

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, June 20, 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 32 students of Grade 9 standing of the Rivers Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. Ernie Jensen. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Virden.

We also have 50 students of Grade 5 standing of the Butterworth School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Kraszewski and Mrs. Prokopchuk. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Logan.

And we have 60 students Grade 8 and 9 standing of the J. W. Gunn School. These students are under the direction of Mr. McDonald. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Transcona, the Minister of Labour.

And we have 60 students of Grade 5 standing of the Nordale School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Elrick and Mrs. Gagnon. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Vital.

On behalf of all the honourable members I welcome you here to the Legislature.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports; Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills. We lay that one aside. Oral Questions. Orders of the Day.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Opposition)(River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the First Minister could indicate at what time or how soon he will be prepared to make the government statement with respect to Gas and Oil Offshore Rights?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, sometime later this week I would expect to be able to do so.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the First Minister. Could he inform the House when he intends to begin debate on the Private Members' Resolution standing in his name?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, once a number of the bills on the order paper are processed to various further states it's hoped that the resolution would be called sometime before the end of the month. However, in terms of the Legislative calendar I would think it would be helpful to be able to proceed with certain legislation in the meantime.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I ask again a question that I asked yesterday of the Attorney-General. I direct it to the First Minister. Can the First Minister tell us perhaps in a general way, or assure us in a general way, that the government has every intention of pursuing either through new legal procedures, or through appeal, the prosecution of those companies, namely the Dryden Chemical Company of Ontario and the Federated Co-Operatives of Saskatchewan that were responsible for the pollution of certain rivers and streams of this province, an action that was recently dismissed in the courts?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I certainly would want to consult further with the Attorney-General and my colleagues before indicating in any definitive way whether or not Manitoba would want to take this to higher court in order to obtain, you might say Constitutional Case Law built up on this question.

MR. ENNS: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I'm seeking clarification of the Minister's answer. Is there any suggestion on the part of the Minister's answer, the First Minister's answer, that we would forgo prosecution of those companies polluting our rivers and streams?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I think we are getting into a legal area. I believe legal questions should be left out of our procedures.

The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. The Parkland area has been alerted to an infestation of the Bertha army worm that's beyond expectation. I wonder where will be the number one battle station established to meet this infestation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): Well, I don't know, Mr. Speaker, I would presume that if the honourable member wishes that we might accommodate him, we might even locate it in Roblin -- (Interjection) --

MR. MCKENZIE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, and the many phone calls, especially today, is, are there adequate supplies to meet this problem?

MR. USKIW: That question was asked a week ago, Mr. Speaker, and I indicated then that there are adequate supplies in North America and as was the case last year they were available on very short notice. Apparently these chemicals are used quite frequently in Texas. So that we are informed that there will be no shortage of chemical.

MR. MCKENZIE: A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Honourable Minister could indicate what co-operation we could expect from Saskatchewan, being a border constituency there is some indication that there should be closer cohesion than there was last year with the Province of Saskatchewan.

MR. USKIW: Well, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, the simplest way would be to set up a trade barrier so that it couldn't cross the boundary. But we will take that under advisement, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder if the Minister can advise the House if he had any communication with Flyer Coach Industries in respect to the 170 people being laid off? How long will these people be expected to be without work?

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

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry & Commerce) (Brandon East): Well, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately due to a cutoff of two essential ingredients, namely seat materials and transmission supplies, as has been announced, there has been a temporary shutdown. The shut down is strictly dependent upon how quickly these suppliers can provide the necessary materials. I can advise honourable members that the management of the company have made valiant attempts at the highest levels with these suppliers to obtain as quickly as possible, but there is no specific time that we can give. We hope it's tomorrow if possible, but we cannot give any specific time for the honourable member.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary. Are all the employees that were laid off were they from the Morris plant?

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I've been advised that it affects the urban transit operation. Which means the Fort Garry plant and only part of the Morris plant. Those employees in Morris who are engaged in producing school buses are continuing their employment.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary. Is this any indication that the Morris plant may be phased out or closed?

MR. EVANS: The events and the announcement relate strictly to the question of shortage of materials.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, on the subject of the Bertha army worms. I am alarmed at the Minister's reaction to the questions asked by my colleague from Roblin.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. Would the honourable member state his question?

MR. BILTON: . . . ask the Minister, Mr. Speaker, the deterrent to the Bertha army worms are going to do no good to the people in Swan River being in Texas. Are arrangements being made to have the material put on site in order to fight the problem that's coming up, and he knows it's coming?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Swan River had he been here a few days ago would have known that I had given a full answer and that the Department was preparing to have supplies available.

MR. BILTON: A supplementary. The Minister has skated around this subject and I'm asking him, has he got the material on site in the Swan River Valley to fight this plague that's coming on. My people are concerned.

MR. USKIW: I appreciate the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the member wants to have some item in Hansard or in his news column. But I did answer that question a week ago.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, he did not answer my question last week. I'm asking him is the material on site to fight the plague as and when it's got to be fought, and it won't be too long.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I had given indication last week that we were preparing for any eventuality and I think that honourable members should appreciate that having given an answer to that question once to other members of the Opposition that that answer should suffice for all. Unless they want to have -- unless they have other motivations.

MR. SPEAKER: Minister of Public Works.

HON. RUSSELL DOERN (Minister of Public Works) (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to submit a reply to an Order for Return No. 23, dated April 18, on motion from the Honourable Member from Morris.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce and ask him in view of the fact that this is about the ninth or tenth time there have been such layoffs at the Morris plant in the last 28 months, if he would be prepared to invite the management of the plant to appear before the Economic Development Committee so that we can get some answers to many of the questions that I know the people in the Morris plant would like to have answers to.

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

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, as you know there is provision for the Chairman of the Manitoba Development Corporation to appear before the Legislative Committee on Economic Development and this is in effect a subsidiary operation of the MDC. But let me say this that in every case of any temporary closedown it has usually been as the result of circumstances beyond the control of the company. Either a problem with markets some time back, or a question of supplies, or other circumstances beyond the control of management.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I would direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce and I wonder if when he calls the meeting of Economic Development if he'd be pleased to call the Rapeseed Processing group in Grandview as well.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Development) (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table answers for an Order for Return tabled in this House on the 6th of June by the Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: My question is to the First Minister. I have in my possession a letter that was sent to him by the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce dealing with the Tax Climate for Business in Manitoba. And assuming that he's received it and had an opportunity to peruse it, I wonder if he can indicate whether he's prepared to act on the recommendations and on the comments that they have made.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'm not surprised that the Leader of the Opposition has a copy of this letter from the Chamber of Commerce. I'm not surprised by that, nor should he be surprised when I tell him that we do not intend to act on the basis of their proposals.

MR. SPIVAK: I have another question for the First Minister. I wonder if the First Minister is prepared to dispute the statistics with reference to private and public investment in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I'm sure the honourable gentleman is aware that we do not ask argumentative questions in this House. I shall ask that all members be aware and conduct themselves accordingly. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Speaker, as was the case with the introduction of the Compulsory Hog Marketing Commission, can the Minister now tell me, or the House, to what price level the prices of barley and oats have to rise before he will institute the measures of the Compulsory Feed Grains Commission so that he can -- could get credit for the, you know, the political credit for the natural market price increase.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, once the Marketing Board is in operation it will have complete control at all times and it will determine from day to day, or week to week, what the price arrangements will be with respect to sales within the Province of Manitoba.

MR. ENNS: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would he not agree that that time is likely to arrive when the price of barley reaches 70 or 75 cents?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Again I must repeat. Does the honourable member wish to state something to me? Orders of the day. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Minister of Agriculture. Is it the recommendation of this Department that Malathion is an effective chemical for destroying grasshoppers?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: No, Mr. Speaker.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the Member for Lakeside that I had indicated that the starting date for the Feed Grains Marketing Commission shall be August 1, which he should know is the new crop year. There is really very little feed grain left to be marketed in the current crop year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. Could he indicate when we can expect the tabling of the agreement concerning the Downtown Convention Centre, and also when we can expect the report of the LeDain Commission in this House?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the first part of the question I believe that there is no reason why the agreement referred to could not be tabled immediately, presumably tomorrow. With respect to the reference to the LeDain Commission I have the impression that copies of that report are available through the Queen's Printer (Federal) and it would be a case of honourable members obtaining a copy in that way. If desired we could obtain copies and make it available here but that would be incurring an expense for a matter that is not under our jurisdiction, and I don't know that it's a good practice to start.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Would the First Minister consider buying this important report and distributing it in the House as is done in other cases?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I know that the Member for Thompson, like I, doesn't mind spending a dollar or two for important reading material and I would urge him to spend a dollar and buy a copy.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day. The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Health and Social Development. Is he planning on any changes in the regulations dealing with ambulances in the Province of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, there have been regulations passed by this government last year pertaining to ambulance service in the Province of Manitoba. These existing regulations are constantly being revised -- so far as an ambulance program for the province there is to be an announcement by this government shortly.

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

MR. McKELLAR: Another question, to the Minister of Labour. I understand there's going to be a government holiday on June 30th. Will this holiday be effective all over the Province of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Health and

(MR. BILTON cont'd) . . . . Welfare. On the proposed ambulance service for northern Manitoba, may I ask if it includes the Swan River Valley?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: If it falls within north of 53, yes.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, it borders 53.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. McKELLAR: He mentioned that it won't be a holiday for the Province of Manitoba because of the fact it's a holiday for the Government of Manitoba, the Legislature . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. Would the honourable member state his question and not debate the issue?

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I'll direct a question then. Will it be a holiday here in the Legislature on June 30th because it's a government holiday?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Not as far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Labour if he's considering make June 25th a paid holiday?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Not this year, Mr. Chairman. It was a very significant day I admit and it should be a day of jubilation for Manitoba but it is not my intention to make it a paid holiday.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Labour on the same question that has been discussed. Is June 30th a school holiday?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, from every observation that I've been able to make school will be out except for this school.

#### 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 some new visitors. We have 63 students of Grade 5 standing of the Winnipeg Hebrew School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Ross and Miss Jacobson. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Burrows, the Minister of Education. On behalf of all the honourable members, I welcome you here today.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY - GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, would you kindly call for second reading Bill No. 53, an Act to amend The Mines Act.

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

MR. EVANS presented Bill No. 53, an Act to amend The Mines Act, for second reading

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I wonder if we could tone down the little caucuses we're having.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

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

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of -- I'll be very brief -- there are a number of minor provisions and minor changes in this Act, in this amendment to the Act, including various improvements in definitions, etc. However there is one very important matter at stake here, one very serious question, and that is the question of safety for employees working in mines in the Province of Manitoba. And there has been, from our experience we've found that there is no specific provision in the existing Mines Act, or the regulations thereunder, which prohibits a workman from being required to work in a place which he considers to be unsafe. And therefore, Mr. Speaker, there is provision in this amendment which prohibits an owner of a mine, an operator of a mine, or a supervisor of that mine, or a

(MR. EVANS cont'd) . . . . section of that mine, from requiring or from permitting, or permitting an employee to work in a place which the employee considers to be unsafe, or which the supervisor considers to be unsafe. And we believe, Mr. Speaker, that this is a major step forward by placing the onus of responsibility on the shoulders of the owners, or on the shoulders of the supervisor. Further provision is made which provides for a penalty on conviction in a situation, which I have described, by prohibiting the supervisor from working in a supervisory capacity in any mine for six months from the date of his conviction in the particular incident.

Well, as I said, Mr. Speaker, this is the main thrust of the amendment, and it's very important we feel as a step which will enhance safety conditions, conditions of safety and safety habits perhaps in methods in mines of Manitoba. There are other minor provisions. There is provision for the rehabilitation of mining lands. This is not provided for in the present Act. The amendments which we propose will incorporate authority for the government under the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to make regulations regarding rehabilitation of mining lands. There is a provision which deletes the subsection whereby the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may make regulations for the disposal of tailings, slimes, or other waste products, from the Mines Act in question. In effect the control of mine tailings will be transferred from the responsibilities -- responsibility of The Mines Act to the Clean Environment Commission.

There is another provision which I should take a moment to explain and that is the provision for the storage and recovery of natural gas, whether it be produced within the province or not, to provide for the storage of this natural gas in natural underground reservoirs with the various safety requirements being added under regulations. I should add in the way of explanation, Mr. Speaker, that at various times the Greater Winnipeg Gas Company Limited and the Trans-Canada Pipelines Limited have considered the question of storing gas, the feasibility of storing natural gas in underground reservoirs, natural underground reservoirs, for recovery during peak periods. And the proposed amendments in conjunction with the provisions of The Gas Pipeline Act and The Public Utilities Board Act will make this type of storage possible. It should be noted further, Mr. Speaker, that there is no provision for expropriation of freehold underground rights for storage purposes.

Well there are a number of other minor items, Mr. Speaker, which I will not take the time of the House to explain. I would simply state that I feel that this bill should obtain the unanimous support of all members of the House because it does take us a step forward in enhancing safety conditions in the mines of Manitoba. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to ask a question if I may. Is the Honourable Minister when he says they're only minor changes, is he referring to the minor of m i n o r or m i n e r?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. If the Honourable Minister speaks he'll be closing debate. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Souris-Killarney, 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: Would you call the adjourned debate on Bill No. 12, Mr. Speaker, please.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Health. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, the provisions of Bill 12 represent one recommendation from the report of the Advisory Committee on Central Drug Purchasing and Distribution taken out of context, and it is of little if any value without companion measures which were recommended. It provides for the legalization of unauthorized substitution for a drug prescribed by a physician by one of equivalent value by the pharmacist who is filling the prescription.

The failure of similar legislation in Alberta to bring about any economic benefit to the patient or the consumer should have made this government hesitate to advance this bill. As the Member from Fort Garry has already pointed out prescription costs in Canada are averaging \$3.89. In Manitoba the average cost is \$3.63 so that it's lower than the Canadian average.

(MRS. TRUEMAN cont'd) . . . . In Alberta the average cost is \$4.46, which is 57 cents above the national average. So we can see that this legislation has not been effective in Alberta. The reason is that there no one wants to take the responsibility for substitution without a list prepared by the government which would guarantee the equivalent.

But this lesson has been lost on our own government for they have failed to provide for the Manitoba formulary a list of equivalencies, also recommended by the report of the Drug Advisory Committee. Without a Manitoba formulary the substituting pharmacist increases his vulnerability and his liability, and he assumes the responsibility for anything that may happen to the patient as a result of the change. Central to the concept of drug product substitution is the belief that the drug in its effect is the same although it's been prepared by two different companies. I think this position has enjoyed less credibility in recent years as case after case of inequivalency has been discovered. The most notable of these as an example, are the antibiotics. In fact the same drug produced by two different companies, two different manufacturers, may react quite differently in a patient due to the inert ingredients that are used. So the doctor depends on the trademark and the experience that he's had with the product.

There is a term "bio-availability" which refers to the speed and efficiency with which a substance can be absorbed by the human body. Only the physician can determine the biologically superior activity of one product as compared with its generic equivalent. If the pharmacist makes substitutions the doctor may lose confidence in the treatment results and in the pharmacist as well. In the production of a pill, or capsule, or tablet, there may be additives which help provide needed bulk, or they may improve the rate of absorption, or simply provide a coating or a container. A patient can be allergic to one of these inert ingredients, and there also can be varying degrees in the purity of the drug itself depending on the testing methods of specific laboratories. Historically substitution was based on the need because the pharmacist was not able to stock all the drugs which might possibly be prescribed. When a substitution was necessary the pharmacist consulted with the physician and that determination was made by them jointly.

By the 1940's substitution had become a practice whereby unscrupulous pharmacists subverted physicians' instructions. They sometimes dispensed drugs of uncertain quality and ignored the innovating firms; property rights and they realized unfair profits. In the 1950's in the States pharmacy licences were being revoked on the grounds that they substituted. In 1952 as much as 40 percent of prescriptions had substitutions. In 1953 because of sterner measures that number had been reduced to 14.7 percent, and in 1957 it was reduced to 3.7 percent.

By the 1960's the practice of substitution had died out, and in the 1970's the American Pharmaceutical Association called for repeal of the restrictions that had been enforced. Substitution advocates frequently claim that if given the power to decide which product to dispense the pharmacist could choose quality, low-cost substitutes, thereby passing savings on to the consumer. In fact he could abuse his privilege without fear of quick and meaningful legal restraint. So we have to ask whether the public is no longer vulnerable to this type of unethical practice. I fail to see why if a substitution, in order to provide some economic benefit for the patient, is desirable it should not still be done in consultation between the pharmacist and the physician, and in my opinion the informed consent of the consumer is also desirable. I for one would be quite angry if I took a prescription to a druggist and later on learned that without my knowledge, and without my physician's knowledge, a substitution had been made and that I had been given a different product. I do feel that I would be entitled to know that this had happened.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I've looked into the similar legislation which is being brought forward in Ontario. There an Act to amend The Pharmacy Act has received first reading -- I'm not certain whether it has yet received second reading. I would like to read the relevant clauses from that bill, the ones which would effect the change that we're trying to secure here. Their bill states that notwithstanding Section 63 every person who dispenses a prescription may, unless otherwise directed by the prescriber, select and dispense an interchangeable pharmaceutical product other than the one prescribed provided that the interchangeable pharmaceutical product dispensed is listed as interchangeable in the par cost CDI and is lower in cost than the drugs prescribed. This is equivalent of the Manitoba formulary which was proposed in Manitoba. It's a very interesting list, it's all colour coated so that the doctor who is prescribing anti-infective agents, everything that he is interested in is in the orange section. The Cardiovascular agents in a sort of brown colour, the endocrine agents in a red, psychotherapeutic agents in blue, and so on, so that it's very quick for referral.

(MRS. TRUEMAN cont'd)

The Ontario Bill goes on to say, no person shall knowingly supply an interchangeable product under Subsection 1 at a price in excess of a cost of the lowest price interchangeable pharmaceutical product in this inventory and the maximum dispensing fee as set out in the par cost CDI. And regarding liability, the government has guaranteed equivalency in this list, so that they have taken that responsibility, and in their legislation they also say that no action or other proceeding lies, or shall be instituted, against a prescriber or a pharmaceutical chemist on the grounds that an interchangeable pharmaceutical product other than the one prescribed was dispensed in accordance with this section. So the pharmacist will be protected in several ways by the legislation that is proposed in Ontario.

The par cost listing will be passed as a companion to the bill. There are several needs which are -- the efficiencies in the bill before us which are met in the Ontario legislation. And it's difficult to understand why without these companion measures the government has bothered, taken the trouble to pass a bill such as Bill 12. I think that we would be prepared to support Bill 12 in the hope that the necessary additional measures to make this legislation effective will be forthcoming, and if it has to be done in stages we are willing to give the opportunity to the government to take this first step.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I just wish to add a few words because I think most of the advantages, and even some of the disadvantages, have been brought up. I am perhaps a little bit -- I'm not too sure if I understand the part where it calls for a pharmacist to of course write our the prescription, and I'm concerned of not only the pharmacist in the drug store but also the pharmacist in a hospital, and I take for granted that it means the both. Now in the case of the pharmacist in the hospitals, there are different problems of course that come up although I don't see them as serious. I think it has been said, if it hasn't been it's certainly a fact, that this should certainly cut inventories by a very substantial percentage. I wonder though just how this is going to affect the few hospitals, and I don't think there are too many that actually have no pharmacist on hand and would like to take advantage of this bill, although I take for granted in a case like that it would be up to the doctor of that locality to perhaps co-operate with the hospital. However, as the previous speaker just mentioned, there are certain questions that are of concern but I think this bill is important enough to save many thousands, or perhaps millions of dollars that it's worthwhile that we do support the bill, and this is our intention.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Universities and Colleges.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Colleges and Universities) (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, if the Member for Rhineland doesn't mind I'd like to speak on this bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I have found it a very interesting experience to hear the Member for Fort Rouge about a week or ten days ago, and today the member for -- or rather the Member for Fort Garry in the first instance and today the Member for Fort Rouge. I get my Forts somehow mixed up. And I'm somewhat, as I say, surprised at some of the comments they made but I want to say this to them, you know, Bill 12 is not the beginning nor the end of the world. There was no intention in Bill 12 to solve all the problems that have been with us for many many decades. What Bill 12 was doing, we tried to do with Bill 12, was to begin to take the necessary first steps to make it possible to provide drugs at a price which is fair, equitable, and which would relieve the high cost which has burned so many people. And in particular to the small select number of drugs, because in reality there is something like 1200 drugs on the market. But we are told that there's something about between 40 and 50 drugs which are the major sellers and which are the most expensive, and which, if those costs, the costs of those 50 drugs could be brought down would make an appreciable difference to people and to the prices that they pay.

We know that there are great variations in prices of drugs. We know from the Ontario experience, and elsewhere, that one medication, trade name can cost as much as 14 cents a pill, and a generic one might sell for three cents. Now there's quite a discrepancy there. What this bill aimed to do was to take the first step to make it possible for the druggist to do



(MR. MILLER cont'd) . . . . what he hasn't been able to do up till now, and that is to use his knowledge and his professional skills to make substitution unless the doctor specifies and was very concerned about - concerned enough to specify that no substitution should be made. And I think that was an absolute essential because without that sort of powers everything that has been mentioned by the Member for Fort Rouge and Fort Garry just couldn't happen. There has to be some legislation whereby substitution can be made. And I'm delighted to hear both members now say that they are not in disagreement with this but really they feel it isn't going far enough, and we're not moving fast enough.

The study that was made in Manitoba under the Dr. Class Committee, did recommend a number of steps, and many of those can be done without any need for legislation. But the rights to substitute does require legislation, and it is our intention to introduce this bill to get the views of the House, and to get the views generally of - reponse of Manitoba people, how they would feel about this, because this I say is an essential part of any move in the direction of lowering costs for the public.

So when I hear members opposite say that they are disappointed, I am delighted and I share their disappointment that they recognize, they recognize that this is not a final answer, this is not the total solution. And they're quite right. This is simply a beginning to meet a problem which has been with us for many years. And there's no question we must have, as has been suggested, something similar to par costs, whether we call it par costs in Manitoba or we call it the QUAD Program, the formulary approach which is recommended in the Class study. Some quality assurance which is required and which is needed in order that both the physician and the pharmacist will be able to dispense a substitute drug and feel that he's doing this with a full knowledge that somebody has checked it out, that somebody has assured themselves, and therefore the druggist and the physician has assured them that this meets the requirements of Manitoba and is acceptable to the government and to the formulary that may be set up.

And so I welcome the remarks made by the Member for Fort Rouge and earlier by the Member for Fort Garry, and I want to say to them that we are just as anxious that we move as quickly as possible to achieve the desired goal which I now realize we all share. And that is to make drugs available in Manitoba to the general public at costs that are within reason and which they can afford. -- (Interjection) -- for medicinal purposes. I'm not talking about the other drugs that - the Member for Thompson has perked up the moment I use drugs, It's dispensed drugs; I'm not talking about his drugs. That I leave to him, that's his domain.

And I would like to say this to members opposite, that we are as anxious as they are that we move quickly in this area and it is our intention to move as quickly as we can to set up the necessary machinery to meet and to fulfill those recommendations which were made in the Class study. Recommendations to assure quality control, the recommendations to try to develop, if it's at all feasible and to the extent that it's feasible, bulk purchasing, so that we can get the benefits, . . . of bulk purchasing which aren't available today, and that these costs should be passed on to the consumer.

I would however like to point out something to both the Member for Fort Rouge and the Member for Fort Garry, because they both use the same figures, they mentioned that Alberta had very similar legislation that we have, and it really hasn't done anything. As a matter of fact, they argue that Alberta's cost is the highest, higher than the Canadian average and higher than the Manitoba average. What they don't bother to mention though is that although Alberta's average cost of 4.46 as compared to Manitoba's 3.60, the dispensing fee in Alberta is one dollar higher than Manitoba's and that more than compensates for the difference in price. In Manitoba it's \$1.80, I think it is, and in Alberta it's \$2.80. So that one dollar difference immediately throws these statistics into a different context. But I'm not going to quibble with them on that because I think that is really a minor factor. What is important is that we somehow make available to people the drugs that they need, the medications they need, at prices that are reasonable.

Now I hope that when this government moves in this direction that the members opposite who today, and two weeks ago, got up and chided this government for not moving fast enough, or firmly enough, or with enough determination, that they will stand beside us when the powerful lobby of the Manufacturers Association comes storming into Manitoba, because they will, and I fully intend and hope that they will now stand beside us to meet this onslaught, because I predict it will happen. And they will use every attempt possible to prevent the kind of, firstly, even

(MR. MILLER cont'd) . . . . this legislation, and secondly, any amendments thereto or future legislation, and future actions by this government to achieve a goal which they now I'm happy to hear, want to share with us.

So with those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I hope this bill can go to committee for further discussion, and further elaboration, and as I say I trust when we get there we'll get the support of members opposite when those who oppose even this minor step, and any amendments that may be added thereto, when people come to oppose this that they will stand beside us in helping us to achieve the goals which now they share with us and that is to bring to Manitoba prices for drugs which are reasonable, fair, and which do not gouge the public as they have over the years.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland moved the motion to adjourn?

MR. FROESE: Yes, I'd like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Bill No. 14, Mr. Speaker, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed motion of the Minister of Education. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I have examined the contents of the bill and I am prepared to allow it to pass without further comment. But I would like to remind the Minister in a private conversation I had with him he mentioned the fact that he hoped to make a major overhaul of the Teachers' Pension Act next year. And I drew to his attention under existing legislation where at least one individual in the province has been unable to withdraw pension contributions that were made some years ago. I hope that the Minister will take this into account when he brings in further amendments next year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education shall be closing debate. The Honourable Minister.

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Education)(Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I'll be closing debate on this bill. As I had indicated in my opening remarks that the Teachers' Pension Act is presently under the process of review and the matter that the Honourable Member for Portage is concerned about, namely, the provisions dealing with the withdrawal of contributions. As the Act now stands there's no interest being provided or paid if a teacher withdraws his contributions prior to retirement age, that, and together with many other matters, some of which I may have made reference to during my opening remarks, and others. One other that we are looking at very closely is that which concerns and affects those who may have served in the Armed Forces and due to a technicality now find themselves in a position where they do not receive credit for the time spent in the Armed Forces. And that affects particularly those who upon discharge from the Services may have had to seek some other employment for some period of time, however short it may have been prior to returning into teaching, because the Act as it read was that if one upon discharge from the Armed Services went directly back into teaching then he could receive credit for the time spent in the Service towards his pension, but if there were any interruption then he lost the benefit of that.

So those are some of the matters, Mr. Speaker, that we will be considering, that we are considering now, and that next year's draft bill will attempt to rectify.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Bill No. 20, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Transportation. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, on this Bill No. 20 we are prepared to let it go to committee. It's a simple bill, but I do want to say, Mr. Speaker, that when we have looked in the past at bills where amendments to the Highway Traffic Act have been considered, we have been quite concerned about it. But this is a simple matter and I trust that the Minister in the amendment that we are dealing with here, it's merely changing the wording from 500 to, I understand, to 5000 which gives the Minister authority without having to go to the Executive Council. And I trust, Mr. Speaker, that this authority being granted to the Minister he will use with discretion and using his judicial authorities in a proper manner.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BARKMAN: The Bill is about as short as the last speech and I think mine will be shorter, and I'm not going to pay the Minister the compliment that I feel we're quite safe

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd) . . . . presently with the word 5 in there instead of 1 but I think it's a matter of the type of inflationary measures that must be appearing as his department also, so we really see nothing wrong with this Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister shall be closing debate. The Honourable Minister.

HON. PETER BURTNIAK (Minister of Highways)(Dauphin): Unless there's somebody else wants to speak on it. If not, yes, Mr. Speaker, I'll be closing debate on it.

I wish first of all to thank the honourable members who have made their brief comments on it and it's quite correct that it's, as I said during the second reading of the Bill, that it was a rather simple piece of legislation. It's a matter of being consistent so that the \$500.00 will be changed to the \$5,000 figure, which will be the same in the Department of Highways as the bill which was introduced and passed in the Department of Public Works. I can assure the honourable members that they ought not to worry about the figure because I can assure them that we will give it every scrutiny possible to make sure that the money is well spent.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Bill No. 24. He's flown the coop. Standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Rhineland. Is there any other member who may be desirous of speaking on Bill No. 24? Apparently not. Bill No. 25, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris. On Bill No. 25.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Lakeside has adjourned the debate and . . . -- (Interjections) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Before we get too far so we don't get our votes and proceedings wrong I'd like to suggest to the Clerk the Honourable Member for Morris did not speak on Bill No. 25. Just an explanation. Right. In order to keep votes and proceedings correct.

MR. PAULLEY: I note that the Honourable Member for Rhineland has now returned to the House. Bill No. 24.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Transportation. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: I wonder if I could have the indulgence on this one to have it stand. I had notes prepared but I haven't got them with me.

MR. PAULLEY: It's fine with me, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if my honourable friend is ready to proceed on Bill No. 25, and I would suggest that I will be calling most likely 24 this evening. But if my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, can speak on 25.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, Bill 25 deals with the Manitoba Farm loans Act. I haven't got the Bill before me, I didn't realize it would be coming up this afternoon. But I did check it out. I checked out the former Act that will be defunct after, and probably is already defunct, but there are some loans apparently that are still on the books and which are going to be brought in under the Agricultural Credit Corporation Act.

In checking the old Act I thought there were a number of valuable things in the former Act which could probably have been incorporated into the new Act that are not there. I noticed that the former Act certainly didn't deal with the millions of dollars as we do today. That I think there was a limitation of something like \$300,000 that they could authorize at any one time, so that we have come a long way since that bill was brought into use and being exercised. I personally don't have any exception of bringing the balance of those loans under the Agricultural Credit Corporation. Certainly it means that we are cleaning up some matters and I certainly endorse this type of action.

MR. SPEAKER put the question. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I can't really resist the opportunity of having at least four or five minutes, or perhaps ten minutes, to enter into some little discussion with my friend and colleague the Minister of Agriculture. Because after all the Act before us as any amendment dealing with an Act allows one some latitude in discussing the Act in question. Now we're talking about an Act to repeal the Manitoba Farm Loans Act, and removing and consolidating that within the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation as such, if I understand the bill correctly, and I believe the Member for Morris has already indicated that we, Sir, on our side have no objection to the proposal being put forward by the Minister of Agriculture in

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . . this instance, -- (Interjection) -- or the Minister of Mines and Resources transferring it to the Minister of Agriculture.

Well, Mr. Speaker, without wishing to cause any further aggravation and split within the government let me say -- (Interjections) -- let me say, let me say that that in itself exhibits some wisdom that heretofore has not been exhibited too often by the members of the government opposite, because if given a choice of having to decide the fate of credit in the hands of the Acting Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, who seems to have a great deal of difficulty in keeping control of his department, or keeping industry -- (Interjections) -- or keeping industry in the constituency of Morris such as Western Flyer Coach, then surely I have no objection, Mr. Speaker, in seeing it transferred -- I'm trying to anticipate, Sir, your rising in your seat and ruling me out of order -- to the Minister of Agriculture where it now rests safely and soundly in those hands.

Mr. Speaker, I rise solely really to make some comments because I could not -- I had the occasion to listen to the news this afternoon where the Vice-President of the National Farmers Union speaking before the House of Commons Committee on Agriculture chastised the Federal Government for its amendments before that body that supplies agricultural credit to the farmers of this nation for not being concerned sufficiently about the inflationary, or the pressures, that easy credit brings to farmlands and farm costs in that way. And I believe the specific objection that the National Farmers Union had in their delegation before the Federal Government at this time was that they objected to the raising of the limits of farm loans to \$250,000, which was supported by the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, and that it should be maintained to \$100,000, the position being put forward by the National Farmers Union. Mr. Speaker, I really don't want to do anything else but to use this occasion to remind the Honourable Minister of Agriculture that it was precisely that concern for, and which he has already indicated several times in the House, a concern where easy credit and perhaps even conflicting or competing credit organizations both publicly sponsored some times. In fact aid and abet unrealistic high cost pressure on productive farm land.

Well, Mr. Speaker, with those few remarks I have no objection to moving this bill forward expeditiously and resting the fate of the defunct Manitoba Farm Loans Act within the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister shall be closing debate. The Honourable Minister.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We have heard various comments on philosophies and programs regarding agricultural credit but I would just repeat again that this is a very innocuous piece of legislation which is really administrative of nature, and I'm pleased to note that the Honourable Member from Lakeside and his colleagues are supporting it. Thank you.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Bill No. 27, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, we have had occasion to peruse the contents of this bill. I particularly as a former Minister of Mines and Natural Resources involved with the Water Control Department recognize the facets of the bill that were in fact considered during my time of office, and we have no objection to the passing of this bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister will be closing debate. The Honourable Minister.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the remarks of the Honourable Member from Lakeside, and as he has now discovered it's a necessary piece of administrative legislation, quite technical and really not controversial. Thank you.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Would you kindly call Bill No. 54, Mr. Speaker, on Page No. 3.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, I adjourned debate on this for the Member for Gladstone, and I will defer to him at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR, JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker . . . earlier the House Leader indicated that he would be calling those bills in order, and we're prepared to deal with them in order, and I wonder in that event if he would not be prepared to call Bill No. 39 which is . . .

MR, SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader on the procedural point.

MR, PAULLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Morris is perfectly correct, I did indicate to him that I would be calling the bills in order. Unfortunately the Attorney-General took ill over the luncheon hour and went home and I thought that it might be advisable not to call the bills in sequence where there happens to be an absentee, and it was for that reason that I also passed Bill 49 because I noticed that the Member for Emerson was not in his seat. But if it is the desire for the Member for Brandon West to make his contribution in the absence of the Attorney-General, I certainly would have no objection because then either I or one of my colleagues could take the adjournment, if no one else did in order to proceed with the bill. But I want to assure my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, that was the only reason that I passed those two bills up rather than going in sequence.

MR, SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR, JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, maybe it would be just as well if we did proceed as the House Leader has suggested by calling Bill No. 54. If we run out of bills later on in the afternoon then perhaps we can come back to this one.

MR, PAULLEY: Fine.

MR, SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR, J. R. FERGUSON (Gladstone): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill No. 54 is a forerunner I guess of the bill that we had with the 39 clauses, 59 amendments, I guess in 1970 session. -- (Interjection) -- Well it's an afterthought then the honourable member . . . However it is quite a large bill. There are several clauses to it that we would like to take a look at. One of them being the early part of the bill, the fact that we wonder if there will be an equal price in all parts of Manitoba, or an equal cost rather, in all points in the province. Another would be that we would have no objection to the changing of the time hours for ordering emergency repairs from 7 to 11 from 8 to 10. There are a couple of feed processing, mechanical feed, have been added to the bill which puts it on a little broader base.

Something that we would be very interested in looking at would be the warranty. I think here that a three-year warranty would take a long hard look from just about everyone concerned. We certainly feel that as a farmer that we want to protect the farmers and we also are starting to feel a little concern over the fact that the dealers in Manitoba are phasing out at a very rapid rate. We feel that a three-year warranty will definitely put an excessive strain between the dealer and through the company. Also the fact that if we are going to go on an unconditional three-year warranty without an hour deal with it that we are going to find that some tractors may be warranted up to 3000 hours. We feel there is no way that this can work to the advantage of the dealer or the farmer, or to the company. So consequently this would be something that we would certainly be taking a look at when it goes to Law Amendments. Our previous warranty on this was 1000 hours on a tractor and 300 hours on a self-propelled combine.

Now there is one clause in the Act; Mr. Speaker, that we would like an explanation for. This would be 33(1. 1), if the Minister would be kind enough to give us an explanation on this particular clause. Another thing would be in licensing. We would like to know whether or not there has been a request from the dealers in the province re licensing. I don't think that there's any mention made of the amount of licensing, I expect it will be in the \$50.00 range. There would be a \$10,000 bonding fee here also which we feel would only add to the inconvenience and cost to the dealers. We don't feel that it will be any direct advantage to the customer because of the fact that any fly-by-nighters that want to get in, \$50.00 is not going to be a very big deterrent, and if they're bondable I don't think that this is going to affect it too much either. Now I think this has taken in roughly most of the clauses that we feel that we want to make a few comments on.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that rural Manitoba is definitely feeling concern for the fact that we are losing too many dealers. We certainly don't want to come into a situation where we're going to have centralization of our dealership. We feel we would be losing our right and our opportunity of dealing, and distances involved, expense involved in ordering parts, getting them to the location, and I think that we are going to have to watch very closely and in whatever cases we possibly can to give the dealers a break. I think that they are

(MR. FERGUSON cont'd) . . . . the liaison between the companies and the farmers and they're the boys that are under the gun, and basically in most cases the dealership and farm relationship has been quite favourable, and we would certainly like to keep it this way and we would like to see them get as much protection as legislation can possible give them. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a few comments in regards to this bill. There is a principle here; we have an amendment to a bill whereby the principle we've already debated, I don't think there is any further need to prolong the session on debating this aspect of this particular legislation. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that while we did have a bill with 59 clauses, if I remember correctly and about 39 amendments -- (Interjection) -- 39 amendments. Yes, pardon me, 39 clauses and 59 amendments. Mr. Speaker, we are concerned more so this time from a lesson that we learned from the original bill that was brought in last year, and I hope that the Minister will give ample notification and time for those concerned in this bill to be able to appear before the Law Amendments Committee. I just want to stress the fact that my colleague from Gladstone did state but I must state, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister and emphasize this point: that our dealers are very concerned about their future and while we have legislation that I always say, I want to protect the farmer, but we are concerned here about the people who are servicing the farmer, namely supplying farm machinery, and we are very concerned that the people concerned will have ample notification of this legislation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I just have a few remarks that I'd like to read into the record regarding this bill and I'm wondering if the Minister can explain to the House if this is the wisdom of the Agricultural Committee, which he headed as they toured this province last year and came back with this type of a bill to clear up certain problems and if this is where his government feels that the real problems of rural Manitoba lie in this type of legislation, my gosh there is machine companies closing up almost every day in this province, I daresay there's a day that the Minister could travel around Manitoba he'd find some machine dealer closing up some place. He'd likely also find auto dealers just down the street closing up as well, and where is this Minister's wisdom and his incentives to give these businesses some stability to operate in this province.

I know he's been in the field of marketing boards with the eggs but where is the Minister's wisdom and this government's wisdom to create an atmosphere in rural Manitoba where these dealers can survive, and I can't see it in this bill. I can see in talking to some of the dealers that this is not going to solve any of the problems that we have in rural Manitoba. A time limit such as is in the bill I think is most unfair to dealers and farmers since some farmers use a tractor in only twelve months -- they use it twelve months a year, the guy down the road only uses it for one month, or maybe for 90 or 100 hours, and I'd suggest the only fair warranty is a sort of combined type of hours and use warranty like re the section of travel to farmer's residence or farm, and cost involved in transporting machinery back and forth to the dealer's place of business, I think it very unfair to the dealer since the parts, the tools, the technical data, etc., can't be hauled around the country in the back of the dealer's truck. I don't know how he proposes to do that

I think warranties, Mr. Speaker, in general create many problems for dealers and purchasers, but I think there's many farmers that feel no obligation to maintain proper care of their machinery when warranties cover 100 percent of repairs, and I think it's quite evident when you know that the whole thing is covered by a warranty just zing, give her hell, let her go, she's all covered by warranty and the sooner that you get rid of the thing, the sooner you get a new one. There is certainly that feeling amongst many -- and it's maybe not a fair judgment to make but certainly the evidence is there, and I've tried to check out Section 13, I think subsection 7 there, and I still think, Mr. Speaker, that there's a lot of feelings in that section that will be created between the -- controversy between the dealer and the farmer. -- (Interjection) -- I think it's 13 (7) I think, if I remember correctly. I was looking at another section, I think it's 17 (2) is the one there, and I think most contracts contain this clause now -- at least I went through a contract the other day, a John Deere contract, and that section is included in the John Deere contracts.

But I think, Mr. Speaker, in summation it boils down to a case of mutual trust between the dealer, the manufacturer, the farmer, or the purchaser, like know your dealer, know your

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) . . . . customer, and you know these problems don't crop up until we get into that type of a debate. I hope those will help the Minister in his deliberations on this.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The legislation that is now before us is a pretty classic example of the mentality of the Minister in that he attempts to solve a particular problem, he attempts to solve a particular problem by using the sledge hammer method. He tries to solve a problem of farm machinery the same way that the farmers of the Boissevain district solved their grasshopper problem. They had a three-inch hail storm there, Sir, and it's destroyed the grasshoppers no doubt, but it destroyed everything else as well. This is what the Minister attempted to do last year in the dying moments of the session before he had an opportunity to do a proper job of drafting his legislation, before he had an opportunity to communicate with those people who were going to be affected by this legislation, and notwithstanding the fact that the bill contains something like 36 clauses, during the course of the deliberations of the Committee he brought in a bushful of amendments, something like 59, I believe, and now we've got 15 more. This is an example of the sloppy kind of drafting that stems as a result of attempting to bring in legislation based on no principle whatsoever. The only purpose of this legislation in the first instance was to try and create the impression that they were going to do something about the high price of farm machinery. And the people that now have had to bear the burden of the Minister's attempt are the farmers themselves and the machine dealers. Sir, the problem of high cost of farm machinery still remains, and I suspect will continue to remain after the amendments to the existing legislation is passed.

The whole purpose of this bill, and now the amendment, is simply to create an illusion that something is being done, simply to create an illusion, -- (Interjection) -- Well I'm trying to point out to the Minister that it is not for him to attempt to create that illusion because he's fooling nobody but himself. The fact is, Sir, that the dissemination of the farm implement dealers across the province is going to do nothing to help the farmers. The kind of restrictions that are intended in these amendments, and indeed were contemplated in the original bill, have made it more difficult for the farmers themselves and have discouraged many dealers to the extent that they now throw up their hands and get out of business. And if that is doing anything to solve the problem of farm machine sales, and supplying of spare parts in emergency conditions through the rural areas, then the Minister is indeed fooling no one but himself. The problem will continue to remain.

The real crux of the problem in agriculture is the fact that costs continue to rise, and costs will continue to rise as long as governments continue to impose further and further taxes thereby raising the costs. And this government have certainly contributed their share of those increased costs. One piece of taxation legislation after another being brought into this Chamber ostensibly for the purpose of relieving the burden on someone, or somebody, but in fact imposing greater burdens on those that they say they are going to relieve. Unthinking legislation, badly drafted, poorly conceived, and producing disastrous results for those that they claim they are intending to help. Sir, one finds some difficulty in trying to get a message through to this government that the solving of the agricultural problem lies in our ability to keep costs down, and when governments themselves contribute the greatest share of the increase in those costs they are the ones that are contributing to the problem.

Now I don't think that any great measure of relief is going to be achieved by the amendments that are proposed, nor is it going to solve that problem. Neither is there anything going to be achieved by continuing this debate. There are going to be I presume representations from those who will be affected by the proposed amendment and, as my colleague the Member for Rock Lake has suggested, we hope that this time those that will be affected will be given sufficient notification of this bill's appearance before Law Amendments Committee, so that they can appear and make the kind of representations that are meaningful to them and the members then can consider those representations and their effect, not only on the farm implement industry in this province but on the farmers themselves.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, not wishing to prolong the debate but simply to underline what has already been said by the Member for Rock Lake, the Member for Gladstone and Morris, but I have a more personal concern because you know it is getting on in the session, and we have done our work as conscientiously as we can, and I have a very simple request for

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . . the Minister. I want to know whether I'm going to be called upon to write the piece of legislation for him, rewrite it for him, as we did the last bill before us; I want to know whether it's going to be my responsibility to at least have the courtesy of notifying those people directly affected, the dealers of the province, the machine -- the manufacturing people in the country, and give them notification of important changes in legislation so that they can come down and advise the government, as they did last year, and whose advice the government accepted, Mr. Speaker, when you consider that last year this Minister brought in a piece of legislation containing some 39 clauses and accepted 54 amendments, that's near the impossible. I want to know right now, Mr. Speaker, whether or not we really have to do that same kind of work again, because we're certainly prepared to, we're certainly prepared to rewrite Bill 54 as we did -- what was the number of the last bill? 115 or 113? The Opposition and let's, Mr. Speaker, let's have that well recorded in the public record, the Opposition wrote Bill 113 and brought it into being and the government sheepishly accepted, you know, that fact. Mr. Speaker, to suggest anything else is to deny the fact that the government accepted 54 amendments to a 39 clause bill. Now, Mr. Speaker, I just want to have the assurance of the Minister that he has had at least the courtesy this time around to have informed . . . , the Dealer Association, to have informed - I believe George Fryer is the President of that organization - to have informed such other organizations as Massey-Harris, Massey-Ferguson, John Deere, Cockshutt, Case, other representatives, who after all, despite what you may want to think of them do have some concern in this matter, dealers whom you may choose to think are redundant, although I don't really think that you think that we have redundant dealers, I think the problem is the reverse. But I ask the Minister of Agriculture to accept in this instance, having learned his lesson from the last time around, the responsibility of notifying people, not, Mr. Speaker, with the concept that he has to accept their advice, or that he has to do as they say, but in a democracy, Mr. Speaker, when we're making major changes in legislation that affects the lives, and the businesses of people involved, then surely there is some responsibility on those in that responsible position to take -- at least make this exercise a meaningful one.

Mr. Speaker, the last session really -- I think the last session and the bill that the Minister of Agriculture presented to us, Bill 113, highlighted what has already been said by the Member for Morris, the sloppy and careless approach that this government accepts or takes towards bringing forward legislation. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister will assure me that this bill, which contains I believe some 15 clauses, will have -- this bill will not be rewritten in its entirety. We'll settle for 20 amendments to this bill, Mr. Speaker. You know this is a 15 clause bill, if we only get 20 amendments, you know, then I will already be prepared to give the Minister of Agriculture an A for effort, or something like that, for having improved considerably from his last year's performance when we suffered through 59 amendments to a similar bill.

And the other thing that I want to have, Mr. Minister, very clearly understood, is that I want the government, you know, to go to the expense, and go to the work of making the long distance phone calls and arranging for people to be present to make their views known, to at least even know when the legislation is coming before them. I think as a matter of courtesy, Mr. Speaker, I think the Clerk of the House would even agree, to accepting that responsibility of letting the interested parties know when bills such as this are going to appear before the Committee. Because, Mr. Speaker, the Minister introduced this major bill last year in the dying days of the session, three four days of the dying days of the session when not more than six or eight or nine hours notice could be given to the farmers, to the dealers, to the manufacturers of farm implement machinery. I would hope that at least he has shown some improvement, Mr. Speaker, he has at least introduced for second reading this bill now. Why it wasn't introduced three weeks ago, or four weeks ago, or a month ago? When was it called? When was it called, Mr. Speaker? Well, Mr. Speaker, here not there, I think the Minister is exhibiting some degree of sensitivity now on this particular subject and I don't as I said, don't want to pursue it any longer. I just hope that we can deal with this bill, that the Minister has thought out the contents of the bill. Certainly we have no objections to seeing it move forward to the Committee stage and listen to the comments made at that particular stage.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID R. BLAKE (Minnedosa): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I haven't prepared any remarks on this bill but I would like the Minister to assure us when he replies to the questions that have been put forward to him today that he has been in consultation with the farm machinery dealers across Manitoba and apprised them of the contents of this particular bill, because I'm



(MR. BLAKE cont'd) . . . . sure that he is aware the number of farm implement dealers that have closed their doors in the last three to four years in Manitoba and it's obviously a serious problem. And I just want him to assure us that he has been in full consultation with these people and apprised them of the facts and the ramifications of this particular bill which may see many more of them close their doors.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Bill No. 58, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, we're dealing with a bill here, No. 58, and having perused this bill, also the comments made by the Minister of Agriculture, I think is a piece of legislation here that does give us a good deal of concern.

Now the Minister in his opening remarks commented that - and I want to quote him, The Minister says, Mr. Speaker, "What we are about to witness here this morning will likely, and I'm sure it will, Mr. Speaker, go down in history as another major thrust of this government towards the restoration and revitalization of our rural communities across Manitoba". Well, Mr. Speaker, having reiterated that comment for the records, and having had to listen to the sad news from my colleague from Morris of what's happening to his particular area, I can't help but wonder but what there must be some differences of opinion within this government, that is within the Ministers.

But dealing with this bill on the Water Supply Board, the Minister has stated that - and I'm given to understand that it has been operating in a fashion that has not been in concert with the legality of the legislation. And he proposed to change that, as I am given to understand. It has been operating under his jurisdiction now for three years -- (Interjection) -- No? I stand to be corrected then -- (Interjection) -- when this bill is passed. However, Mr. --(Interjection) -- Pardon me. Yes that's quite correct, Mr. Speaker, I must retract that last comment. There's a change here taking place. The fact though is, Mr. Speaker, on perusing this legislation I have been in consultation with the towns in my area that are affected by this, and there are five of them, and I want to use one of them as an example such as Pilot Mound, where he states that the price that the people in Pilot Mound are now paying is, and he didn't state an exact figure but it's very close to \$2.40. And he indicates that the, as I am given to understand, that the price could possibly have to go up to \$4.80, which is doubling of the cost of water. Now the program that is going on in this town, and I just use as an example, there's four others and they all have different situations. The bill here proposes to amend it by bringing in the sewage which I would say is - I go along with that, there's no quarrel with that. After all we're supplying with water, I think that we have to have legislation to provide for the refuse, and what have you. Also it includes the treatment of lagoons, lagoons themselves. And this is a problem area in some places in the Province of Manitoba. Now I am given to understand, Mr. Speaker, as an example to use this town of Pilot Mound, where over the years when they took on the contract in 1964 they have the complete system that this bill will cover. The total cost as I am given to understand in that area was about \$385,000, and I am given to understand they have approximately 175,000 still outstanding. They had a lagoon problem which was the treatment of the lagoon which was a cost of about \$30,000. They've already entered into contract to take care of that expenditure. Now this total amount of money, Mr. Speaker - the Minister indicates that in his comments here that the local government would be assessed 20 mills, that is a maximum of 20 mills and then other arrangements to take care of the total cost.

Now I am given to understand, Mr. Speaker, that in Pilot Mound for instance, and here I'm using this case as an example, to cover the cost of this total picture, they have a mill rate of 18 mills. And that's what they have to assess to take care of this. Now I don't know whether the Minister is using this 20 mill figure. If that's what they're going to be assessed, and the extra amount, what will happen to that amount of money. The other thing he says is that the price that they will be charged would be \$3.00 per thousand gallons. Now the cost here is \$2.40, but when they project a figure say to \$4.80, the people in this province, and in this particular area, and I know that it'll apply to any town that has a water contract with the Supply

(MR. EINARSON cont'd) . . . . Board are going to be concerned with how he arrives at that projected figure, and I think this, Mr. Speaker, is a question that the people of this province want answered. Is he going to use the subsidization sum of money to take care of those areas that have decided in the past to vote against the kind of service that other towns have? This is something we'd like to know.

There is another part of this bill that the Minister made no mention of and that is the Board is going to be increased from three to five members. -- (Interjection) -- Pardon me. Maybe he did mention, three to five members. But the fact here, Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, that that Board can be a quorum of one. Now I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that here the chairman could be appointed, and is appointed by the Minister, we could have a board operating here something like our Manitoba Hydro, we could have another Cass-Beggs involved in the enterprise like this. And, Mr. Speaker, I wonder just what could happen and where would this chairman take this board.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister asked me what's wrong with Cass-Beggs? I don't want to get into a philosophical debate here with him because I have my answers to him but the fact is, Mr. Chairman, is that I think that this is a very dangerous course of action. I don't think it's democratic. When you increase your board from three to five members and you don't increase your quorum. I think this is something that the Minister has, I don't know, intentionally overlooked, or whether it was purposely decided in that manner, I don't know. But, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about that particular aspect of it, . . . by doing so would have suggested an amendment to Section 36 of that bill.

The other thing, Mr. Speaker, is that, I think that in dealing with the Board itself, there is an area in this bill where it states that in substituting the words "may form" rather than "is" and we're talking about the expenses of the operating of that Board, and I think that the only way that we can criticize in a proper manner and know exactly what is the cost of operating this Board by means of having the legislation as it was but rather as the Minister is suggesting to make this change by the two words from "is" to "may form", I think is allowing him the freedom that I don't think he's justified in asking for. These are some of the criticisms, Mr. Speaker, that we have on this bill here.

I feel that here again it's important that those who are concerned with this matter will be given ample opportunity to present their cases before the Minister and the Committee, and that while he has given us figures of the cost at the present time and the projected costs for all towns that have a contract, there are many areas, many towns are questioning the figures from this Minister.

So, Mr. Speaker, with these few comments on this bill, I am prepared to allow it to go to Committee because I know there are going to be a number of questions that we're going to want to ask even after the Minister replies.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gimli.

MR. JOHN C. GOTTFRIED (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, the passage of this bill will help to alleviate a problem that has existed in my constituency for a number of years, so I am particularly pleased with the proposed intention to help bring about a greater measure of equality in the ability of towns to secure adequate water and sewer facilities.

As the Minister has outlined, it will now be within the financial means of smaller communities to enjoy the benefits of modern community living and to further be in a position to take advantage of industry wishing to locate in their areas, and in addition, it will give them an opportunity to participate in government sponsored housing projects, erections of homes for the aged. I might also add that this bill is really an investment in the improvement of health for the citizens of our province, for in some localities the purity of the water supply is questionable. With our government now committed to providing adequate health services, the provision of a proper water and sewer system should pay off in the long run and reduce health service costs. Our government has already acknowledged this fact through its plan of assistance offered to farmers to install adequate water and sewer facilities. Now towns will be able to receive this benefit. Since 1969, I have considered provincial assistance for the installation of sewer and water as a number one priority item for towns in my constituency since it is the basis of so many other activities enabling a town to grow and to develop a strong economic base. The provision of adequate water and sewer makes it a great deal easier to attract and retain professional people into a rural community setting. I therefore consider this bill to be a major breakthrough since previous schemes made adequate provisions for a clean water supply but did

(MR. GOTTFRIED cont'd) . . . . little in the way of assisting a town to install sewage.

This brings to mind in particular one of the towns in my constituency, the Town of Stone-wall, which located as it is on top of a large limestone formation, the cost of installing adequate sewer and water was prohibitive, prohibitive to such an extent that although a number of votes were taken on the issue, the people voted it down because they just simply couldn't afford to bring it in.

I find the argument presented by the Honourable Member for Arthur that now towns like Gimli will be expected to subsidize towns such as Teulon to be very shallow and parochial in their outlook. The Federal Government for years through the ARDA-FRED Program has been using the resources of the nation to subsidize and assist in the development of those areas more economically depressed. Our government for some time now has been subsidizing towns supplied with water through the Water Control Board, and what about the attempts of the former government to assist in the establishment of industry in the region of The Pas. In that instance they not only subsidized the north but also people in foreign countries like Switzerland. And further, the money we haven't been able to track down to date could I am sure have installed adequate water and sewer in many of our towns.

I personally prefer using our money to develop Manitoba for Manitobans. If the establishment of water and sewer facilities in the town can make the residents more productive and thereby contribute more to the economy as a whole, then I am for it. The small outlay now will pay huge dividends and a healthier more productive and viable community. The opportunity to attract and retain industry and the retention of professional people in highly specialized fields will be greatly enhanced. So I am for this bill.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Rock Lake, that debate be adjourned.

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

. . . . . continued on next page.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: The Honourable Member for Thompson is here. Would you call Bill 63.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour. The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, when I was speaking last week I indicated I was surprised at the remarks made by the Member for Fort Garry. My understanding of his comments were that he was for the bill and then after the first paragraph he went into a tirade of attacking the Minister. I was amazed to read in the paper where the headline was that - both papers in fact - that the Member for Fort Garry was enthusiastically supporting the bill - and I would first of all recommend to the press to reread the speech so they would know precisely what they said, because on reading the speech the second time I find out that he clearly was telling the Minister to stay out of the lives of the businessmen: that they were getting fed up and sick and tired of government interference and the Minister may as well come in and run their businesses for them. I can't understand that kind of an attitude, because some of the sections in the bill date back practically to the Ming dynasty, Mr. Chairman, and improvements in it are some - as I indicated before, that people that went on strike and back in the 30's, they were thrown into jail for fighting for these improvements. And I not only congratulate the Minister, I expect that legions unwatched throughout Manitoba will have something to say when this bill becomes law because the improvements in there, the improvements in there are such that it will make it a model bill in Canada.

That's not saying, Mr. Chairman, that we should stop there. I have looked at some of the increases there and I hope that the Minister is not going to rest on his laurels and let it sit there for ten years, and then one day somebody will refer to it as the Paulley dynasty because cost of living continues to increase every year and these people are locked in in these pensions and there is absolutely no way for them to improve their lot. They can't negotiate them as labour can, so it will be up to the Minister and this government or subsequent governments to make sure that there is a periodic review and updating. I notice on widows' allowance the monthly pension of widows will be increased to \$150.00 from 120. Well that percentage-wise is a very impressive increase, Mr. Speaker, but I want to say to the Minister that I hope that he doesn't allow that to sit there too long because he knows very well, better than most people as Minister of Labour that the costs continue to increase.

I notice also in the bill that he has provision, Mr. Chairman, which I commend him for to decrease the silicosis section where at one time you had to wait five years, or be in the mining field for five years before you could qualify; now it's been reduced to two years, and I think that that is a very progressive step - and again I hope that the Minister will a year from now, or two years from now reconsider this area and perhaps bring it down to something like 12 months.

I mentioned, Mr. Chairman, last time I spoke on it about the tremendous improvement in payment for widows for burials, and I'm afraid I was wrong in my reading of the bill. I re-collect our discussions in caucus, and I find that this Bill, Section 11 here, which deals with the cost of burial - it's still \$300.00, it used to be 300, it still is. The change in this section is, the Minister tells me, is cremation and urn or ash storage place. In other words at the present time if you want to be buried they will pay for it; if you want to be cremated there's no provision for it and the trend is - whether it's a good trend or not I don't know - but the trend is for more cremation and more people buying these urns to store their ashes in. So now it's going to be covered when this bill becomes effective. Where the improvement has come in, Mr. Chairman, is in the lump sum payment to the widow. It used to be \$500.00 and it's now increased to 650 - in other words \$150.00 increase. The purpose of that, Mr. Chairman, is not to pass legislation which will do what for example the tax rebate is doing in Thompson right now. In other words, placing money into the hands of those it was never intended, like the \$55,000 for International Nickel. We were afraid when we discussed this, Mr. Chairman, that if we turn around and increase the burial section from 300 to \$450.00 that the undertakers will simply say, well we're entitled to it and they'd of simply taken it and the poor widow would have not been one penny ahead. So to avoid this type of manipulation, the Minister wisely put it into a lump sum settlement, which means that the widow is going to get the full benefit, the \$150.00. I understand that even our friendly undertaker, the Minister, is in favour of this section. I wonder if the fact that he is now Minister and doesn't really depend on the burial business has anything to do with his position.

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd.)

Anyway, I want to conclude in stating, Mr. Chairman, that in my humble view this bill and the improvements in this bill are probably worth several years of strikes - because some of the items first of all as I indicated initially, some of them simply are not negotiable as International Nickel told us on more than one occasion. There are certain areas we do not negotiate. It is the Minister of Labour and it is government business. Other ones could be negotiated. I know that the Opposition is against strikes, and I know that the Opposition will enthusiastically endorse the bill because by doing so they will eliminate certain strikes in Manitoba. And I also know that the Opposition wants to displace this government, and one way of doing it is to pass a bill that's going to help the working people in Manitoba. So in spite of what happened in Wolseley I think both the government and the Conservatives got what they deserved. Nevertheless I hope that both sides will support this bill - and when I say both sides, I'm talking about the new party that has officially been created as a result of the election. And I want to congratulate the Minister in closing, Mr. Speaker, for bringing in progressive legislation for which I'm sure that the majority of the people in Manitoba will be grateful. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a word, particularly in view of what the Honourable Member for Thompson had to say. I think he misunderstood or misconstrued what the Honourable Member for Fort Garry had to say. I heard his speech too, and it seemed to me that his feelings were as my feelings are - and I'm sure as all members of this House feel - that the increase in benefits are long overdue. As the Minister said in presenting the bill in the first place, Mr. Speaker, he pointed to some of the hardships particularly of widows and orphans that are brought about by accidents. And I regret very much that the Member for Thompson took that attitude with regard to the Member for Fort Garry. I think when he talked of the businessmen he wasn't talking of corporations, but rather he was talking of small businessmen. Myself as an illustration, with some eight to ten people on a payroll - and I must say those small businessmen if the Honourable Member for Thompson would think about it are somewhat the backbone of this province insofar as providing employment and doing their part in providing taxes in which this province operates. And I think he was trying to emphasize that when subjects such as this are brought up, it's very simple for the government to say business can absorb this, it's only a few cents more. But you know, Mr. Speaker, when you consider what the small businessman is confronted with just a few cents more here and a few cents more there, and a few cents more elsewhere - and I'm thinking of the Canada Pension Plan, and the unemployment insurance and the income tax and the sales tax and the business tax - all these things wrapped up together and many more there's only one way that he can pay this bill and that is to the consumer; in what he produces, he must ask the consumer to pay that much more. And I think the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, if one would recollect what he had to say, was simply making a plea in that direction.

And you know the workmen's compensation benefits or contributions are solely the responsibility of the businessman who operates the type of business that I am talking of and of course the larger corporations. The larger corporations, Mr. Speaker, are much more capable of handling and taking care of these charges much more than the small businessman that must do his business over the counter for 50 cents or a dollar and \$1.50 and meet all these commitments.

So I again say, Mr. Speaker, with those few remarks that I regret very much that the Member for Thompson took the attitude he took in his few remarks. He didn't show the normal and usual vehemence, but at the same time I just wanted to clear up that one point on behalf of my colleague because I think that his comments were sincere and well meant and I hope they're understood by the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the bill. I will not be too long because I'm sure the Minister realizes what my opinion and feeling is in respect to workmen's compensation legislation. I'm sure if he would have read some of my speeches when I had the opportunity to deliver on the Labour Estimates, on his estimates, and he knows quite well why at this time I really do welcome the changes, welcome the legislation, welcome the increases - but I'm not satisfied completely. I'm sure that the Minister will realize that, because I have pointed out on many occasions during the Labour Estimates that where the compensation really fails and falls down.

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.)

It appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that it has always been said that quite often the governments are led and very seldom that the government really leads the people. And in this case I would have expected from the Minister - who really is a friend of the working person, the working person, a friend of the employee - would have really showed a little better initiative, and at least in some areas - some areas, I very much appreciate and I believe the bill certainly does the job, but in other areas it doesn't. And I'm sure that the Minister realizes that he could have brought in this legislation at least a couple of years ago - but I see that he waited on his third year, and naturally there is pressure from the workers and the Minister had to give in.

But in some areas the increases in my opinion is small enough that I'm sure it wouldn't have been even difficult for the former government, either Mr. Roblin or Mr. Weir, to increase the pensions. And I'm particularly referring to one area, which in my opinion is the most glaring injustice in the compensation that the wife with children receives, and in my opinion she is better off when her husband is alive than when he is dead. When the husband is around, even if totally incapacitated he can do some chores around the house, perhaps looking after the children when the mother is shopping or even doing some part-time work. When the husband dies the compensation goes down while the work is increased; I'm sure that we all realize and all know that. A man permanently totally disabled through injury or industrial accident would be entitled to a maximum of 75 percent of his total earnings - that maximum is built or based on \$8,000 ceiling. For example, a man that's making \$800.00 per month his total pension would be \$600.00 - or 6,000 a year. What happens, what happens if the husband dies? The widow was not responsible for the industrial accident. She will receive under the present legislation \$120.00; under the increases that the Minister introduced, \$150.00. Mr. Speaker, I know that some would say she should get a job. She may be at the age that she cannot get a job; she may be having a difficult time to find a job because she hasn't got training to get a job - and still she has the same responsibilities; she still has the same costs of running that household, of paying mortgage payments or rent; she still has the fuel bills, the light bills - and in my opinion the \$30.00 increase to the widow with children is really, Mr. Speaker, is not very much. It may look a fairly substantial increase but I'm surely - surely not from a Minister of Labour who always professes to be the friend of the working man. And this is the one glaring injustice that I find in this legislation. In my opinion I feel the increase should be - I'm going out I know on the limb - but the increase should be at least two-thirds of the pension that her husband would have received if he would have been totally disabled. Then that type of a pension, Mr. Speaker, would have some meaning, it would have some meaning.

I will get into some of the recommendations I would have liked to see in a few minutes, but I would deal for instance with one case and that is the increases of the present pension. And I'm talking of a specific case. A man lives in St. Vital; he was totally disabled in 1962; he received a pension of \$295.00. Ten years later his increase only comes to \$15.00; that's not a very high increase. The cost of living has skyrocketed in the meantime, in ten years, and they were giving him \$15.00 increase; that's not a very high increase. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, I feel that increases should be tied to the cost of living index which was done under the Federal legislation to the senior citizens. --(Interjection)-- Well it may not be, but I feel that apparently the Minister feels satisfied; feels satisfied with \$15.00 increase over a period of ten years, and I don't think that's enough. Pension increase as stated by the Minister - and I have the date - which started - if the pension started before January 1st, 1954 there'd be a nine percent increase. If started between December 31st, 1953 and January 1, 1959, a seven percent increase; and if started between December 31st, 1958 and January 1, 1964, a five percent increase would be granted; and if started between December 31, 1963 and January 1969 - --(Interjection)-- That's right - at three percent increase, three percent increase.

Now two glaring injustices that I am saying to the Minister; the increases in pension to past recipients is not sufficient, and the most glaring adjustments in my opinion is when the husband is killed, the pension - the increase to the widow. That's the two points. I also know that there is no increases where compensation or a permit earning was for less than ten percent. So there have been no increases in that area. I agree and I welcome the point - it's a very important principle in this bill that it would reduce the maximum exposure of time for silica dust to two years from the present legislation of five; and to people that are suffering with this disease, the reduction is very much welcome and it is a great reduction, more than 400 percent.

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.)

The other point that I really welcome that the Minister has zeroed in on, and that's the accidents outside of the province which it seems to be that it will not be necessary to inquire whether the employee is entitled to claim compensation from another province if he was only out of province for less than six months. I know that I've had on several occasions that I've met with at least with three different employees with files, really thick files - that they were sent by an employer from Manitoba to work in out-of-province area - there was an injury and then there was a denial on both sides by both provinces, who was going to pay the compensation. And I know that I had one employee come to see me three years in a row and it still was not resolved because both provinces were declining. I know at that time I had pursued this matter with the former Minister of Labour, and pursued it with the Workmen's Compensation Board - and I certainly welcome this because it certainly clears up the legislation and I think it's quite clear now who, what province will have to compensate the employee.

Mr. Speaker, my recommendation would be that \$150 is not sufficient - I would like to see two-thirds of the salary of the husband when he was totally disabled - that's what the widow should get. The other point, I believe that the children should receive compensation if the widow remarries. And particularly when the children are at that age, there's not quite often - I shouldn't say quite often, but there's times that the stepfather does not take to children that easy, and there is some problem in the family and I feel that the children should get compensation because I'm sure it would be helpful.

I also feel that the children between 16 and 18 that are attending school - I know that the increase is to \$70 per child, but I feel that it's very expensive now. These students have to clothe themselves and so on, and I would like to see the change at least increased to \$80 instead of the 70 at the present time. Students attending school or children attending school between 16 and 18 would have liked to see the increase of \$80 to ones that are attending school instead of the \$70.00. --(Interjection)-- Yes, instead of 70. That's right, yes.

Mr. Speaker, I welcome the lump sum to widows after a fatality of increasing after \$650, and also that the total minimum compensation for total disability increased to \$175.00. I have talked to quite a few employees and I have found this to be quite satisfactory.

We as well know that a temporary disability or minimum disability payments have been raised from 35 to I believe \$40.00. I would hope the Minister would advise the House - but I understand that some industries, particularly the construction industries are paying less for Workmen's Compensation fees today than they were paying say five or years ago or in premiums. I am not sure but this is an area that I would like to see the Minister check out. If that's the case, I'm sure that he could have moved in the area of widows' pensions - increased that little more.

Mr. Speaker, I know that I have asked on many occasions of the Minister to improve the appeal measures or at least have whoever wants to appeal the decisions of the Board; that they would be able to go to a solicitor without any cost within the Department of Attorney-General or even within the Department of Labour who has nothing to do with that particular appeal. I don't mean that there would be conflict of interest. In the first place, the lawyer may be working for the Board and as well working for the person, the employee that's appealing his case - the injured worker - and I would see someone completely independent that would be able to give the worker the assistance to go through a proper appeal because I understand there are still problems as far as appeals are concerned, and this has been - I've checked with quite a few employees and they still tell me that they're not quite satisfied the way the appeal system works at the present time.

So these are the points that I wish to make. I know that pre-existing injury, there's some problem in that area; I'm not sure that - it's been improved to some extent, but all in all I think the bill is in the right direction. It's a very good improvement but in my opinion, it's still a very great injustice in respect as far as the widows are concerned - and I think this was the most important area that the Minister should have zeroed into, which in my opinion he has not, because the percentage of increases is not that high. The second one for the pensions at the present time, which I pointed out to the Minister - when we're talking in ten years time, an accident that happened ten years ago and the total increase in that pension for one that is totally disabled; totally disabled of \$15 in this case that I have checked out, who is a person living in St. Vital - and to me it doesn't appear to be satisfactory.

So with these few points that I'd like to bring to the attention of the Minister, perhaps we

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.) . . . . can improve the bill in Law Amendments and I would hope the Minister would still give it his serious consideration.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Well, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: I wonder if the member would submit to a question. He mentioned in his remarks that he would have liked to see a child's pension left intact even after the mother remarries. I believe that's correct. I wonder if he would not be concerned in view of the fact that we live in a materialistic and fun-loving society, is he not concerned that if we did this that it may expose a widow to mercenaries that would marry her into a life of a total pension. You know life of ease and comfort with no exemptions and all the tax benefits. Is he not concerned that this may occur?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Well, perhaps maybe each case can be judged you know, on its own merit - the Board can decide that. But I have checked out with quite a few people, and where there is a remarriage it's been always stated that it would be much better if the children would receive an allowance of compensation; it would be much better concerned for the mother and the children in furthering their education. So for that reason I feel that the pension can be continued, I think it would be in the interest of the children receiving their education.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I have a few remarks I'd like to make on this bill in regards to people that were hurt years ago when wages were very low. And I'm thinking of a particular case where a man was a lineman with the Hydro in 1956; and he was burnt with Hydro, he lost an arm and had burns to his body and was considered a 80 percent disability. And this entitled him to a pension at that time of \$140 a month, for 80 percent. And this pension hasn't increased, and I know now it's going to be increased a small amount. But there's another part that I'm thinking about that seems to me rather unfair, and I don't think it's covered in this Act as I read it - and that is, this man was single at that time and \$140 seemed like a fair pension for him, but now he's married and he has a wife to keep and he has three children - and as I understand this Act now, there's no allowance for the family. So here we have a fellow that's 80 percent disability and he's getting a pension of 140.00. Now I can see that his pension probably should increase even as far as he was concerned if he was still single, but there's been no allowance made for him being married and having three children and possibly more to support. So I think that here was a man who was paying into the fund just the same as if he was married and had a family which is getting a very small return out of the compensation that he's getting. And I'd like to see something put into the Act that would take care of people in a case like this, because his status did change so much - and with an 80 percent disability he's not able to provide for them.

Now I know there's retraining programs and all this. This happened to be a farm boy who was very efficient as a linesman all right, but he was really a boy that never took to office work. He was retrained, but he just couldn't take to office work and he never did like it. And so he chose to go back to try to help other people on the farm and to do things like this but he wasn't able to increase his earning power a great deal. So he's left with a pension of \$140 a month now to keep a wife and three children. And if this person wasn't extremely proud and his wife the same way he'd have thrown in the sponge a long time ago and gone on the welfare program, where he'd be getting a terrific amount more. And I suppose if I'd been smart I'd have gone to the Welfare Department and found out how much this man would have been entitled to, and I'm sure it would be much more than the \$140 that he's getting now. So for this reason I think that this part of the Act should even be extended further.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, after hearing other members, I certainly don't want to repeat what has already been said. I too welcome the bill and the increase benefits that will result - although if I recollect correctly, when the present House Leader was on this side of the House, that they were usually asking for much more than what they're coming up with. And we wouldn't hear this only once, this would be an annual appeal - that the government of the day wasn't doing enough. They were too niggardly in their approach and --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. FROESE: I don't think the Member for St. Boniface - or the Honourable Minister I



(MR. FROESE cont'd.) . . . . should say - should take exception to that term, because during the time that he was on this side of the House he used much stronger terms that I'm using right now, on many occasions.

I welcome a number of the provisions that are contained in the bill such as the Medical Review Panel which will be considering different matters referred to them. I am sure the bill is an improvement, no doubt about that. On the other hand, I would like to know from the Minister what will the end result be; will this mean an increase in fees, or will the present fees cover the increase benefits. Because I find in the bill that there is provision for overdraft of something like \$6 million that they can borrow on a short-term basis, yes - and I'm just wondering whether the government by underwriting these expenditures, what is the course going to be in the future? Are we as government going to take monies from the Consolidated Fund to make up the differences, or will there be increased fees if the present fees do not cover the increased benefits. And to what extent has there been any calculation to date as to what this could amount to? Surely if the government brings in legislation of this type, they must have done some figuring on this as to what the cost will be. --(Interjection)-- The Member for Thompson says \$4 million. I am not saying that this is excessive, but we don't hear anything being said about \$4 million. On the other hand when we discuss aid to private schools and the matter of \$4 million they scream to high heavens. But \$4 million to me, Mr. Speaker, is \$4 million - and I would like to know where the money is going to come from, whether it's going to be from additional fees or whether it's going to be from the Consolidated Revenue Fund. I think the other matters that I had made notes of have been covered and therefore I certainly don't intend to repeat those, but for whatever is being done I want to commend the government on this bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour shall be closing debate. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Minnedosa that the 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: 68, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour - the Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I would ask the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. PAULLEY: The bill before us tonight, Mr. Speaker. Bill No. 69, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation and Cultural Affairs. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I reviewed Bill No. 69 and studied it, and find that the Bill is rather ill prepared. I don't know who did the homework on the Bill, but first of all the first problem I find a section is mentioned in there - it's Section 21. As I read the Bill as today there's only the last section is Section 12, so there's some 9 sections that I have no record of and can't follow if we are to pursue the bill. But no doubt the Honourable Minister will be able to maybe clarify - maybe it's a typographical error or something; it should have been a 12 instead of a 21.

And of course I wonder, Mr. Speaker, in viewing with this bill I went through the old bill and I found that it entered into agreements with Canada. It gave the functions of the Minister; the transient accommodation facilities; classifications were described; regulations effecting certain municipal by-laws; the offences and penalties and the cost of administration, etc. were included in that bill. But here in this Bill we have another brand new section of course that sets up an advisory committee on multi-culturalism and an advisory committee on tourism. And I wonder in that - I have both bills in my hand - I have Bill 49 which incorporates the Franco-Manitoba Society; and on the other hand I have another bill with a Multi-Cultural Society in this hand. Does this Bill include the Franco-Society? Or am I wondering if there's two Societies - and this was where I'd like to get some clarification to the Minister and ask him to - if he'd be kind enough to take it back and give it some more study. Because in my news on the radio this morning I did hear a remark from a certain group of people, in I think it was the jurisdiction of Edmunds this morning where they were most concerned that some \$300 million had been expended on the French culture but only \$1 million had been expended by federal funds

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd.) . . . . on the Multi-Cultural Society. And these questions again, Mr. Speaker, are unanswered, and I would submit that maybe in the both bills we could talk about a Canadian culture, Mr. Speaker, so . . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. PAULLEY: Just for the purpose of clarification I wonder if my honourable friend heard me when I called for consideration of Bill 69.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable House Leader would read Bill 69 I think he'd find that I'm speaking from it, because in Section 13 it talks about . . . .

MR. PAULLEY: I thought my honourable friend said something in reference to 49.

MR. McKENZIE: No, I'm speaking on 69 which talks about a multi-cultural society which I support most wholeheartedly in this province and all across Canada. And also an advisory committee on tourism which I also support. But due to the fact that this Section 21 is mentioned, and I can only find in the Act Section 12, is the Act that sits beside me here. And due to the fact that there are those unanswered questions, I just wonder where the Minister is moving us today in with the two bills that are before us. I would submit that maybe we should have more study on the legislation, and possibly in the committee we could deal with it at greater length than we can in the House, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say a word from this particular bill. I didn't have the privilege of speaking on the Estimates but I see there's a - no, the time ran out . . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I see there mentioned by the Honourable Member for Roblin, there's two committees set up, advisory committees. The one that interests me the most is the one on tourism. I live in an area where we do have many points of interest in our constituency. And I think one of the points of interest the Minister is going to be at this coming Sunday, the International Peace Garden; and I do hope that when you're setting up this particular committee that you do have representation from rural Manitoba, because the people from the rural parts of Manitoba are interested. So often we focus our attention on tourism principally in the City of Winnipeg, because that's where are the largest number of people.

But we have many points of interest, I've mentioned before, in the rural parts that I think that haven't even begun to be touched as far as selling them to our brothers and sisters in both the other parts of Canada and the United States. But I think that this advisory committee on tourism can do a wonderful job in extolling to the people of Winnipeg and all other parts of Canada the points of interest in rural Manitoba.

A year ago we had 400,000 people, came into the International Peace Gardens. That's a lot of people and a lot of vehicles. And we're looking for a lot more people this coming summer. And I do hope the Minister this coming Sunday on his visit to the International Peace Gardens will get the privilege of touring this wonderful garden and looking over the improvements that have been made in the last number of years. We have at the International Peace Garden I think a garden which is second to none in North America, and I'm sure that the people who visit there annually, and maybe for the first time, will appreciate this beautiful garden. One of the problems which we have there is selling ourselves to the people of Canada and North America. But once you get away about 3 or 400 miles very few people have ever heard of the International Peace Gardens. And so if they can do nothing else, this Advisory Committee, they will be able to help us in our endeavours on the Board of Directors of the International Peace Gardens.

Also too, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to inform the members of this Legislature this is the 40th Anniversary of the International Peace Gardens, having been started in 1932 by a group of people who were interested in the development of a garden - a location was decided in the Turtle Mountains about 15 miles south of Boissevain. And I think we congratulate these people who promoted this garden for the people of North America, and I'm sure that when the final development takes place - which we hope is not too far in the future - that all people will praise the pioneers who developed this particular garden.

One of the buildings which we have to develop yet there I think will be of particular interest to everyone here. It's going to be a million-dollar Peace Tower which will be located right on the border of the United States and Canada. A million dollars which we hope to be shared equally by the Government of the United States and the Government of Canada. And we hope this will not be too far away, maybe in the next two or three years. And I think the Americans are

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd.) . . . particularly interested in developing this, because their 200th birthday is not very far away. And we're hoping the Government of the United States will pass this amount of monies, and the Government of Canada will follow.

So once again I hope that each member here in the Legislature will take a day off from their busy summer schedule to come and visit the International Peace Garden and spend a day in the constituency of Souris-Killarney.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, the bill is to amend the Tourism and Recreation Act, and it is recommended in the Bill that an Advisory Committee on Multi-Culturalism be appointed. I welcome this bill too, because I think it is essential that we further that type of work - because if we lose our languages and our cultures I think we in Manitoba, is that much poorer. And while a lot has already been lost in my opinion, both in the way of language and culture as well, because the two go hand in hand, Mr. Speaker; if you lose a language you lose a certain amount of the culture too. And many of our people used to be - or most of our people used to be bilingual at one time, and this is not the case any more. There's certainly still a large group that is bilingual; not only bilingual, probably trilingual - because we have the English taught in our schools; we have what we call the low German or the . . . which is a language that is spoken in many of our Mennonite homes - and which is really not a written language, although there are some books out in that particular language, but very few are out and therefore it is not commonly a written language. But in addition to that there is still the German which is sometimes referred to as high German, and many of our schools have given instruction in the German up until a year or so ago. I think we had probably 150 classrooms or so that gave instruction in German in Manitoba. And they started this at an early age, and our young people when they came to university they had no difficulty in passing German exams; in fact, many of them wrote university tests without doing any studying whatever at the university. And therefore, I strongly endorse this kind of a committee.

Just the last week I was invited to one of the special classes where teachers were being given additional instruction in teaching language in one of the colleges here in Winnipeg. This was a three-day course. It was sponsored I think by the Department of Education, and I think they did a wonderful job. They had some people out here from Dr. Eckhardt, I think it was Eckhardt was out - and Karl Fast another person, a teacher with the Department, a former teacher I should say. And so that this is being furthered, and I do appreciate it - and I'm sure there is many other people in Manitoba who do appreciate this. I don't know whether I should bring my own family into it, but certainly one of my daughters graduated last year from the University of Winnipeg, majoring both in English and German and came out with top honours - and as a result she visited Germany last year, and this certainly helps.

And especially with the world becoming smaller day by day; with the new improved facilities and communications that we have, the world is getting smaller day by day. And I think the more languages we acquire, the better for us, the richer we are. I think a person with only one language certainly is missing a lot, because if you know more than one language the additional language has so many things to offer, and sometimes the expressions that one can use in a second language and so on lend themselves so much more to a certain situation.

Then too this speaks of culture I would say, and I think we have a rich heritage - not only our people, but I am sure there is other groups in this House whose heritage is just as rich and probably more so yet than ours, because some of them are much much older and have been in existence much longer. And I feel that this is something very worthwhile; that with the museums that we see going up in this province and which are supported by provincial funds, I think it is well advised at this time to set up a committee and to give study - and also to bring in recommendations in my opinion as to how we can further multi-culturalism without diminishing from our official languages in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister shall be closing debate. The Honourable Minister.

HON. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs) (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the honourable member that took part in this debate. After listening to the remarks from the Honourable Member from Rhineland, I see it's quite clear that he understands what we are trying to do. And I certainly welcome his support and tell him that we are as concerned as he is - and I think he knows that - in trying to do something for these different groups.

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.)

The Honourable Member from Souris-Killarney took advantage of this debate of course to extol the beauties of the areas around this district and I think that this is quite permissible. I would like to tell him that I am looking forward to again this year visiting, in the official capacity visiting the Peace Gardens next Sunday.

The honourable member expressed concern - the members of the Advisory Committee on Tourism should certainly include people from the rural area, and I can assure him that this is certainly will be the case. There will be people from all across Manitoba and if this wasn't the case of course it wouldn't be any kind of an Advisory Committee on Tourism or anything else.

As far as my honourable friend from Roblin, I am rather surprised and disappointed. I've always felt him to be - whenever he was giving serious criticism, I'm not - he's had his fun like the rest of us during the Estimates and so on he's criticized but he's always offered constructive criticism. But I deplore the method that he used today, not to offer any kind of criticism at all, to try to use the actual tool that we're doing to unite our people and turn it against people and try to divide the people of Manitoba - unfortunately by dragging another bill that has nothing to do whatsoever with this at all. I think that if he had been listening and when I introduced Bill 49 he would have realized that I am not going to debate 49 at this time - that's going to come tonight I understand - he would have understood the reason why this was being done. This has nothing to do with this bill at all.

And he also mentioned the fact that so much money was spent federally for the French people and some for the other groups. This has nothing to do with this at all, and as he mentioned this is a federal matter anyway. I wish to assure him that this is we are not looking at this as a second-class citizen. He's talking about multi-culturalism. Multi-culturalism includes everybody in Manitoba, every single citizen of Manitoba, that is no matter what racial origin they might have.

And this bill is very simple. If the biggest criticism is that - and I don't know, I haven't verified this - I, as you know we have people who prepare these bills and it might be that the section is not numbered well, but if this is the biggest criticism that could be offered at this time on second reading when we are talking about principle well, it's not too serious, and I certainly don't intend to withdraw this bill to present it again because of that. The amendment could be made quite easily in Committee I'm sure.

Now it would appear that my friend is not satisfied - I don't know if he's speaking for his party or only for himself - that he opposed this bill. But this bill I think it should be quite clear, is very simple. I wanted to be in a position to set up, to name a couple of boards, advisory boards that I felt were needed. I think that probably any Minister can call somebody in and say, can you advise me on that - but I felt it should be something a little more important, a little more official than that. Under the present Act this was not - this right was not given to me and this is amending the Act of the department only by giving me, giving the Lieutenant-Governor power to set up an Advisory Committee on Tourism and an Advisory Committee on Multi-Culturalism and I say that my friend should have refrained from dragging in anything else. He should have been able to give us his comment on this. Is he against us naming an Advisory Committee on Tourism? People that will represent the province, that will assist us and help us with their advice to make sure that all the beauty of Manitoba here is - the people are aware of the beauty of Manitoba and that all parts of Manitoba can get a little part of the tourist industry.

And the other one as I say is a committee that I hope will be representative of all the different groups; all our people of Manitoba who will get together to discuss how best we could really not only pay lip service, but make sure that we have this Manitoba mosaic we're all talking about; and to see what we can do to help retain the different cultures of our native people and all our ethnic groups, including the French, including the Anglo-Saxons. So I would ask that before this vote is taken that this is what we're asking, just the right to name these two committees. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Bill No. 70, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I thank you. I respect the tongue lashing I just got from the Honourable Minister and I think he knows my position on that bill and my name is in the

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd.) . . . . record at any time. But I've become very concerned, Mr. Speaker - on that bill he wants boards and commissions; on this bill he doesn't want any boards or commissions. Now who is kidding who? --(Interjection)-- 70, right. I'm speaking . . .

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

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I'm speaking on Bill 70. If I heard the Honourable Minister correctly, Mr. Speaker, I just heard him say that he wants a new board and commission on the other bill, but on this bill he wants to scrap the Censor Board - and that becomes very difficult for me to resolve in replying to the two bills. And I'm well versed in some of the remarks that the Honourable Minister has made over his period as an MLA, and I think he believes in the Censor Board - but this bill dissolves the Censor Board, Mr. Speaker. And of course I would like the Honourable Minister to explain to the House how come on the one hand he wants two boards and commissions, and on this one he'd like to scrap one.

And of course I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, in this bill that the House and the press who are sitting up before us today, and all the members of the Legislature will be assistance to the Minister to try and help him create a Censor Board that will give us some stability in this province. And it's rather shocking to me today, Mr. Speaker, to go down around the newstands of our city and find some of the junk that's on the newstands today. I'm sure if you had the privilege of that experience, Mr. Speaker - and the Minister - he'd find it pretty shocking to what it was a few years back. It's unbelievable what I came across today.

However - and the restriction of course in the bill, Mr. Speaker, about children 18 is left to the discretion of the operator. My gosh, who wants to tell his customers you know, get the heck out. He's got a student at his door or a customer at his front office, and all of a sudden he's going to have to tell him to get with it because you're not old enough to see this film. Well my gosh, if I was operating a movie theatre I wouldn't drive a customer away from my door because of his age - and in this bill it appears that the Minister is asking the movie operators who operate the movie theatres to be the policemen for their theatres. And of course minors can be charged under the Juvenile Delinquency Act, but again I ask you what movie theatre operator is going to charge somebody for coming in to see a show because of his age? So we got the old birth certificate thing out with the picture on again. I think that the Honourable Member for Thompson brought that in with The Highway Traffic Act, and he ran into this road block of human rights. You know, has this Minister or has this government or this province the right or the jurisdiction to put people's pictures on a card and make them carry it around in their pocket to make them produce it on certain times and occasions. So I'm sure that the Minister will answer if he's met with the Human Rights people in this bill and give us some indication of whether in fact that they agree with that type of an approach to the disbandment of the Censor Board.

One section deals with the duty of the Examining Board, Mr. Speaker. I find again that this is - policy of this government is kind of wishy-washy. I find in this one they're striking out the word "shall" and they're substituting it for the word "may". I happened to look at a bill the other day, I think it was The Municipal Act No. 3 where it's the reverse. It was changed from "may" to "shall" and you know --(Interjection)-- It's the Welfare section.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. McKENZIE: It's Section 17 amended, but the words are "shall" and "may" and I'd like the Minister to answer how come that they want to change it this way in this Act; and the other Act is the complete reverse. And under The Municipal Act maybe he can get in touch with the Minister of Municipal Affairs and find out if government policy is "shall" or "may". The other one that has come up and I'd like the Minister to answer is, what's the difference between "uncensored" and "unclassified"? And I've asked a lot of people in the last two or three days when this bill came across my desk, is there any difference between the two words and they are used quite extensively in this bill, the words "uncensored" or "unclassified", and very few people would want to debate that at a public - well some members think that there is a difference, and no doubt the Minister will answer those kind of questions.

No doubt, Mr. Speaker, the problem of the censorship of movies is a difficult problem. It's been one that I'm sure the Minister has had some nightmares with and I think the government has had some nightmares with; the man on the street is having some problems with, but surely with the wisdom that we have around us in this day and age - and we can listen to the expertise of those people, that surely we can finally establish a sort of middle of the road policy that will satisfy the majority of the people in our province. No doubt the committee in the

(MR. MCKENZIE cont'd.) . . . . committee stage will certainly get the wisdom of a lot of people that will help the Honourable Minister resolve this.

Those are a few of the questions that come across me, Mr. Speaker, in reviewing this bill, and no doubt other sections will be dealt by other members. I think we agree with a lot of it, a lot of the sections of the bill, but the one censorship I find it very difficult for us to move from - on the one bill we're asking for a couple of boards and commissions and, Mr. Speaker, in this one the Minister is asking for us to scrap a board that has done a reasonably good job over the past.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move, seconded by the Member for Flin Flon, that the debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Just before you put the motion, I wonder if the Honourable Member for La Verendrye desires to speak at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BARKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I actually don't think I will need any more than the five minutes for what I have to say. I am very disappointed in this bill because I think it has absolutely no teeth to it. I am surprised that the Minister brings this type of a bill in that really doesn't give him even the authority, other than perhaps if too many things go wrong he can order or ask a peace officer to do certain things - but it really strips him of most of the powers that any Minister in most cases should have. And I was very disappointed to hear - there has perhaps been enough said about censorship. I think most of us are familiar to a great extent along what line these things take place, and I for one was very disappointed that this legislation did not go further. And I have a feeling that even the Minister himself must feel that this doesn't leave him with very much room to do anything about certain positions or situations that may come up.

I was just thinking while the Member for Roblin was speaking that about the worst penalty that can happen here - you start off with somebody having the right to say that if you are of the age of 18 - and it doesn't really matter what the - we can say a film or it could be in other directions - doesn't really matter what is going to take place because it hasn't been censored in the first place to any degree and all you do then is say, well you're age 18, now it's permissible. This is fine. Well if that same rule applied in the case of theft or robbery it's terrible, you're not supposed to do it - or other things. Well now you're 18, this is fine now - go right ahead. So I refer to that, I think that is an example on part of the principle of this bill that just leaves far too much room for some of the things that are not really needed or not really wanted by the average citizen. I know that there are people like my colleague here that may get certain types of joy out of certain things that I don't - but in the meantime, in the meantime I think there should be a limit to these things and I can't but agree with some of the others that there just isn't enough room even for the Minister; there just isn't enough room in this bill to stop some of the things that I don't think generally speaking the public really wants.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Colleges and Cultural Affairs, that the House do now adjourn and stand adjourned until - I mean Universities, Sir - the House do now adjourn and stand adjourned until 8:00 o'clock this evening.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 8:00 o'clock Tuesday evening.