister took office. What about the increase in cost of drivers' licences, Mr. Speaker? How many Manitobans does that hit? What about the recently announced increase in banquet permits and wedding permits if they're serving liquor? --(Interjection)-- Two hundred percent is putting it lightly. In the case of banquet wedding permits I think the increase was 500 percent, Mr. Speaker. I think the permits went from \$2.00 to \$10.00. --(Interjection)-- My colleague says to me I can go all afternoon. You're darn right I could go all afternoon, Mr. Speaker, and you know what? You know what, Mr. Speaker? I could go all afternoon and one million Manitobans would follow me all the way. --(Interjection)-- There's the pied piper over there and it's those one million who are going to have to pay that piper's tune and that tune is off key and nobody wants to hear it anymore.

Mr. Speaker, what about the increase in the taxation on liquor that has just been introduced by the Minister? Now I'm not here to represent the vested interest of drinkers and alcohol consumers. I know that my friends opposite will interpret everything I say as representative of a vested interest, a special interest group but we're used to that. I don't know whether, I don't know whether my honourable friend the Attorney-General has done any campaigning in his constituency or in Wolseley lately but I know he's done a lot of campaigning in his life and I would suggest that he recall, that he recall to memory some of the personal, some of the personal homely, homespun little experiences that he must have had . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I'm having tremendous difficulty trying to hear the Honourable Member for Fort Garry. I realize he's doing his best but I would suggest if all the

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd) honourable members would do their best to listen we'd probably be able to hear what he's saying. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate that; I was having a little difficulty hearing myself. But I would just suggest to my honourable friend the Attorney-General and others opposite that they recall to mind some of the personal homely, homespun little experiences that they have when they go door to door and remind themselves that not everybody occupies the seats of the mighty and lives in the kind of relative luxury that the occupants of the treasury benches enjoy, and that even that tax on liquor hit Mr. Average and Mrs. Average Manitoban, hit the working man and working woman who really don't have the financial resources to enjoy some of the opportunities offered in the area of entertainment to those Manitobans such as the ones occupying the treasury benches; who look for a little relief from tedium, a little relief from boredom in the occasional use of liquor in their homes or in other persons' homes or down in the corner cocktail lounge which gives them an hour or two of enjoyment.

So when the members of the treasury benches opposite dismiss my reference to the increase in liquor taxes in such cavalier fashion, I suggest that they are deliberately attempting to avoid the true significance of the impact of that tax, which is a tax on the little man and the little woman in Manitoba again like so many of these other fee-permit type increases have been. These are in the final analysis parts of the taxation load. In the final analysis they are taxes to the Manitoban who is trying to make a living, trying to maintain a home and trying to raise and educate his children.

The taxes increased in the Minister's recent Budget with respect to cigarettes and other forms of tobacco fall into precisely the same category, Mr. Speaker. There is the additional sales tax now on production machinery which as we have attempted to say and much of our debate has fallen on deaf ears, will reflect itself all down the line in prices to consumers in this province. And there are the two great categories of burdensome tax which have been mentioned so often, the top-heavy corporate income tax and personal income tax rates which exist in Manitoba and militate against the Manitoban's opportunity to enjoy the benefits of his work to the full extent of the effort that he puts in.

Mr. Speaker, to suggest that Manitobans are being spared anything in the way of taxation burdens or cost of living burdens by Bill 55 is false. The burden has simply been shifted, Sir, from one shoulder to the other. The catalogue of permit increases, fee increases, licence increases and other taxation increases which I cited a moment or two ago amply illustrates the tendency, and it's an inherent one, of this government -- or in my opinion any socialist government, Mr. Speaker -- to spend extravagantly and therefore to have to tax extravagantly. The truth of the matter is that not being acquainted with the realities of the marketplace, with the realities of the stress and strain and the principles of the marketplace, they apply what appear to be, what appear to be attractive principles and theories and policies to their economic thinking. The truth of the matter is that tested in the marketplace many if not all of these policies and principles derived from their philosophy are found desperately wanting, Mr. Speaker. But they don't know that because they've never had to compete in the stress and strain and give and take of the marketplace; they've never had to meet a payroll, most of them; they've never had to negotiate a contract, most of them; they've never had to pay a business tax, most of them; they've never had to meet competition, most of them; they've never had to pay a business tax; they've never had to acquire equipment; they've never had to borrow capital to finance their business and economic programs; they've never had to do any of these things. They've never had to pay compensation to injured workers; they've never had to provide vacations for workers; they've never had to give raises; they've never had to give Christmas bonuses; they've never had to do any of those things because they've never been in the marketplace. They get beautiful theories from their books on philosophy and doctrine; they take them into the arena which they now dominate and they bankrupt Manitobans by applying them. And this is inherent, this is inherent in the socialist, Mr. Speaker. There's nothing wrong with socialist economic theory except that it doesn't work. That's the only thing wrong with it. It just doesn't work. Their approach is one of extravagant spending, to apply theories and to engage in their experiments and to finance that extravagant spending they resort to the only means possible and that is extravagant taxing. And in the teeth of the extravagant taxation measures which they've been introducing for three years in this province they come along in the height of a by-election campaign and introduce a sop in the form of Bill 55 to the homeowner, the taxpayer of Manitoba, and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it's not really going to fool anyone. It's not really going to fool anyone.

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd)

What they have done here, Sir, is shift the burden from one shoulder to the other, that's all. But they still have got the taxpayer on his knees. The burden is still with us and it will be with us as long as we have to finance runaway spending. As long as there's a profligate government spending wildly and extravagantly there will be this kind of taxation to which I have referred and there will be these kinds of measures of an illusory nature that are offered to the taxpayer as a sop to delude him into thinking he's getting some form of relief. Whether the burden falls on one shoulder or the other, Mr. Speaker, is not of much consequence to the taxpayer who is on his knees and trying to struggle under the burden to maintain his home in many cases, to maintain his business in many cases, to maintain a standard of living for his children and his family in many cases, to which he believes and I believe all Manitobans have a right. They can go on with their extravagances for just so long and then the breaking point will come. In the meantime they're not fooling anybody with this kind of deception, Mr. Speaker.

The Minister has attempted here to offer a form of indirect taxation relief that he somehow believes really does constitute a form of indirect taxation relief. But if he looks at that in comparison to the other burdens he's loaded on the taxpayer he can't justify this measure as taxation relief and say it in this Chamber and look himself in the eye. He cannot honestly believe that this compensates for the kinds of taxation measures that have been introduced on other hands. So I end where I started, Mr. Speaker. It's a lullaby, a socialist lullaby designed to soothe the taxpayer; but he's going to wake up, he's going to wake up and he's going to find the \$2,00 that he left on the dresser is gone as the Minister steals away in the night with everything that he owns.

..... continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, it was really interesting to listen to the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, particularly his final - or Fort Garry. My apologies to the lady from Fort Rouge, I believe she would have given us an oration that had some substance. As a matter of fact the only true statement and the right statement that was made by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry was his final statement when he said he concluded his remarks with the same sentence he started, "this is a lullaby". And I noted while my honourable friend was speaking, half of the members on his side of the House were in that state of flux, namely as the result of a lullaby they were relaxed and I doubt that if the acoustics in the Assembly were better we could have even heard the snoring from those who had been put to a lullaby by the Member for Fort Garry. --(Interjection)-- No, I'm not going back to 55, I'm going back to 58 though, I'm going back to 59.

But there was one point that the honourable member did really convey to me as I listened to him. He has never read Bill 55. He showed an absolute ignorance of the provisions of Bill 55 which establishes a relief for those least able to pay their school tax and gives them a greater measure - that category of people - a greater measure of relief in respect of their school tax. Rant and rave as my honourable friend likes about other extraneous matters in respect to Bill 55, I still don't know, Mr. Speaker, whether he's going to vote for the relief of the people that require the relief and need the relief from school taxes as contained in Bill 55, because he didn't say so. --(Interjection)-- Yes, you have to. If you're going to expound the guff that you did on a bill --(Interjection)-- You asked a question. Did you have to reveal it. And if your House Leader has to answer simple questions that are directed to you, my honourable friend, then I can understand why you spoke the way you did because you're just as ignorant of other things as you are of that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I do hope the honourable gentleman will address the Chair. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . I hope though, Sir, that when I use the pronoun "you" in respect to him you don't take it as referring to you personally. In my friend's remarks he chastised members on this side of the House, or at least he indicated that none of us had ever been connected with businesses or industries and had to make payments for such things as workmen's compensation, vacations with pay, and other allied matters.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, just on those matters alone, that the previous Conservative administration in this province did nothing for them and it is only since we've become the government that a reasonable fair shake to the worker is being given. Request after request was made of the former administration for increases in minimum wages without any response. --(Interjection)-- That's exactly why I'm glad, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend raises - what has that got to do with Bill 55?" Ninety-five percent of his talk had nothing to do with Bill 55 and now he's questioning whether I should raise the matter of minimum wage after he'd gone over the whole spectrum of labour relations and vacations with pay, workmen's compensation and the likes of that. It was all right, Sir, for him apparently, but because I'm using his words --(Interjection)-- Yes, I'll call Bill 63 and I'm sure my honourable friend is going to support it. Of course he's going to. But they had the opportunity to introduce it over ten years when they were in power and they didn't do it, they didn't have the intestinal fortitude because it would affect their friends. That was why it wasn't done. The guy who played the fiddle called the tune for you fellows when you were in opposition.

My honourable friend was talking about taxes and the imposition by this government since we became government of income taxes. And he went to cigarettes, he went to everything, liquor he omitted, when his heart was bleeding for the poor worker that we didn't increase the tax on beer, which is normally considered, Mr. Speaker, as being the poor man's drink, unless it was imported. But, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if my honourable friend the Member for Fort Garry has ever read the history of the taxation policies of the Conservative Government since they took over in 1958 - 59. Who was it that imposed the tax that the leader of the party at that time said was dead as a dodo? Mr. Speaker, in the election in 1962 Duff Roblin - or 1959 - Duff Roblin was then leader of the Conservative Party said the sales tax was as dead as a dodo, but he sure resurrected it in a hell of a big hurry because he imposed it. --(Interjection)-- Yes, the ground rule was created at that time, and talk about a lullaby, talk about a lullaby, surely the greatest mesmerizer this province has had in recent years was the same Duff Roblin. --(Interjection)-- Oh, yes, you had schools to fill and you showed today that you should have filled one of them, or partly filled one of them.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. I would suggest the Honourable Member for Fort Garry has had his opportunity. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Occasion after occasion during the tenure of office, Mr. Speaker, of the Conservative Party, in opposition we asked that Party to adopt a taxation policy based on the ability to pay. And did it happen? It did not. We have every justification for saying to the people the fact that their taxes have been increased in the field of income and corporation tax is in order to bring about more equality.

My honourable friend from Fort Garry resents the fact that we on this side keep repeating the story of the reduction of premium payments for medicare and hospital. That was requested of the Conservative Party year after year without avail. It fell on deaf ears. Why? Because it was their friends who were obtaining the benefits of the higher premiums being charged at that time by that administration when they were over here for the last time in the history of this province. I predicted at one stage that the Liberal Party were doomed to oblivion in Manitoba. My prediction came right in respect to that Party, Mr. Speaker, and my length in this Legislature may not be very long, but I will live to see the day that the same thing happens to the Conservative Party if it's going to have its policies expounded with the sort of guff we got from the Member for Fort Garry this afternoon.

As the years went on, 58, 59, oh, that was a long time and I want to give people of Manitoba credit for suffering for those ten years, but I also want to give them credit because in 1969, Mr. Speaker, they got out of being mesmerized. The lullaby was over and they got a forward-looking government who has some concern for people and not a few such as suggested by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

I recall my honourable friend the Member for Morris has been characterized in this House as being an echo of John Diefenbaker, and he portrays that picture very very well, Mr. Speaker. I want to paraphrase something of John Diefenbaker's: "Why didn't you do it when you had the opportunity of doing it?" The very things that the Member for Fort Garry criticizes us for today. Another famous statement, I believe, of that same Right Honourable John Diefenbaker was "promises, promises, promises" and this is what he said. "Why didn't you do it when?" 58 - promises, elect us, we will be the saviour of Manitoba. Well he didn't get elected in 58 but they came very close to it. In 59 they were successful in forming the government. In 1962, promise, promise, promise of reduction in the cost of education on land, equality. And did it happen, Mr. Speaker? Not a five-cent reduction. In 1965, the same sort of guff from Duff, but were any of the promises fulfilled? Not one, except that dead dodo was resurrected shortly following '65.

The Liberal Party tried to come to the aid of the public at that time by asking for a reduction from five to three percent. We didn't vote at all, we abstained from voting because of the principle at that time of the sales tax. We were opposed to it. We'd like to get rid of it today. And there's no question or doubt about it, we are doing something, we are doing something about some relief in the application of the sales tax. Items that we, and at that time joined with the liberals, attempted to have excluded from the Act by this tolerant, considerate, or then tolerant in their opinion government, without avail. My honourable friend today, to use a phrase of mine that I've used, had the consummate gall to criticize us in our taxation policies because we try to bring about a fairer system of taxation in this province.

I only wish that my honourable friend from Fort Garry had been with me yesterday. --(Interjection)-- Yes, you were canvassing and I hope the results of your canvassing was just as fruitful as yours were in 1968, was it?, when you were kicked out at Ottawa. --(Interjection)-- That's dirty pool? It's a fact, it's fact, it may not sound well to my honourable friend from Charleswood but nonetheless it is a fact. It happened to the Conservative Party in general in 1969. --(Interjection)-- Of course it's coming. I remember - talking about my turn coming, Mr. Speaker, I recall in 1955 I sat in the seat that is now occupied by the Honourable Member for Charleswood, Jack McDowell, a Conservative, sat where the now House Leader of the Conservative Party did, he turned around to me and said: "You know, Russ, you're going to be wiped out, you and your party are going to be wiped out." Jack McDowell isn't here any longer, he retired, and so did most of the other Conservatives - some by force, some by choice. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, I'm the only one left and I'm a member of the Treasury Bench so my time didn't come then, but I predict that the Member for Sturgeon Creek won't be around for only one session. --(Interjection)-- Of course, my honourable friend says he'll take his chances. --(Interjection)-- That's right. My colleague from Inkster says he'll have to, but

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) I question and I doubt whether the voters in his constituency will take the chance a second time.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I wonder if we could take a chance with Bill 55.

MR. PAULLEY: We certainly will, because I was just going to say to the Honourable Member for Fort Garry that I only wish he had been with me yesterday when I went to see an old age pensioner who had just received his new tax bill for Unicity. He's an elderly gentleman, and a gentleman - 88 years of age - and a new tax bill for him came out and he couldn't quite understand it. And he said to me, he says: "How come, Mr. Paulley, my taxes are lower this year than they were before." Incidentally he lives in St. Vital, I believe in Riel constituency. "My taxes are lower this year. How come everybody's talking about taxes going up at the local level." This guy lived in St. Vital. "How come," he says, "when they're all sputtering, particularly the Conservatives about the increased taxes on land and mine are down." I said because this government realized that the old age pensioner and those with the least ability to pay should have relief, Mr. Speaker. Then I went on to say, "And you know, Jack, next year you'll even get more relief, because by an amendment to the Income Tax Act, in the proposition that's before the House at the present time, standing in the name of the Honourable Minister of Finance, you're going to qualify for a further, or for a total \$140 reduction in your tax." He said, "What?" And he said, "They still have the gall, those" - I won't describe the Conservatives the way he described them, Mr. Speaker, because I'm sure that you would call me to order, and justifiably so, and he was justified in his expressions too. But he said: "Those so-and-so and so-and-so Conservatives are going around yapping all the time about increased taxes as a result of policies and here I'm getting reductions, how come?" --(Interjection)-- No, and if my dad was living I'm darn sure that he would be far more eloquent than I, but he would also be just as factual as I am because he was my tutor in being honest even sometimes when it hurts. And that has been my policy and while it is normally construed as a politician just being someone who sloughs off the truth in order to gain a point, such as apparently being done by the Conservatives in Bill 55, I was brought up and I was taught differently, and I'm proud of it. My honourable friend --(Interjection)-- when I'm finished. My honourable friend from Fort Garry really covered the waterfront - taxes, taxes, taxes. He even exaggerated to the degree of saying something in reference to a million Manitobans leaving and by jiminy Christmas this won't go down very well with Mr. Spivak, the Honourable Member for River Heights, who just has said that there's such an outflow of Manitobans that our population's going down.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. . . . the honourable Member for Fort Garry, state his matter of privilege.

MR. SHERMAN: Well as a point of privilege I did not say that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Might I ask my honourable friend to try and recall then what he did with reference to a million Manitobans leaving?

MR. SHERMAN: I said that there were a million Manitobans who had to carry this tax burden, the spending program burden of this government.

MR. PAULLEY; Well then, Mr. Speaker, what I say is substantially correct of what he said, he just repeated it.

MR. SHERMAN: No, I missed the reference, Mr. Speaker, I think probably what the Minister is thinking of is I said a million Manitobans and I will be leading them. We were talking about the hue and cry on voting day that will find its expression on voting day against the taxation policies of the government.

MR. PAULLEY: That's right, just like the Pied Piper of Hamelin. And where were they led by the likes of my friend? To destruction. And that's where Manitoba was led by the Conservative Party and that's why they were kicked out in 1964, and they are going to stay out. So I say, Mr. Speaker, I only wish, I only wish members of the Conservative Party would tell us, and tell the people of Manitoba, precisely where they stand in respect of Bill 55. My honourable friend the Member for Fort Rouge accuses us of introducing this just because there's a by-election going on in Wolseley. I dare them, I dare them to have one of their members stand up today and say where the devil they stand in respect of relief that's provided for in Bill No. 55. I ask my honourable friend that question, Mr. Speaker, and he says I don't know. --(Interjection)-- I don't have to be told. Talk to my House Leader. Well maybe the House Leader can give the answer as to where the Conservative party stands; because the Leader hasn't, the Member for Fort Garry hasn't, and no one else who has spoken on that side of the House have stated where

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) the Conservative Party stands in respect of this bill and they have been dared to do so by member after member on this side of the House, and I dare them to stand up and be counted.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I hope the Minister wasn't making reference to me or somebody on this - I think he said everybody on that side. When I rose in my place I said I rise to support the bill, so I hope that the Minister can make a correction.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I did not say - I said members on that side, pointing to the Conservative ranks, and I say to my honourable friend the Member for Assiniboia, I give him full credit for being very intelligent, for being highly considerate of the taxpayers in his community, who will be making a contribution in income tax, but also through that will be making an opportunity for us to give relief to many in his constituency. I am proud to be able to say that the Honourable Member for Assiniboia did say that he supported this progressive legislation, and we thank him for his support.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, will the honourable member permit a question. Yes Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Honourable Minister of Labour how much more his friend from St. Vital would have saved if the Unicity Bill had not gone through?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Again I must indicate to all honourable members that questions must pertain to clarification in respect to the speech that was made, not to new areas which will open up further debate. I cannot allow it unless it's reworded and it pertains to the speech. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Brandon West, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if you would kindly call Bill No. 63.

MR. SPEAKER: The Proposed Motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, after the recent contribution of the Minister of Labour, particularly the remarks which he found convenient to direct specifically towards me, I must say that he's likely to be surprised at the position I take with respect to Bill 63 because, notwithstanding the criticisms I have of earlier legislation discussed today, I wish to say that I commend the Minister in the main for the principles enunciated in Bill 63, for the measures of improvement and relief in the status of working Manitobans and their families which are attended to in this legislation.

I want to temper that by saying at the same time that I have had many criticisms, Mr. Speaker, from small businessmen in the community who feel that much of the legislation that the Minister of Labour is piloting through the House in this session, and has piloted through the House in previous sessions, is really inhibiting them in their right and their opportunity to run their own businesses. I have had small businessmen say to me, why doesn't the Minister of Labour come in and run my business; he might as well; he's virtually taken over the role of running the business. He's virtually taken the opportunity of running the business away from me and if he thinks he can run business in this province so well, why doesn't he come in and try it?

The truth is that this province is one of the most attractive provinces in Canada in which to live today, all things considered, just as Canada is one of the most attractive countries in the world in which to live today, all things considered, and it becomes extremely painful for many of us to see that position eroded through the kinds of invasions of free enterprise, and invasions of free opportunity, which are indulged in by this government, and in a large part by the person of the Minister of Labour himself through some of the legislation that he's responsible for in this session. I think that his approach is one of a regulatory nature, that he believes that his department and his office should have greater and greater scope for regulation of and control over working Manitobans and their lives, and I resent that, and I object to that, and I challenge the Minister to get out of the lives of the businessmen in this province, the small businessmen, let them run their own businesses. We've had enough invasion of that opportunity; we have had enough snoopier clauses; we've had enough kinds of arbitrary assumption of authority by this Minister in the field of labour, and by his colleagues in the field of labour and business.

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.) But, Mr. Speaker, where Bill 63 is involved specifically in principle in what it has to say about the condition of the working man and his family and his dependents, I commend the Minister. There are many things that our administration, my party when it was in government, wished to attend to in fields such as this one but because of other priorities that had to be attended to first, there was not enough time to do all the things that had to be done. Ghandi once said, Mr. Speaker, "There go my people. I must hurry and catch up with them for I am their leader", and this is a principle of politics that expresses itself to everybody in the field of public service. You can only go as fast as your people are prepared to go, and as the revenues available to you permit you to go. And when the Minister or any of his colleagues criticises the former Conservative administration of this province for not having moved as fast as the present Minister is in the field for example of workmen's compensation, I say that's hollow speeches, false and misleading. We had other priorities; we had other things that had to be done. But that doesn't take away from the fact that advances, that progress, that responsibility, had to be met in this field, particularly the field involved in this bill, and I commend the Minister for what he is doing, but never let him forget, Mr. Speaker, that he has the freedom and the opportunity and the right now, the chance now to sit down and deal with this kind of legislation because he didn't have to build any roads; he didn't have to build any schools; he didn't have to develop Hydro Electric energy; he didn't have to introduce rural electrification; he didn't have to build the university that his two daughters went to and graduated from, and that Duff Roblin in large part built; he didn't have to build any hospitals; so he's got time to deal with Workmen's Compensation. Never let him forget that, Mr. Speaker.

The Minister of Labour never misses an opportunity to stand up and say, why didn't you do it when? Well there will be plenty of time when the next administration is in office in this province; there'll be plenty of times when we will stand up probably and be tempted to say to the government of which the Minister of Labour is currently a member, why didn't you do it when? And the reason that some of the things they are not doing today are not being done is because a government can only do so much, and there go my people, I must hurry and catch up with them for I am their leader, I am their government. Surely the Minister who attempts to portray a posture of fairness and charity and reasonableness in certain moods in this Chamber, would admit, would concede that a government can only move as fast as the conditions and the revenues and the people permit, and he knows darn well, Mr. Speaker, that he didn't have to lift this province out of the 19th century. The Conservative administration that was in office from 58 to 69 did have to lift this province out of the 19th century.

So now, now having lifted the province out of the dark ages, having given it roads, having given it schools, having given it a university that his two daughters graduated from, having given it hospitals, having given it other material benefits like that, the time had come, the time had come, Mr. --(Interjection)-- all right, having taken the initiative to attempt to introduce some industrial input and some job opportunity into the north, which is still being judged, and having undertaken other programs that were aimed at getting the economy moving and giving Manitobans jobs, the time came, the time came in 1969 to address itself to certain social measures, and I want to say here and now on the record, Mr. Speaker, that I acknowledge and I commend the present government's efforts in many fields of social legislation, but let's not distort the picture by saying that we in the Conservative administration, of which I was not a member - at that time I was in Ottawa before I was kicked out, as my friend the Minister of Labour so unceremoniously put it --(Interjection)-- as my House Leader says before I retired at the request of my constituents --(Interjection)-- before he and I retired at the respective requests of our respective constituents, and came into a much more exciting field, the Provincial field, where we are blessed with the kinds of confrontation that is the sheer delight that we get from people like the Minister of Labour, the Attorney-General, the Member for Thompson, the Minister of Health and Social Development, and many others on the government benches. Before that happened we had to attend to some of the physical things that had to be done and then, I admit, there were social steps necessary, and I commend this government for taking those steps, but they didn't have to build the material edifices that had to be built first. So now they are into the field where they can engage in social progress, and they'd better do it, they'd better go do it because that's what they've rested their case on ever since their party was founded, and they don't have the material edifices to which they have to devote their energies, so they should be in the --(Interjection)-- How did we pay for them? Well not by raising personal and corporate income taxes anyway.

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.)

So now we come to the field of social progress and the needs of social progress, and I commend the Minister for what he is doing in the field of workmen's compensation, Mr. Speaker. I would say one thing in criticism of the bill only - I will leave others more knowledgeable in this field perhaps to criticise it more clinically. My position, and I think the Minister of Labour knows this, from the day I came into this House was that I support him in his efforts to improve the lot of the Manitoban where compensation for him, or his family, or his dependents is concerned, is involved in the case of industrial injury, accident, or worse, death, and I think that the Minister would agree that - I think one of the first speeches I ever made in this Chamber was to support him in the efforts he was attempting to make to improve the lot of the working Manitoban and his family in industry, but the one criticism I would have of this legislation, Mr. Speaker, is that with respect to the compensation and the relief being offered widows, all the Minister's engaging in here is mere tokenism. It's just tokenism to raise the widow's pension, the widow's benefit, from \$125.00 a month to \$150.00 a month. I know that I have stood in this Chamber and said the government is spending too much money and they should cut back, and the Minister is likely going to say to me, how are you going to raise the benefit for widows any higher on the one hand, when you say on the other hand cut expenses, but I believe there are ways of cutting government expenditures not at the expense of the widow of a workman who has been killed on the job. There are other ways of cutting expenses without doing that and I think, Sir, what the Minister and the government have to take into account is that many of the widows that they're dealing with here are widows of working Manitobans who were making good wages and probably those families were living fairly well, maybe in the category of 7,000, 8,000, 9,000 or 10,000 dollars a year - maybe in some cases, certainly in some cases less, but maybe in some cases even more than that, and to compensate for the, or to say you're compensating for the loss of a breadwinner with a \$150.00 a month is a mere pittance. It's not good enough. It's better than 125, and I say to the Minister on behalf of all widows in that situation, in that condition, thank you, but it still isn't good enough. It's tokenism and I would ask him to address to himself to means of raising it, of increasing it as substantially as he can, and the areas in which he can find the money to do it in are in the areas that come under the attention and the responsibility of his colleague the Minister of Health and Social Development, and the area under the aegis of his colleague the Minister of Education. If some of the extravagances in those areas were held in check and contained, there'd be more money for the Minister to look after, the Minister of Labour, to look after the widows of fatally injured workmen, and I know that's something he wants to do, and I support him in it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, that debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member for Thompson wish to speak? The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Yes, I'd like to speak before it's adjourned for a few minutes, Mr. Speaker. I'm rather amazed to hear the remarks of the Member for Fort Garry. He started off by saying that he thought it was a fairly good piece of legislation and he no sooner got those words out of his mouth when he turned around and suggested to the Minister to get out of the lives of the businessmen. And he went on to chastise the government and the Minister for what they are doing and I think if anything was proved, if any action of the Conservative Opposition, any single action would prove, or would clearly show up their position in respect to the working people, that speech surely must stand as a monument. This bill, Mr. Speaker, I consider a working man's Magna Charta. As a working man we have fought, we have gone on strike for some of the things that are in that bill, and some of them we have not achieved, and without legislation I suggest that it would take us a decade or more to achieve some of the progressive legislation and improvements in this bill.

I simply cannot understand how the Opposition could take a view that they are taking, and perhaps he's not speaking for the party, we have just heard of one member, and the Leader of the Opposition may come in and other members and take a different attitude. But if this is the view of that Party then I hope that this speech is recorded in the front pages of the papers throughout Manitoba. I think that that's a selfish, self-interest speech if I ever heard one. Businessmen have recognized in the last 20 years, they have recognized that they have a responsibility to their employees. But businessmen, Mr. Speaker, being businessmen, knowing

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd.) that all these things cost money have taken the attitude, well if you want it you'll have to bargain for it, and we will reluctantly give it up. And on many occasions they have given up a great deal which has cost money.

Other things it's simply impossible to bargain for, Mr. Speaker. I recall vividly when we spent seven months negotiating with International Nickel, the first agreement, and I was a member for Underground which represented one-third of all the employees at Thompson, and we spent seven months discussing various clauses, pensions, holidays, pay increase, and the various things that are normally in a contract. And certain areas we'd come in and the company would simply say, look we're prepared to discuss any of these monetary issues, or conditions of employment, and penalties, etc., these other matters we do not want to waste time, they are matters for the Legislature, and until a government is prepared to bring in legislation we will not discuss them, and we were frustrated because of this attitude. At the same time we recognized the fact that they were indeed the responsibility of the government. We have by accident, or perhaps by fluke, as the former Premier said, that the people made a mistake and it was really a fluke. Perhaps it was but when we got into office I felt, and the working people of this province felt, that at last, at long last in a hundred years we've got a government that knows something about working people because it is largely composed of working people, and we will finally see the promised land insofar as labour legislation is concerned. Well, Mr. Speaker, this bill, as you know yourself as a union man and a working man, contains some of the best legislation in this country, and it wasn't brought in, or the Minister didn't put it on paper here just overnight, we have discussed this long before we came into office - we have been in office three years - and some of us have been very impatient with the Minister, suggesting to him that he has been dragging his feet, that he perhaps didn't have the courage to bring in some of this legislation because we know that we'll get flak, not just from the Conservative Party but from the Chamber of Commerce, the Manufacturers Association, and other vested interest groups, large employers, which some of these things are going to cost a great deal of money. And the Minister, perhaps he did drag his feet but finally we have this bill - I'm just glancing through it, Mr. Speaker, and I'd just like to refer to some of the items in here that are going to be covered, which have never been covered, and are not covered in most provinces. Starting off on the first part of the bill the replacement and repair of glasses, dentures, compensation for clothing, burials, for how many years, Mr. Speaker, have we had a clause in the Act that said that you are allowed only X number of dollars for burial. Anybody that knows anything about the cost of burials knows that the cost has sky-rocketed over the years, yet the amount that the Compensation Board would pay stated that pittance, and the same applies to some of the pensions that we've had.

People that have been injured years ago, and at that time the compensation was based at the income level and the cost of living. Today, 20 years later, you couldn't feed a dog on that pension, yet we're saying to them, we're sorry that was what the law established and this is what we must pay you. I understand that this is going to cost the province - some of these items in here - about a million dollars --(Interjection)-- Pardon? --(Interjection)-- Of course, of course, absolutely. The same as anything else that we pass in here; we don't pay for it personally; we all pay for it collectively through income tax, sales tax, and other taxes. Employers are going to pay a great deal of money, the people of Manitoba are going to pay, so those that were injured years ago building this province can live in human dignity today, and I'm sure that the Member for Swan River wouldn't begrudge the miserable increases that we are going to give these people. --(Interjection)-- There's going to be an increase in allowances, and it's spelled out very clearly in No. 7, and also in lump sum settlements, increase in compensation for partial disabilities . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The hour of Private Members' Hour has arrived. The honourable member shall be able to continue the next time we get to that order of business.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR -- ADDRESS FOR PAPERS

The first item, Private Members' Hour, on Wednesday and as agreed we are on Address for Papers those transferred for debate. The first one is by the Honourable Member for Brandon West on Page 6 of the Order Paper.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I should present a motion here.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion has already been introduced when the resolution came before the House. Now it has been transferred for debate.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, the motion then stands that was presented on March 22 when this was first brought to the attention and the request for information was presented to government. On March 22nd it was the First Minister who replied on behalf of the government after this request was made which was simply to request copies of all informational documents and applications relating to each of the PEP Programs and the grants initiated by the Provincial Government. In his reply the First Minister said, "If it could be clarified that what the honourable member is seeking is a copy of each of the kinds of informational documents that were issued and a copy of each of the specimen or example forms of application, then we would accede to this request, but in the event that the honourable member is referring to each individual actual application then it is not acceptable."

Well, Mr. Speaker, this I think is an example of one of the difficulties that we're running into in the matter of the original motion and the reply from the government side. It seems to me that it's very difficult for the person on this side who asks for information to receive for the first time the assessment by the government and a possible qualification of the request. It would appear that it would be much easier if some prior notification could be given by the representative of the government side who is going to reply to the member in advance so that the sort of offer, or adjusting offer, could be considered and then it could be decided in advance if it were possible to modify the request. But having it presented in the House it seems to me gives the mover no opportunity of debate so that it is a quick decision on the part of the mover to decide that he will either accept the modification or have it transferred for debate. Well in this particular instance I don't think it was a very difficult request to make because what the First Minister was offering really was just sample forms, and our information, the request for information, really involved again the request that we know how many PEP Programs were approved, and the kinds of programs that were falling into the area of government approval. We were not asking for this information in any critical way but we do feel that inasmuch as a considerable amount of government money is being expended, a considerable amount of taxpayers' money is being used for the purpose of carrying out Provincial Employment Programs, then it was a reasonable request from this side to ask for copies of the application forms that were used. That is copies of each application which the government saw fit to approve. Now how many there were, we don't know - there might have been two or three hundred of them. This would involve copying all such documents -- two or three hundred copies might be a fair amount of work, but nevertheless it is work which would involve -- programs that involved expenditure of public money.

It was suggested that the debate might have been carried on during the Estimates under one or the other of the departments, but from what I can gather, Mr. Speaker, these approvals were and this program was, carried on by Management Committee of Cabinet, and that probably the kinds of forms that the First Minister offered to supply in answer to this request could easily be obtained through the normal government channels. But I submit, Mr. Speaker, this was a legitimate request for information on the expenditure of public funds, and recognizing that the time for debate of Private Members' Resolutions and Addresses for Papers is rapidly running out with the imminence of the speed-up motion, it is not my purpose to extend the debate but really I think all we can accomplish at this time since the original request has been denied, is simply to put our request on the record and achieve again a vote by the government against the disclosure of the information requested.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that all that needs to be said on the matter of the request for information has been said by our side and we're simply prepared at this time to accept the decision of the House.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I think it would be in order if I were to speak briefly in reply to the Honourable Member for Brandon West. I think the honourable member will find if he checks with the Clerk that a written reply was filed in reply to a written question by one

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) of the honourable members opposite asking for information relative to the Provincial Employment Program. The information ran to several pages; it provided a breakdown of the use of public monies for winter works programming according to regions of the province, according to the category of winter works involved, be it in the nature of construction, be it in the nature of social service, be it in the nature of pensioner home repair, etc. So all this information in terms of the disposition of public monies was provided with respect to category, with respect to regions, with respect to whether it was private non-profit local organization, or municipal groups applying. So that the honourable member really does have all the information except that it is not on an individualized basis.

Now the honourable member, I think I heard him say during the course of his remarks in the last few minutes, that what he was wanting was information as to the nature of information documents that were sent out, or circulated; that he wished also to see the format of the application forms, and also I believe a detailing of all individual applications approved. Now that's not clear from the wording of the motion since the reference to applications is not qualified as to whether they be only those applications approved, or those both approved and rejected.

In any case all of the information which the honourable member seeks has been tabled by group and category and region, but not on an individual basis. The member is quite wrong if he thinks that it is on that basis of individual application tabling that it would run to only a hundred or two hundred separate applications. He's quite wrong, it's much more voluminous than that.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, it of course is open to the honourable member to resubmit his -- well I'm not sure under the rules whether he can resubmit a motion, an Address for Papers that is essentially the same, but in any case I've already indicated the reasons why in the form it is, the motion for the Address is not accepted.

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

MR. MCGILL: Ayes and nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Call in the members.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The motion before the House is an Address for Papers by the Honourable Member for Brandon West in respect to the PEP Program.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Bilton, Blake, Einarson, Enns, Ferguson, Graham, G. Johnston, Jorgenson, McGill, McGregor, McKellar, Moug, Patrick and Mrs. Trueman.

NAYS: Messrs. Adam, Allard, Barrow, Borowski, Boyce, Burtniak, Cherniak, Desjardins, Doern, Evans, Gonick, Gottfried, Green, Hanuschak, Jenkins, Johannson, McBryde, Malinowski, Miller, Paulley, Petursson, Schreyer, Shafransky, Turnbull, Uskiw and Uruski.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 15; Nays 26.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the nays have it. I declare the motion lost.

The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): I was paired with the Honourable the Minister of Health and Social Development. Had I voted I'd have voted for the resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed Address for Papers by the Honourable Member for Brandon West, the second one on Page 6. The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, this was an Address originally presented on the same date as the previous one, March 22nd, 1972, and it arose from a request which was made by certain of the members of the Public Utilities Committee in order to obtain additional information as to the processes which preceded and led up to the decision reached by the Hydro Electric Board on the order of procedure with respect to the regulating of Lake Winnipeg and the development on the Nelson River. When this was presented on March 22nd the First Minister gave as his reason for denying the request that his government had checked with the practices on the part of the Government of Canada and that they knew of no basis or precedent for the tabling of minutes of Crown corporations and for that reason the Government of Manitoba rejected this Order for Return.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for this information. It certainly will be applicable I imagine in certain instances but I don't quite see the relevance in this particular instance. I feel that we have a Manitoba Hydro Electric Board Act and it would be under the terms of that Act that I would feel my application and my request should be judged and The Hydro Electric Board Act, Chapter 190 of the Statutes of Manitoba covers the situation I think . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable First Minister on a point of order.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. My point of order is that in the initial instance the request for access to the minutes was made by way of a general request and on that basis the honourable member was advised along the lines which he has quite accurately outlined in the last couple of minutes. Since then however, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member was advised by the Secretary of Manitoba Hydro, and again advised in the Public Utilities Committee of this House last week, that upon specification of the minute, or minutes, which the honourable member wishes that in accordance with appropriate section of The Manitoba Hydro Act and The Evidence Act that the minutes would be made available upon payment of ten cents per hundred words. That is the statutory provision and upon that basis obviously the information requested here would be made available. My point of order, Sir, is, since that is an established fact which has been communicated to the honourable member I am wondering whether there is any point to requesting something that has already been indicated will be supplied pursuant to statute.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris on the same point.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order. I would agree with the First Minister that if an indication has been given subsequent to this Order for Return, or this Address for Papers, being transferred for debate that the information is going to be made available then it does seem unnecessary then to proceed with a debate at this time, and I don't know what the communication between the Member for Brandon West and the First Minister has been. Perhaps the Member for Brandon West would want to elaborate on that and if that is satisfactory to him, then I see no difficulty. I don't know why we should continue the debate if the information is indeed going to be made available. But I think I'll leave that decision up to the Member for Brandon West who ordered this Address for Papers transferred for debate in the first place.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, my understanding of the information as it was given to me at the last Public Utilities Meeting was that the minutes of a specific meeting, a specific minute could be supplied if I were able to designate the particular meeting that was of interest to me. Now I didn't get the understanding from the First Minister on that occasion that he was then prepared to supply all of the minutes from the date mentioned in my original request, that is in June 69. I understood that the minutes of the specific meeting in May of this year would be available on this basis but that if now I am to understand that all of the minutes are available on a payment of ten cents per hundred words, then I think this certainly eliminates the necessity for proceeding with this debate, and I'm sure the Minister would not have rejected it in the first place had he understood and taken that position at that time. It seems to me that there is now a difference of interpretation from March 22nd and the meeting in June, a few days ago, that this new position was explained.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, speaking to a point of order I suppose. I would indicate to you, Sir, and to the Honourable Member for Brandon, that in Public Utilities Committee last Thursday the solicitor for Manitoba Hydro indicated that pursuant to existing statute law that anyone wishing to peruse a Minute of Manitoba Hydro meeting, any Minute which he can identify as to subject matter, that the Minute would be made available and pursuant to the provisions of the Act and upon payment of ten cents per hundred words. Now the offer was made not restricted to a specific subject matter but to any subject matter which could be identified by the person wishing access to the Minutes. So that the only caveat placed was that the subject matter of the Minute or Minutes in question must be identified and not merely in its sort of generic term, merely the Minutes. Now that is not only the author, that's not the point at all, Sir, it is statute law so therefore it is open to the honourable member to proceed in that way and in my opinion I would suggest to you and to the Member for Morris that it makes the Address for Papers quite redundant under the circumstance.

MR. SPEAKER: I would thank the honourable members on the discussion in effect to the point of order. I can't concur with all of them, that the debate does appear unnecessary at the present time since what is being requested if identifiable can be had by anyone. Shall we move on to the next. Does the Honourable Member for Morris wish to speak on . . . the Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I'm certainly prepared to accept this explanation and this

(MR. MCGILL cont'd) opportunity for me now to proceed in the channels that the First Minister has outlined to obtain the information that I desire and I therefore am prepared to withdraw this.

MR. SPEAKER: In that case we must have unanimous consent of the House to withdraw this Address for Papers. Agreed? Any objection? So ordered. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Sir, we are attempting to locate the Member for Riel. I understand that he is on his way down here to deal with the next three Orders for Return. I wonder, Sir, since the Member for Minnedosa is here, if it would be agreeable to the House, and again we would require unanimous consent, that if it would be agreeable to the House to proceed with the resolutions standing in the name of the Member for Minnedosa until the arrival of the Member for Riel, then we could go back and deal with those, if that is an agreeable course of action to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Is that agreeable, any objections? Very well. The Honourable Member for Minnedosa. Page 6, the second last Address for Papers first.

MR. DAVID R. BLAKE (Minnedosa): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Our reason for putting the Order over for debate of course is to enable us to obtain the information to bring us up to date and indicate to us the reason for the purchase of the bankrupt firm of Symbionics Corporation. We are not aware of the studies that have been done by the government to indicate the need for the purchase of such equipment as there were many existing services available in the private sector and there was a new computer service installed just prior to this company becoming involved in bankruptcy proceedings. I believe it was installed by the Hudson's Bay Company that was available.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I wonder if we are discussing the same resolution. I was looking at the second one from the bottom. Is the honourable member discussing the very bottom one?

MR. BLAKE: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I was speaking on the first one and I inadvertently referred to the second one which, obviously one leads into the other. Our reason for requesting the information was to define the need for computer service within the government service and we were unable to obtain this from other sources and this was the reason we put in the Order for Return. We felt that this service was available in the private sector and we request this information now in order to assess the need for computer services or additional computer services by the government agencies and for this reason we have requested the matter be held over for debate in order that we may be provided with the reasons that additional computer service was required in the government sector.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I believe that it was indicated in a very brief way earlier during this session, just why it was that this Address could not be accepted in the form that it's presented. The Honourable Member for Minnedosa is asking for copies of studies that are done relative to the assessment of present and future needs by the Crown in Manitoba for computer service. The fact of the matter is that there is some assessment that is being conducted by persons expert in the field, but the study is not yet completed and it would scarcely be possible nor even logical to present a half completed study. That's certainly one argument.

The other is that the curiosity which motivates my honourable friend as to the reasons why a particular kind of computer was purchased, the curiosity is understandable but there is no simple answer as to why it is that the need for computer service by the Crown is increasing at the rate that it is increasing.

Honourable members opposite would be interested to know that in Ontario they have just completed a total government organization study known as the Productivity Study on all government operations, and one of the volumes of the report deals specifically with the nature of Crown computer requirements and the best way to organize Crown computer services. It is suggested there for example that it's in their considered opinion better to have the centralized machinery of computer service, but that the programming for the computer operations ought to be left in the several departments and agencies of government. What is being conducted here at this time is a relatively sophisticated study into that very same question and also as to the relative best use as between one kind of computer which is owned by the province and another which is now owned by an agency of the province.

At this point in time it is simply not possible to make available the study referred to in

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) the Address for Papers for the simple reason that it has not yet been completed. There is in fact no report as yet to present.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? On Division -- against . . . -- (Interjection) --

MR. SCHREYER: If you would put it another way, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Right. Is it the pleasure of the House not to adopt the motion? On Division? Agreed? So ordered. Shall we proceed with the Member for Riel, third Address for Papers on Page 6. The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, this Address for Papers asks for correspondence between the Government and Manitoba Hydro and the Manitoba Water Commission, and it is with regard to all aspects of the Lake Winnipeg control, whether it's power benefits, flood control benefits, or the regulatory pattern on Lake Winnipeg.

We ask for these papers because as you know, Mr. Speaker, the Manitoba Water Commission in its meetings was restricted to receiving information from the public only on the pattern of regulation that was to be used on Lake Winnipeg and not on the basic principle as to whether or not Lake Winnipeg should be used or not for Hydro purposes. As a result I think the information which was presented to the commission was in some respects incomplete because some people certainly felt inhibited from presenting their position, particularly with matters of power benefits, because of the terms of reference of the Manitoba Water Commission. So in order to complete the picture, since the government from all appearances is going to go down to the final decision without any formal hearings where all these inputs can be made, this Order for Return requests information that was formalized between all of these three bodies, the government, the Hydro and the Water Commission so that at this point in time we can find out just who was responsible for what particular decisions that have been made with regards to Lake Winnipeg.

We feel that this request is a legitimate request, Mr. Speaker, and I think it is particularly important that the government should reconsider whether it will not table the correspondence that goes on between itself and a Crown corporation when a matter of great public involvement is so evident as is in the case of the control of our natural lakes for Hydro purposes and with the much greater interest even that there is now than there may have ever been before in the history of the province, that they ought to reconsider this and bring as much of this information out clearly into the open, and in addition to that of course, have the hearings, formalized hearings, where professional witnesses can be brought before the committee and much of this information that we are getting secondhand can be brought forward in a formal manner. So with those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I will trust the government might see fit to table this information.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House not to adopt the motion? Agreed? On Division. Very well. Second address for Papers, the Honourable Member for Riel.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

Order, please. Order, please. The Resolution is the Address for Papers by the Honourable Member for Riel.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Bilton, Blake, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Ferguson, Graham, Jorgenson, McGill, McGregor, McKellar, Moug, Patrick and Mrs. Trueman.

NAYS: Messrs. Adam, Barrow, Borowski, Boyce, Burtiak, Cherniack, Desjardins, Doern, Evans, Gonick, Gottfried, Green, Hanuschak, Jenkins, Johannson, McBryde, Mackling, Malinowski, Miller, Paulley, Petursson, Schreyer, Shafransky, Uskiw and Uruski.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 14; Nays 25.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the nays have it. I declare the motion lost.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to indicate to the honourable members that we have in our gallery some 36 members and ministers of the church from Cross Lake, Norway House, Bloodvein River and the adjacent country. They are under the direction of Reverend J. D. McMurty. These members are from the constituencies of the Members of Churchill, Thompson and Flin Flon. On behalf of all the honourable members I welcome you here today.

ADDRESS FOR PAPERS

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Riel, the second Address for Papers.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, this second request for correspondence is between the Premier's office and members of the Association of Professional Engineers of Manitoba with regards to the Nelson River Hydro development and/or Lake Winnipeg regulation. On an earlier occasion the First Minister agreed to table information respecting parts of this and the request though is for the correspondence between the government, if such exists, and the Association of Professional Engineers or any member thereof.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a legitimate request because under The Professions Act in Manitoba when a person is dealing with an engineering organization they are in fact dealing with the individuals the same as they are in a law firm or a firm of doctors or dentists or whatever it may be, as long as they are not a limited and corporated company you are in fact dealing with the individuals and not with the management of the company. Therefore I think that this request is every bit legitimate and there have been other requests for information that have been agreed to by the government for them to table, and I would trust that if there is correspondence that could be tabled that the reason for not tabling it is not just because the government does not want to but there is some legitimate reason. But on the basis of precedents I believe that this Order in particular, Address for Papers, should be accepted by the government and that's why I asked that it be transferred and separated out for comment today.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I have on a previous occasion indicated to the Honourable Member for Riel that the government was in agreement that it was a proper request to ask for the tabling of correspondence as between the government, or Minister of the Crown, and the Association of Professional Engineers. And if the Member for Riel had seen fit to modify his Address for Correspondence accordingly, the request would have been acceded to. The honourable member however argues that not only should there be tabling of the official correspondence between the government and the organization, the Association of Professional Engineers, but any particular member thereof. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is open to the Honourable Member for Riel to ascertain the opinions of each individual member of the Association. But insofar as who speaks for the Association of Professional Engineers, it is the officer, or the officers, who have been voted by the membership as their table officers, and it is those letters that we have received from the officers of the Association that we are prepared to table, not individual opinions. Those the Honourable Member for Riel can obtain privately.

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

(On Division)

MR. SPEAKER: Third Address for Papers by the Honourable Member for Riel. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I just want to clarify a point. Just on division, not same division.

MR. SPEAKER: I didn't say same division . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Because there could be a technical difficulty.

MR. SPEAKER: Third Address for Papers by the Honourable Member for Riel. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like just a few moments to make a few comments at this particular time because it does become apparent, Mr. Speaker, that the government has little or no intention of complying with the reasonably legitimate, straightforward, requests for information . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, if I might ask the member what resolution the Honourable Member for Lakeside is speaking to.

MR. SPEAKER: The one that is before the House is the third one in the name of the Honourable Member for Riel on Page 6 of the Order Paper. There are three in sequence. He's speaking to the third one.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . that's the only reason because the honourable -- if I may on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside was talking about the general attitude of government in response to Address for Papers, and I must confess some confusion as to precisely what he was talking on.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, not only does the government have no intention of in any way living up to a promise of open government, particularly in this area of hydro development, they're not even going to give one the opportunity to ask and raise arguments in this particular case. It has become -- and I'm addressing myself specifically to this Order for Return which, in concert with other ones that have been put forward by my colleague the Member for Riel, have asked for a kind of information, the kind of information, Sir, that this government, and individual members of this government, made such a hullabaloo and heyday some few short years ago about refusing to have had. At the time the whole controversy of the Hydro Development Project was started most of the information, the studies that were done, the transition to the north by the consultants, the hydro studies that were done by Hydro were available to the public and to all members of the House. The only report that was not available, and we took the same position that this government takes, that inter-departmental studies, or draft reports, were not necessarily germane to the Chamber or the public, and deserved that privacy. And I refer specifically to the one report which through a leak in the department was made public through the newspapers, a draft copy of a resources study done by the Department of Mines and Natural Resources, an internal document upon which both the newspapers and the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. I should like to indicate that I had indicated when we were debating these originally that the scope would be wide at the beginning and narrow at the end. The honourable member is now debating a third resolution, or Address for Papers in respect to certain particular items and certain procedures, and I wish to remind him that I want him to stay very close to the Address for Papers that is called for here. I cannot allow a wide-ranging debate because that was the understanding that I gave if the honourable members were going to go wide afield at the beginning they would have no latitude at the end, and that's the problem we're in. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well then let me address myself specifically to the Address for Orders for the Papers: That an humble Address be voted to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor praying for copies of all correspondence from January 1st, 1970 to the date of this Address between the Water Resources Branch of the Department of Mines and Resources and Environmental Management and Manitoba Hydro. Mr. Speaker, that was the report, or a similar kind of a document, that was put forward -- (Interjection) -- Well, Mr. Speaker, I take at least some pleasure, some pleasure at the splitting of hairs, at the now definition of what is open government and what is not open government, Mr. Speaker. This government that has now referred the matter to a Water Commission to study the matter then suppresses that Water Commission to the point where members have to resign, then tells that Water Commission what kind of a report they have to issue, that coming three short years after the same members, and I refer particularly to the members of the House who were there at that time, the Member for Inkster and others, who had contrived with the help of unknown persons to receive copies, internal copies of material that were published for internal reasons but who made a cause célèbre out of the fact that that kind of material was not being made available readily and openly. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, this Order for Return asked -- (Interjection) -- certainly the Water Control Branch, the Water Control Branch . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable First Minister on a point of order.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, my point of order is that the honourable member in his Address, in his remarks insists on equating reports and correspondence and I believe that under the rules and practices of this House there has always been a clear distinction made as between reports and correspondence, and it would not be desirable for the House to allow that clear distinction to now be obscured by the efforts of the honourable member.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately the response by the Minister belies the degree of ignorance with respect to the particular function of the department, of the Department of Mines and Resources, and more specific the Water Control Division. The Water Control Division as such is the body under Act, under statute, which is empowered through its director, and so forth, to provide -- (Interjection) -- no, to in fact issue interim licences to be involved with respect to the regulations, with respect to the kind of regulation that one could conceivably expect will be undertaken on Lake Winnipeg or other related hydro matters. The Director of Water Control -- at least when I last saw the legislation -- had certain such powers

(MR. ENNS cont'd) and had certain such provision made to it, so certainly the provisions of asking for that kind of correspondence cannot be construed as simply being correspondence internally between a branch and an agency. This is by the Act and by the law . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. Order, please. ORDER. The honourable members can continue when the House is adjourned. The hour of adjournment having arrived the House is accordingly adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon.