

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, June 7, 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 41 students Grade XI standing of the Neelin High School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Jones and Miss Davidson. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Brandon East, the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

We also have 6 students of Grade IX standing of the Sansome Junior High School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Marshal Kushniruk. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

We have 5 students Grade XII standing of the Tech-Voc School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Gerald Johnson. This school is also located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

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

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions. Presenting Reports by Standing and Special . . .

MR. CLERK: The petition of Brian Jakobson and others praying for the passing of an Act to incorporate the Icelandic Festival of Manitoba or Islendingadagurinn Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports; Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Oral Questions. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Opposition) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. Has the First Minister or any other Minister of the Government communicated with any Minister of the Federal Government concerning possible delays of Manitoba Hydro proposals by reason of orders of the Federal Government pursuant to The Canada Water Act?

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I would have to - I would prefer to see the question in written form or to have enough time to ponder it in sufficient length. Offhand I would say that I am not aware that there's been any request or communication from the Government of Canada, any of its departments or agencies, that requests Manitoba Hydro to desist from any of its current plans and operations. If I have misconstrued the honourable member's question I suppose he will place a supplementary.

MR. SPIVAK: I assume that the First Minister has then taken the question as notice at this point. Well then, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I can address a question to the Attorney-General. Has the Attorney-General ordered any study or sought any opinion concerning the conflict between the Canada Water Act and the Manitoba Hydro Act or any other statute of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. A. H. MACKLING, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (St. James): No.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the other day the Member for Brandon West asked a question which was taken as notice as to whether or not there was any oil exploration activity on the Hudson Bay coast. The information that I can give the honourable member is that there are two companies with permit areas and that one of the two companies has definite plans to proceed with exploration in 1973.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. I wonder whether he can indicate to the House whether he has ordered or any governmental Minister has ordered a report from Manitoba Hydro to indicate the size and increase in hydro rates in the area served by City Hydro in the event that City Hydro were taken over by Manitoba Hydro and take into account the takeover arrangements proposed by the Chairman in his letter to the Unicity Council and possible increases in Manitoba Hydro power costs . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. The question is very complicated and

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.) lengthy, I am sure the honourable member could either rephrase it or have it written so it could be answered that way. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I will frame the question another way. Has the First Minister or members of government ordered a report dealing with the possible takeover of City Hydro by Manitoba Hydro and the potential increased costs to the users in the Winnipeg area?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, it would be more correct to say that the government has asked that analyses be made and that discussions and negotiations proceed with respect to the possible acquisition or integration or amalgamation of the two utilities. Certainly that would be an accurate summary of the direction that has gone out.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes. Another question to the First Minister. I wonder whether he can indicate whether such analysis was asked after the letter from Mr. Cass-Beggs was forwarded to the Unicity Council or before?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the analysis referred was requested to be made quite some time ago, not after the fact.

MR. SPIVAK: If there's a request from the Unicity Council for the Provincial Government to join in negotiations will the Provincial Government . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. The question is hypothetical. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Will the Provincial Government be prepared to negotiate with the Unicity Council directly on the possibility of the takeover of City Hydro?

MR. SPEAKER: The question is still a hypothetical one. The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

HON. RUSSELL DOERN (Minister of Public Works) (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, last week the Member for Portage asked me a question about the use of cars by the Human Rights Commission and I wish to inform him that they have one car assigned to them.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Since the icebreakers will remain idle as the strike continues at Montreal I wonder if the Minister could request that they be used to open the Port of Churchill at an earlier shipping date this year?

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

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, this is a very interesting and intriguing suggestion. I'll look into the matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I have another question for the First Minister. I wonder whether he can inform the House whether he has received the resignation of the Chief Executive Officer of Planning and Priorities?

MR. SCHREYER: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Municipal Affairs, I'm not sure whom. I wonder if the Minister who has been responsible can indicate to the House whether he had caused to be prepared the estimate of the cost of the current advertising program being conducted with respect to the Education Tax Rebate Program?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I assumed that one of the Ministers was prepared to answer that, if they're not then that's . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I do not take the assumption as being correct until a member rises. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance) (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, if I understood the question I might consider whether or not it is worthy of an answer.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: I'll direct the question to the Minister of Finance although I'm not sure that it's his Department. I have a copy of one of the ads in front of me. I'm asking whether his department, if his department is the one responsible - caused to be prepared an estimate of the cost of the advertising program informing the people of the Education Tax Credit Program.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: I believe that estimates have been prepared.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question then. I wonder if the Minister would inform the House the estimated cost.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: I should think that that's a proper matter to be brought by way of an Order for Return, a request for an order.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable the Minister of Health and Social Development. How does a community or a group of citizens who wish to establish a day care centre outside of Greater Winnipeg, how do they approach his Department and how do they qualify.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Development) (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, the application for such a facility can be made directly to my office and then be directed to the proper source where decisions can be taken.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister aware that an application has been made by a group from the City of Portage la Prairie and no answer has been received?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, many applications have been received for such grants and if an answer has not been forthcoming to Portage la Prairie it only means that the application itself is still under consideration.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health and Social Services. Has the Minister or his Department contemplated phasing out of training of nurses within the hospital system and to train the nurses at the Community Colleges?

MR. TOUPIN: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PATRICK: Supplementary. Is there any study under way at the present time to that effect?

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, there could be but not to my knowledge.

MR. L. R. (BUD) SHERMAN (FORT GARRY): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development. Does the Minister or any official of his Department have any plans to meet with Doctor Lionel Israels in an effort to save the Manitoba Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, by checking some of the questions that were directed to me by some members of the Press this morning and in checking with some officials within the Department of Health and Social Development, the Manitoba Health Services Commission, and with other Ministers of this Government, I am informed that the Cancer Research Foundation is not in need of being saved. It may be in need of a larger injection of funds by different levels of government and that can be considered.

MR. SHERMAN: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister conversant with the Foundation's position, that it doesn't need funds that it simply needs a green light to expand its facilities . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. The honourable member is debating the point. The Honourable Member for Charleswood. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Has the Minister been acquainted with any request from the Foundation for a green light to expand its facilities with its own money?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I'm well aware that the request of the Cancer Society is part of a freeze that was imposed by this government for reasons that are known to the members of this House, and it is actively being considered by the Committee of Cabinet that deals with these things as many others and the Cancer Society is well aware of this.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health and Social Development. Has his department been called to inspect the sad operation condition of the Charleswood sewage lagoon?

MR. TOUPIN: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I didn't get the gist of the question?

MR. MOUG: Has your department been asked to look into the sad operational condition of the Charleswood sewage lagoon?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I haven't received an up-to-date report on the situation there. There is certainly, you know, a joint responsibility pertaining to that type of situation between the Department of Health and Social Development and/or the Department of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management, and that can be dealt with. And equally Unicity is involved and a report could be forthcoming from them.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, another question to the Minister of Health and Social Development. With respect to the freeze on construction in the medical facilities area can the Minister advise when a thaw may be expected?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, as the honourable member well knows, there has been a partial thaw already. Some facilities have been given the go ahead since the freeze was imposed because we had terminated the studies that we had undertaken pertaining to those facilities and others are to come, and that is a matter for policy decision.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs, and relates to the Manitoba Housing Corporation. I wonder whether he can indicate whether the government has given the Manitoba Housing Corporation instructions to build rental units that will not be for people of low income groups but will compete in the regular market?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Selkirk): No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Supplementary question. I wonder if the Minister can indicate then why the Manitoba Housing Corporation is now negotiating with Unicity to try and rezone an area so that they can produce units which will compete but rather not be offered to low income groups?

MR. PAWLEY: I think that the honourable member should provide me with details and particulars rather than deal in such general questions in the House.

MR. SPIVAK: Well then I'll frame it another way. Has any authority been given to the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation to build units that would not be units available for low income groups?

MR. PAWLEY: As the honourable member must know, there is authority under the Act itself for this.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable member has had two supplementaries on housing. The Honourable Member for . . .

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder then if the Minister of Municipal Affairs can inform the House whether there has been a request by the Manitoba Housing Corporation to build units not for low income houses but for people who can rent in the normal way on the market?

MR. PAWLEY: If the honourable member would refer to a specific project then I could examine it in a specific way.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable the Attorney-General. Relates to the Toll Commission appointed by the Minister last year to investigate alleged cases of racial discrimination in the Brandon area. My question is has the Minister now received the report of the Toll Commission?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: No.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Inasmuch as the Committee completed its public hearings about two months ago would he care to speculate on when the House might have that report?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. No speculation is necessary for our procedure. The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. EARL MCKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. How many people who chose the Autopac time payment plan have yet to pay their second half premiums?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: The honourable member, I would like to thank him also for this, gave me notice of three questions yesterday. This was only one of the three. I wonder if he would like to read all three questions at the same time then probably I could answer the three together.

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

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I'll read two other questions. Second one is, do these people still have full insurance coverage and are they subject to any sort of penalty? The third question is, were all the notices mailed out in time to permit payment by the June 1st deadline?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, in regard to the first question in regard to the Autopac time payment plan, how many people, I would be unable to provide any answer to that question except to indicate to the honourable member that insofar as those that were due June 1, they're presently in the processes of batching microfilming, keypunching, computer and other processes that are involved at the Motor Vehicles Branch. I might say to the honourable member that there has been the normal type of response you would expect from those that were due on the 1st of June. Insofar as any that have not responded with payment of their premium, yes they do have insurance coverage. And insofar as the procedures or enforcement in regard to those that do not pay, they are spelled out in the regulations and I would undertake to provide the honourable member with copy of the appropriate regulations if he so desires.

Insofar as the notices being mailed, were they all mailed out on time, I've learned through bitter experience not to say, all, because there may be some that have not been mailed. I'm informed for example that upwards to three or four hundred have been returned due to changes in address, forwarding addresses have to be obtained, so that naturally those have not reached the appropriate person - incorrect addresses - and I'm sure that there are others that may not have received the notices in question of payments due. I would say to the honourable member that the public should rest assured that no action would be undertaken insofar as anybody that had not received a notice.

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 Agriculture. Does the government intend to bring in legislation at this session amending the legislation providing for 15 percent or \$300 maximum grant to farmers who apply for assistance for water and sewage installation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, this is a matter of policy but there is no policy determination at the present time nor do I expect any change in policy in the near future.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. JEAN ALLARD (Rupertsland): Mr. Speaker, last week I rose on a point of privilege at the request that my name be written in on the seating plans that are distributed for the visitors of this House. And since it was last week and this practice has been followed, you took it under advisement. I'm wondering whether you have made any decision on the subject as yet?

MR. SPEAKER: I would suggest the honourable member see me in private any time he wants to raise a question to me personally. The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. DOUGLAS J. WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to redirect a question to the Minister of Agriculture in regard to the report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture. And I ask him again, is it his intention to make a ministerial statement on this report and table the report, and if so, when?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I am of the understanding that the regular rules of the House bring about the tabling of those reports. It does not come under the jurisdiction of any Minister in particular.

MR. WATT: I redirect the question or supplementary question then. Is the rules of the House governing the Minister of Agriculture on bringing this report into the House and making a statement or is he afraid to make a statement?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The question is argumentative and out of order. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Attorney-General. I can wait. I wonder if the Attorney-General has received the Warden's report of the recent confrontation at the Headingly Jail?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: No, Mr. Speaker, I don't anticipate receiving the Warden's report. I anticipate receiving a report from my department who have been instructed to carry out whatever investigation is necessary.

MR. BILTON: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder when that investigation has taken place if it is the intention of the Attorney-General to submit the report to the House for its edification?

MR. MACKLING: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BILTON: Another supplementary question. May I ask the Attorney-General if it is the intention of the government to charge those responsible for the damage concerned?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, it is the intention of the Attorney-General and his department to study the recommendations that are made as a result of the investigation and then act accordingly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Arthur on a number of occasions has enquired about the report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture and I just want to advise him that that report had been tabled some weeks if not months ago for his benefit.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to answer a question put by the Member for Arthur, and that is whether financial support has been withdrawn with respect to our weed control program throughout Manitoba. The answer to that is no, that the money was redirected but within the weed control program.

Another question raised by the Member for Churchill is whether or not the new hopper cars, whether they would be able to handle grain into the Port of Churchill, whether they are built in such a way as to fit in with the facility. The answer is that apparently there seems to be no problem in that connection, that they could be used for the Port of Churchill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): A subsequent question to that. I wonder if these hopper grain cars are going to be confined to Canada in moving farm products during the rush season? And secondly, could the fertilizer hopper cars be used on the same basis during their off-season?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I really am not familiar with the way these cars are designed. I don't think I can answer the question. I think the Member for Churchill can find out just as easy as I can.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Health and Social Services in connection with an article in the Winnipeg Free Press of June 6 titled "Therapeutic Abortion Rates Soaring and Strain on Facilities Critical". This refers to the General Hospital. Is the government doing anything or are they contemplating doing anything in providing facilities for sterilization operations in this . . . ?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I am informed by officials within my department that such facilities are available today and we do not have at this stage the contemplated additional facilities apart from those that are on-stream already.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, in light of the statement that the Minister has just made about the withdrawal of support from the province to weed control in the Province of Manitoba, I'd like to ask him if his statement can be used to all the weed control districts who have contacted me indicating that weed control insofar as perennial and deep rooted weeds has been withdrawn?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, again for the benefit of the Member for Arthur, I did indicate that there was a change in the program; funds allocated for weed control remain but provide for weed district supervisors and assistants, but not directly towards the control of the weeds themselves - chemical control.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Could the Minister inform the House as to whether or not any of the machinery in the John Bertram Plant at The Pas has been sold, and if so, who to?

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

MR. EVANS: I am not in a position to advise the House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister take the question as notice?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'll look into the matter, yes.

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

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would mind calling the adjourned debate on second reading of Bill No. 55. The adjournment is in the name of the Honourable Member for Emerson. --(Interjection)-- He's not here? I'm wondering whether the House Leader of the Opposition could indicate whether somebody else may be speaking in his stead.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I was just about to indicate that there would be someone else prepared to go in his place on the conclusion of those remarks. Unless there was someone else who wished to speak the adjournment would stay in the name of the Member for Emerson unless he returns to the House.

MR. PAULLEY: I don't think there's any objection to that, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: May we proceed. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I rise on this debate not to repeat the arguments that have been presented already with respect to the Education Tax Credit Program as proposed by the government, but rather to reply to some of the remarks that have been made by the Minister of Finance in his presentation.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I do request of all the honourable members that they contain themselves and that the undertones don't war with the overtones, so I can hear what the honourable member has to say. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, I rise to reply to the Minister of Finance's presentation on Bill 55 and to deal with some of the advertising that is now taking place in the Wolseley byelection dealing directly with this and the advertising being paid at the public expense to inform those people of the benefits that will be given to them as a result of the program.

Mr. Speaker, I must say that I guess the government could receive commendation for making people aware of the benefits of programs that they can take advantage of. But I am one who believes that if you're going to do it on one occasion you should be consistent, and I am not aware, Mr. Speaker, of any attempt on the part of the government to inform those people who are potential recipients of assistance programs through the Department of Health and Social Development, at any given time receiving the same kind of benefit that is now being conferred on the general public by way of information being communicated to them about what their rights are or the advantages that they could receive as a result of a particular program of government. So I find it rather strange but very logical because of the period of time that we're in, at this particular time to recognize that the government has now decided to spend the taxpayers' money to tell them about programs that they can benefit from, and can do it in a way which possibly would and could influence a result in the byelection.

We objected, Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Finance introduced his Budget to some of the statements that he made about the Income Tax Credit Program. We suggested then, and we still maintain, that he was overstating the benefits that would flow from this plan to the taxpayers of Manitoba. The Minister heard our arguments at the time, he had an opportunity to go over figures and although he has not yet replied to them, I would hope that in the debate on this bill he will try to bring forward a revised estimate of the likely total impact of this plan, because it's our conclusion that it's nowhere near what is suggested. It is outlandish as some of the statements that have been prepared by the New Democratic Party for their candidate in the Provincial byelection in Wolseley.

The Minister originally told the House the plan represented a shift of some \$28 million. We suggest that his estimate was rather larger than the true impact of this plan and we hope he will clarify the matter for us because it seems obvious the total impact of the income tax credit on the taxpayer must be one of the factors we all use in this House in evaluating its merit. If as we suggest, the original estimate was high that does not of course, Mr. Speaker, automatically mean that the plan is without merit. It means merely that all members of this House ought to be informed of the most accurate possible projections of its impact as a part of this second reading consideration. Even while doubts remain about the total dollar impact of the plan, it is possible, however, for us to make some comments about the plan, to express what we hope members opposite will accept as legitimate doubts and questions.

Mr. Speaker, first I'd like to remark about a very interesting fact about the government's posture. In the Throne Speech we were promised a tax shift. In the Budget Speech the Minister

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) described it as a tax rebate and a tax reform. Now as we consider this bill we are told it is a tax cut. Well, Mr. Speaker, we prefer the wording of the Throne Speech. We are treating this proposal as a tax shift, and insofar as it has its intention the removal of some portion of the burden of education from the real property tax base, we can even acknowledge that it has the potential of being a good and humane step. We can agree that education costs must be removed as far as is possible from real property. But, Mr. Speaker - and now I must say some things that our friends in the Press Gallery will describe as getting back to normal.

Mr. Speaker, we must state that this attempt, and of course we accept that it is a real and sincere attempt, is not in itself enough. We must state something that the Minister of Finance himself knows; that we can hope for no remedies for problems resulting from excessive taxation without also addressing ourselves to the problem that government spending in all sectors is growing faster than the real income of the people of Manitoba. So long as that is true, Mr. Speaker - and I know my friend the Minister knows this and has tried to impress it upon his colleagues - so long as that is true we can hope for no real relief. All we can do is change the bookkeeping a little from time to time. We can say, let's change things so our failure to control spending will attack the economic position of group A instead of group B just for a while.

When he first proposed this nonsense we granted him a charity of conceding that he merely had made a blunder. We did not charge direct deception or dishonesty, only incompetence. Were we too generous? What can we say now? He's back with the same plan, he's back with the same discredited numbers. What can we now assume to dull the edge of our disgust? Can the blazing heat of the last two weeks and the weeks of the Budget debate have left him sun-struck? How can we speak in parliamentary language of what really is a monstrous deception. A tax cut, Mr. Speaker, a tax cut; even that lamentable excuse for a Throne Speech with all its weaknesses, confusion and downright misrepresentation, did not go that far. It spoke of a tax shift. We suspected a tax shift but nothing so gross as what is being proposed. And now it is called a tax cut. A tax cut, Mr. Speaker; just think of this. A government which squanders our wealth, like Farouk, talks of a tax cut. The government which has increased spending by \$300 per capita in just three years talks of a tax cut. The government which is even today increasing spending at the rate of \$3 million a week talks of a tax cut. This plan won't change the fact that every working day the costs of government in Manitoba rise by about \$600,000. The last year the provincial government spent about \$570 million per capita. This year's spending has risen to about \$670 million per capita, and this includes the \$95 million tucked away in the Capital Estimates. The increase is about \$150 million for this year, Mr. Speaker. The rate of increase is just under \$3 million a week, just under \$600,000 for every working day. The daily increase is just about \$1.50 for every working Manitoban on every working day. But we can still agree about the need to shift costs from real property. And let us consider it in that context. Let us once more review the problem which Bill 55 purports to solve. Since the Minister has so little understanding of numbers and since he thinks statistics and quantifications are more toys to play with let us perform this review with as few numbers as possible.

In 1958 the education system of Manitoba was seen as inadequate. Major changes were undertaken, teacher salaries were raised, new schools were built, a set of technical vocational schools were designed and over the years built and placed in operation. The University of Manitoba was vastly expanded and subdivided into three universities. All of this was expensive. The cost of the primary and secondary systems in particular placed a heavy and growing burden on the real property taxpayer. Year by year the contributions from other tax sources had to be increased. In addition in 1964 the school tax rebate idea was tried. It didn't work very well, Mr. Speaker. The concept of taxing incomes, sales and so on to raise revenues while simultaneously taxing property then reducing the weight of property taxes by paying back 50 or 100 dollars to each real property taxpayer is cumbersome, slow and expensive, and obviously more direct reduction systems work better. --(Interjection)-- The Honourable Member for Radisson says vote against it. He should know that when the last tax rebate was brought into this House, the New Democratic Party voted against it.

A MEMBER: Right.

MR. SPIVAK: So, Mr. Speaker, three years later, a revised system - including the First Minister - and so three years later a revised system of financing was introduced which simply substitutes funds from general revenues for real property tax revenues. An exemption was offered for farm and residential property. The idea was to continue to increase the

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) contribution from general revenues year by year until all costs of education were removed from farms and homes. The plan was lost when the government changed. Rising costs of uncontrolled expenditures in other fields soaked up the surplus in the general revenues and even forced tax increases. The growth and contribution from the general revenue was less than the growth in total costs and so school boards have had to increase special levies on all real property. The taxpayer sees the bill once a year, if he owns property, and once a month if he rents, and the increase, Mr. Speaker, is substantial. Some can afford to pay, some cannot. Senior citizens generally cannot; farmers generally cannot. Their incomes are fixed and inflation erodes them.

Now we have Bill 55. What should Bill 55 accomplish? What is the answer to education costs? Does Bill 55 provide the answer? The needs are simple. The solutions are not very glamorous. The solutions do not involve cheques payable to individual taxpayers. No gimmicks are needed, what we need is cool-headed, intelligent financial administration. And that need can be outlined in five points:

Point 1. Control the costs of government. Mr. Speaker, control the costs of government. Provide fiscal elbow room to allow the Minister of Finance enough money to meet the increases in education costs. An appropriate redress of this balance would be achieved by a cut in spending of about \$30 million.

Point No. 2. Disallow the taxation of farmlands for education purposes. Farm incomes have been falling, not rising. The farmer has been on a declining net income for several years. Obviously he cannot meet the inflating costs of education.

Point 3. Relieve the senior citizens of the cost of education. Exempt education taxes for senior citizens up to about \$300. Where education taxes are higher than \$300 on homes of a senior citizen, he obviously has resources which will allow him to meet some of the costs.

Point 4. Increase the allocation of funds from the general revenue to the public school finance board sufficiently to cover the revenue losses deriving from lifting the tax on farmland and on homes and apartments used by senior citizens. The two in combination would cost about 19 to \$20 million.

Point 5. Provide general tax relief to other taxpayers by either reducing income taxes by 10 percent and removing the new \$12 million sales tax for a total relief of about \$26 million; or further increase the allocation of funds to the Public School Finance Board by \$25 million to allow for a vast reduction, in fact almost elimination of education taxes on residential property.

Now the latter alternatives - we favour Plan A, an income tax and sales tax cut; but there is some merit in Plan B, a general cut in property taxes. The relative merits of A and B are still debatable, Mr. Speaker, and that's what we should be debating in this House right now, not a proposal as a gimmick to win votes now and next year.

Well, Mr. Speaker, my friends opposite are so far from accepting either of the proposals that I guess there's really no opportunity or no point in debating them. Let's compare their proposal, Bill 55, to ours. Does Bill 55 reduce taxes? It does not. Does Bill 55 reflect a control in expenditures? No, Mr. Speaker, it does not. Does it provide tax relief? Of course not. It provides only for the Minister of Finance to do two things and just two things, Mr. Speaker. He may borrow in this fiscal year against next year's revenue; his income tax estimates show a major increase this year, and then he says he is cutting taxes. Well nonsense, Mr. Speaker, all tax revenues are up. Secondly, it allows the Minister of Finance to send a cheque to every family in Manitoba sometime next May or June and he calls it a rebate - and Mr. Speaker, we call it deceit. He will send the taxpayer - and of course his problem is that the Minister of Finance in Ottawa may say "no, I'm going to send it", and they haven't been able to resolve that yet - and I think I'm correct in that and I have some information on that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance on a matter of privilege.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well it's not a question of interpretation, it's a question of statement. I think that when I introduced the bill I made it clear that the tax credit would be based as a reduction of income tax payable or a refund made by the Federal Government Department of National Revenue I presume.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I have had a great deal of opportunity to spend time to understand fully what is taking place with respect to the province, the Federal Government and to other provinces who have attempted this - and I'm satisfied that my interpretation is a correct one. Mr. Speaker, --(Interjection)-- I know, you may be able to do it, you're still trying.

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) It's unfortunate that the Federal Government isn't going to allow you to do it. They would like to take the credit that you would like to take but what you're really trying to do is to send a cheque to every family in Manitoba some time next May or June, and you're going to call it a rebate. We'll call it deceit; you'll send taxpayers back a little of his own money, a little money which was taxed away from him and he will send back far less - and I'm now referring to the Minister of Finance through whatever means he determines, Mr. Speaker, then the increases in taxes that have been paid. Well when will he send it, Mr. Speaker. Just in time for a May or June election; just in time to spread confusion - and, Mr. Speaker, when we talk in terms of shallow deception we have to repeat, it is shallow deception. It is a fiscal sleight of hand and it's clumsy; it's an amateurish way of trying to bribe the people with their own money.

Mr. Speaker, to see how this ruse will be represented we've only to look at the childish deceit practiced by the New Democratic Party in the campaign in Wolseley - and I have a pamphlet which shows cash and which says: "What does Ed Schreyer's school tax reduction mean to you?" Well, Mr. Speaker, the answer is very simple; it means cash, and I believe that the Minister of Finance's department has worked out a million dollars which is now being represented by the candidate. Well, Mr. Speaker, cash - whose cash? Our cash. The taxpayer's paying more, Mr. Speaker, for the cash that is supposed to be going back. Consider the first statement: "Ed Schreyer's school tax reduction" "Ed Schreyer's school tax reduction". What reduction? Are school taxes to be diminished? Are costs to be reduced? Of course not, Mr. Speaker. There is no reduction, only a promise that the Minister of Finance will continue to rob Peter to pay Peter. But the pamphlet is a long one, Mr. Speaker and I won't bore you with all of it - just ask you to consider one more statement. The statement of blatant dishonesty, of blatant dishonesty on the part of the government - and the statement says: "The total cost of this program is being paid by the New Democratic Party government". Mr. Speaker, the statement says: "The total cost of this program - 12 to \$14 million - is being paid by the New Democratic Party government". Now, Mr. Speaker, are we to believe that my honourable friends have found a money mine. I don't think so, Mr. Speaker, the statement is utter nonsense and garbage. The true statement would be that the total cost of this program including the high cost of administration is being paid by you, the taxpayers. We like - this is the government - we like playing with your money.

Well, Mr. Speaker - and this is of course another ad - and the Honourable Minister of Finance has indicated he has an estimate of what it would cost. He's not prepared to tell you what it will cost. Well I'm not sure that tax change you can pocket. And as I said to the Honourable Minister, when I think of how many people, how many people in this province who are in dire need of assistance but who have no knowledge of the way in which they can receive assistance in this province, are denied that right because the government has not been prepared to go out and to solicit and to in fact advertise so those people who require assistance would be in a position to do it. When I try to compare that with the bribe that is offered and the money that is spent of the taxpayers' money in Wolseley and outside, I think I have to say - fine, you consider yourself politicians, you are politicians - but don't try and put a little halo around your heads because you literally are doing absolutely nothing for the taxpayer. And I must tell you and I say again that the deception is not winning, and you know it's not winning - and it's not going to win any converts in Wolseley, and I assure you it's not going to win any converts in Manitoba as well. Because the public are not that stupid, the public are not that stupid to be misled by the attempt to put your hands in their pockets and take out their money and then give it back to them and say that you're playing God. --(Interjection)--

Well, Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Finance made his presentation he finished - and I recall he finished when he said he was proud; he was proud when he presented his budget; he was proud when he presented Bill 55; we'll see how proud he'll be on June 16th. He's proud of what? And that's a perplexing question, Mr. Speaker. What is he proud of? But he spoke of timing; he spoke of how the taxpayer would get his so-called tax relief in about 12 months and that must be the source of his pride. He thinks he's carved a plank for an election platform and, Mr. Speaker, the voters of Manitoba will likely, but not necessarily, have to walk the plank before the wheat ripens in 1973 or in 1974. But consider this, Mr. Speaker, tax bills will arrive at most homes in Manitoba soon. Some may already be there. The time to cut taxes is passed; taxes should have been cut in February at the latest; but they have not been cut and they will not be cut so long as this spendthrift, extravagant, and incompetent government

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) clings to power. Mr. Speaker, taxes will be cut when spending is cut; taxes will be reformed when spending is cut. When a tax cut comes it will be easily recognized by the people; it will not be cloaked in subterfuge or announced like the gimmick advertising of a soap company. It will come openly.

And a tax cut will come, Mr. Speaker. It will come when the Progressive Conservative Party forms the next government and comes to power; it will occur after the next general election; and, Mr. Speaker, the date of the election is announced by the timing of the cheques to be brought forward with respect to this program, and that date will be either May or June of 1973 or May or June of 1974. And so, Mr. Speaker, what we on this side believe with respect to the Minister is that we have to express contempt for his belief that the people of Manitoba and the people in Wolseley will be fooled by a clumsy attempt to bribe them with their own money in a program that does little to actually meet the basic needs of people today - to try and control government spending and to allow them to have a greater control of their own resources rather than have government continually encroach, encroach and take more and more of the resources because they themselves as government believe they know better. And, Mr. Speaker, I must say, Mr. Speaker, I must say that the people realize that the government does not know better because the government that is in disarray across from us in this House, Mr. Speaker, are incapable of arriving or making the kinds of decisions with respect to current matters today and matters from the future that will allow them to be able to carry on.

Mr. Speaker, there could have been significant tax cuts given to the people of Manitoba. The government failed; it failed because it was not prepared to do the very difficult task, the task that would have required their energy and their determination and their will to examine government programs and to cut it and to reduce those programs that have no cost benefit and to in fact eliminate programs that are not worthy of government today. Instead they took the easy route and devoted themselves to a whole range of problems that seem to them to be significant and important - but I would suggest to the people in Manitoba are not that important - and now they want to hide behind the cloak of an attempt to bribe the people with their own money and, Mr. Speaker, on June 16th, they're going to see that it has not worked.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member permit a question? How does this plan proposed here differ from that of Ontario's?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Again I must indicate to honourable members that questions of clarification are allowed. Questions which will open up further debate should not be entertained.

. . . . continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Osborne.

MR. IAN TURNBULL (Osborne): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for giving me the opportunity to join the debate immediately after the fast talking and cherubic cream-puff who represents River Heights. It is always amusing to me, Mr. Speaker, -- I realize that the Leader of the Opposition seems always to run out of the House when I rise to speak following his presentation to the House, Mr. Speaker, and I don't expect that he'll stay long today either -- but I always find it amusing, Mr. Speaker, to listen to the Leader of the Opposition address the House on a major bill or a major topic such as the Throne Speech, I find it amusing because he seldom seems to be able to rise to the heights of debate that are necessary without a detailed type-written pre-prepared script in front of him. I think that that, Sir, demonstrates the kind of absence of leadership qualities that the Leader of the Opposition has displayed here. When he does speak extemporaneously, he usually puts his foot in his mouth and labels bills or measures with adjectives and terms that hardly describe the measure that he is attempting to criticize.

I was amused too, Mr. Speaker, when he was on his feet with the pamphlet that the New Democratic Party is using in the by-election in Wolseley. It was the pamphlet that he held up and said was a deception because it said that there was to be cash for the homeowner. Now I might point out to the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, that although he may wish to represent to the House his own ideological preconceptions, his own idea of free enterprise and its virtues, that he hardly understands the tax credit plan if he thinks that the homeowners in Wolseley are going to receive money in the mail. But I might point out to him, Sir, that for the pensioners and for those on low incomes in Wolseley and in my own constituency, if they do receive next year a credit of \$140 or \$100 or \$80 or \$50 that's a hell of a lot more than they would have received if the Leader of the Opposition had been in the Premier's seat.

I think I might point out to you, Mr. Speaker, I think I might point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that when the Leader of the Opposition claimed that this plan - the education property tax rebate plan - was outlandish, he spoke truer than he thought. Because many of the people in my own constituency do believe, do believe that if the Tory government had been in power they would never have seen a reduction in tax. They think it is outlandish to have a government representative come to the door and say, you know you are going to receive 50 percent of your school taxes back this year up to a maximum of \$50, and depending on your income you're going to receive up to \$140 back next year. They think that is outlandish because they've never heard of property taxes going down in the Province of Manitoba. And I say to you, Sir, that although the Leader of the Opposition would like the people of Manitoba to think that this education property tax plan is one which will not in fact put money into their pocket, the plan will do exactly that.

I know, Sir, that the Leader of the Opposition has some difficulty in making a case against this education property tax rebate plan. It is extremely difficult to criticize the plan, and certainly when our party caucused the idea of bringing about a school property tax rebate, and the plan was discussed in general terms, many of the backbenchers did have difficulty in finding a loophole or a basis for criticizing the plan. And I'm sure that the Leader of the Opposition and those two or three competent members in the Conservative Party opposite have difficulty in criticizing the plan. The fact is, Sir, that many governments in Manitoba -- I'm sorry, many governments in Canada -- and perhaps, just perhaps, a Tory government in Manitoba might have introduced a similar scheme. It must be very difficult for the Leader of the Opposition to stand, being a member of the Conservative Party, and criticize a plan which this government is introducing in Manitoba, a plan which is similar to the plan introduced by the Conservative Government of Ontario. How does a leader of a Conservative Party criticize what his colleagues in the Conservative Party are doing in a province adjoining ours? It is extremely difficult for him to do so. And therefore, Sir, the Leader of the Opposition resorts to the kind of adjectives, the kind of name-calling that really is not becoming a Leader of a major party in this province.

But I was glad, though, Sir, that he did not today get down to specifics as he did on the Throne Speech debate. Because if you recall then, Sir, he did get to specifics and I think every figure that he gave to the House practically was incorrect. And I said then that the Leader of the Opposition was guilty of gross misrepresentation and I'll say again, Sir, that the Leader of the Opposition and every member of the Conservative Party who stands on his feet and makes the kind of statements he does, or attempts to misconstrue the detailed figures, is making misrepresentation to the House and is attempting to confuse the people of Manitoba.

MR. TURNBULL cont'd) Now I agree that they must do this. Some people would maintain that this is the role of the Opposition, that they have to criticize regardless of how good a government program is. But I would like them, Sir, to be able to criticize it in a way that would have meaning, in a way that could be constructive, in a way that they might even be able to get some amendments to the bill.

So I was glad, Sir, that he stayed away from specific figures, because if he got into the details I'm sure he would have made those kinds of high school errors in arithmetic that we saw when he addressed us on the Throne Speech debate. It certainly must be difficult to criticize this government's plan when the Ontario Government has introduced a property tax credit plan this year in the Province of Ontario. I would like to read -- for the edification of members opposite, I'm reading the Conservative Government's budget address for 1972, a document which I commend to them as one which not only outlines in a general way the kind of plan that the Provincial Government of Manitoba has introduced, but also presents some of the idea of a Progressive Conservative Government. And I would emphasize, Sir, that it is a Progressive Conservative Government in Ontario and not the kind of reactionary party that we have opposite us today. And I'm reading from page 12 of the budget, of the Ontario budget, and it says here, Sir, and I'm quoting: "The Ontario Government will introduce this year a property tax credit plan which relates to the property tax burden borne by each taxpayer in Ontario to his ability to pay as determined under the personal income tax system. For three years Ontario has pressed the Federal Government to incorporate a credit against property taxes within the basic income tax system. Now, the Federal Government has agreed to administer this plan beginning with the 1972 taxation year and the Ontario Government will finance it for the benefit of Ontario taxpayers."

Now I would just like to dwell for the moment on the idea of a property tax credit system based on the ability-to-pay because that's the system that has been introduced, or will be introduced when this Bill 55 is passed, in the Province of Manitoba, and it is, Sir, a progressive system of taxation. For the edification again of the members opposite, who I gather if they vote against Bill 55 are in favour of a regressive tax system. That is a flat system of taxation that would be imposed on everybody regardless of their income. And we've seen that the members opposite when they were the government of this party in 69 do in fact favour a regressive system of taxation, for how regressive, how reactionary was the medical care premium system imposed on the people of Manitoba in 1968 by the previous administration? That was regressive, and I gather, Sir, if they vote against Bill 55 they also want a regressive system of property tax rebate.

We've seen, we've heard rather, Sir, today the Leader of the Opposition stand in his place and say that every person in Manitoba who is a senior citizen, a pensioner should receive the abolition - I believe it was - of his school property tax, that they should be eliminated. I would like to say, Sir, that that too is, in effect, Sir, a regressive system of taxation. It would be a system of taxation that would enable all those who had pensions of \$1,000 a month, as some do, to receive a complete refund of their school tax system. And also, Sir, the old age pensioner living on canned soup and bread and tea in a crummy basement apartment, he too would get a rebate of his school property taxes; that obviously, Sir, he would benefit somewhat from such a scheme but I think that the introduction of that kind of scheme would mean that taxes would have to be levied on many other people who are also living on low incomes, who are also living on a minimum of good food, who also had poor accommodation, they in turn would have to pay into the revenues of Manitoba the amount of money that would be refunded to those who had adequate income to pay the school taxes that are levied in this province.

I don't think, Mr. Speaker, really that one can argue for or against the education property tax plan, Bill 55, on the basis of ideology. It really isn't, Sir, an argument that can be debated on the basis of free enterprise versus social democracy. It might be argued on the basis of conservatism versus progressivism, I suppose. But really, Sir, when we're talking about school tax rebates, we're talking about the little people that live in my constituency, in the constituency of Logan, the constituency of Churchill, the constituency of Rhineland, we're talking about those little people that I, for example, spoke to the other night when I was talking to people in my constituency. A woman who at age 62 had been relieved of her employment by her employer - good old free enterprise, Mr. Speaker - had been dismissed at the age of 62 without any pension, without any benefits at all and was required to pay school taxes in the neighbourhood of \$475 a year, and said to me, Sir, -- and this is just last week, not back in 69

(MR. TURNBULL cont'd) that I'm talking about -- and said to me, Sir, that she didn't know which way she was going to have to turn, she didn't know how she was going to be able to keep her house, the roof needed repair, the garage was coming apart at the seams, it's 40 years old, and she said to me, Sir, and -- (Interjection) -- and there, Sir, and there, Sir, and there, Sir, is the difference between me and the ass from Charleswood, because when you mention, when you mention in this House about individuals who are suffering from regressive taxation, who are paying excessive taxes as a result of five percent sales tax, for example, raised and pumped into Swiss banks then you get the kind of idiocy from the Member for Charleswood that we just heard. The kind of hard-hearted lack of compassion, the kind of hard-hearted lack of compassion that is so typical of the reactionary and regressive Conservative Party of Manitoba.

I see now, Sir, I see now, I finally realize, Sir, why the Leader of the Opposition leaves this House when I speak, because he knows when I speak that those dimwits from Charleswood will get up and utter - or maybe they won't even get up - they will utter those idiotic remarks, those hard cold remarks from their seats that he the Leader of the Opposition would be ashamed of, and it's because of his shame, Sir, of his backbench that he leaves this House. That obviously is the reason.

There are times, Mr. Speaker, there are times, Mr. Speaker, when one can pass aside heckling, when one cannot pay any attention to remarks uttered by the members of the Opposition, but there are times, Mr. Speaker, when I think one should call a spade a spade, when one should say that the Member for Charleswood is lacking in compassion for those individuals who don't happen to be as successful as he is. And I'll say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the other day when I spoke, being provoked by the Member for Morris to enter the debate as a private member on the Estimates of the Department of Municipal Affairs, that the Member for Fort Garry at that time got up and manufactured a case, manufactured a case saying that my remembrance of the Public Utilities Committee meeting to consider Bill 55 recalled only, only the attempted slur of a private citizen by the members of the Opposition and by the members of the automobile insurance industry of this province. And he manufactured a case, Sir, saying that I lacked compassion for the agents. Well, Sir, I don't lack compassion. I'm in far too close contact with the members of my constituency to lack compassion. I spend too much time calling on people in my constituency, old age pensioners and low income people, to lack compassion. I have great compassion, Mr. Speaker, I have great compassion even for members of the auto insurance industry, even for auto insurance agents, Mr. Speaker, until they begin to call me names, as they did during the Public Utilities Committee. Until they demonstrate that kind of lack of regard for the ordinary citizen as was just demonstrated by the Member for Charleswood, until they come to me, Mr. Speaker, and say that we are some kind of totalitarian regime introducing wild measures; then, Sir, I truly lose my compassion for them that accuse me thus. Yes, Sir. And then, Sir, I am in full support of Autopac and I am in full support of education property tax rebate such as we have before us today.

I'm glad, Mr. Speaker, that we have such nincompoops in the back bench of the Opposition of the Conservative Party because when they utter those words, Mr. Speaker, I become hardened in my resolve to support this government to run again and again, so that we can introduce legislation which will gradually reduce school taxes in the Province of Manitoba to the point where all those on low incomes and even medium incomes will be able to benefit. So I'm glad, Mr. Speaker, that we have the calibre, the calibre of Opposition that we have in this House, a calibre that even makes the Leader of the Opposition ashamed to stay here to hear what they have to say.

Now I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that we have seen at least a progressive liberal party, and while I, as a party man myself have some difficulty in uttering these next few words, I must say that I must commend the Member for Assiniboia who the other day when speaking on this Bill 55 was able to say that he intended to vote for it.

I might point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Assiniboia has a Leader outside of this House who is reputed to be a tax expert; and as I have often accused the Member for Assiniboia in the past as being one of those who perhaps is voicing the ideas and programs of that Leader in this House, I must be consistent and commend both the Member for Assiniboia and Mr. Asper for their support of Bill 55. I hope, Sir, that they are doing it out of

(MR. TURNBULL cont'd) conviction and not out of the feedback that they've got in Wolseley Constituency from those individuals there who can't yet believe that they're actually going to get 50 percent of their school taxes back this summer up to a maximum of \$50 and are going to get \$140 maximum less one percent of the taxable income back next year.

However, Mr. Speaker, Bill 55 if passed, would I think be beneficial not only to property taxpayers, school property taxpayers in Manitoba, but it will also be beneficial, as I said before, to the economy as a whole. And the reason for this, Mr. Speaker, is a rather basic economic principle, two basic economic principles which I attempted to point out to the Leader of the Opposition when he spoke on the Throne Speech, when I sent over to him a copy of a second year Economics text by one Mr. Samuelson with the recommendation that he read certain passages. I gather from what the Member for River Heights had to say today that he couldn't read those passages. Simply stated, Sir, if taxes are given back to those people with the lowest income they tend to spend the money that they get in that manner; and when they spend the money there is a multiplier effect developed in the economy and therefore the money they get back and spend has a greater impact on economic development, economic prosperity, than would a similar amount of money given by the government to other sectors of the economy.

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, what I said then, and I'm quoting this article, "that money put in the hands of low income residence is more effective in stimulating the economy than tax incentive given to business." I think that after I made those remarks, the Leader of the Opposition, or one of the members opposite, I don't even think it was one of the three competent members opposite, had to say that obviously I didn't know what I was talking about, obviously they being businessmen knew that if money was given to businessmen that would be more beneficial to the economy than money given to low income people. Well, Sir, once again they know not what they speak of because they no sooner said in this House that the money that we're giving back to the low income people should have been given to businessmen and that would have developed or stimulated economy more, they'd no sooner said that then there was an article in the Globe and Mail, the general import of which was critical of the Ontario Government's plan for giving monies to business. And I'd like to read, Sir, from the Globe and Mail of May of this year: "The Ontario Government has reversed a five year old policy and stopped giving forgivable loans for economic development to foreign controlled corporations." And it goes on to say, Mr. Speaker, that John White the Ontario Minister of Tourism and Industry in the Ontario Legislature said that he thought that it was impossible to determine accurately whether or not these incentives given to business were productive. He, Sir, was critical of his own program in the Ontario Legislature. And I think, I need not, surely, for members of the Conservative Party of Manitoba quote to them a more reputable source than a member of their own party who's on the front bench of the Ontario Government, to refute for them the argument that they gave us about the need for giving incentives to business. Business incentives, Sir, have their place but they are not necessarily more or even as effective as tax rebates to low income people such as we have in the Education Property Tax Rebate Plan contained in Bill 55.

Well, Sir, I think that the members of the Conservative Party can if they've got the internal fortitude which certainly their bluster would indicate that they have, that they should vote against Bill 55. I would like them to do that, Mr. Speaker; because at least then, Sir, they would be being consistent with their belief that taxation should be regressive, that taxation should be levelled on all regardless of their ability to pay. I would like them, Sir, to vote against the bill so that they can support their Leader's accusation that this bill is a hoax or a blunder, which of course was his first reaction to Bill 55, his first visceral reaction - visceral seems to be a common term these days - his first visceral reaction to Bill 55 was to say it was a hoax or a blunder. Well let them support him, let them vote against Bill 55 so that I can go back to the old age - I'm sorry to that woman who is 62 years old in my constituency and say to her; You know the plan that I told you about, I'm very sorry, I'm very sorry that the Conservative Party voted against that plan. I'm very sorry. And if they don't vote against that plan, Sir, well then it's obvious that they lack the guts that they need to be the government of this province.

And I might point out, Sir, that if they vote against the plan they will be proven so reactionary that they'll be even right of President Nixon of the United States, who certainly is regarded as a very progressive individual. Because President Nixon stated in January of this year - and again I'm quoting from the Ontario Budget of the Conservative Party Government

(MR. TURNBULL cont'd) of Ontario that: "Property taxation was one of the most oppressive and discriminatory of all taxes, hitting most cruelly at the elderly and the retired. Subsequently he instructed, that is President Nixon instructed the Advisory Commission on Inter-Governmental Relations to review proposals for Federal action."

Well fortunately, Sir, our system of parliamentary Cabinet government doesn't get hung up on deadlocks between the Executive Branch and the Legislative Branch of government and we can carry out the kind of tax rebate that is contained in Bill 55 and we can carry them out very quickly. And it's for that reason, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to say now, that I certainly intend to support Bill 55. To me it is a bill that will give relief to those on pensions and to those on low incomes who are presently living in their own homes, and even to some others who are renting. And I think, Sir, that it is a system of progressive taxation that should really be supported by anyone who isn't hung up on ideology - who isn't hung up on the idea that money should be better spent pumping it into businesses than giving it back to the ordinary citizen of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: . . . side of this House and our caucus far more capable of speaking on school rebate and income tax problems than I myself. But I hate to be ridiculed in this House and say that I have no, that I give no consideration whatsoever to the aged or the people that are less fortunate, because most certainly I do. And the chipmunk is back at his job on the front bench over there - and I'll try to ignore that and go back to what was said. I certainly only talked to the member when I made reference; when he said that the roof was falling off the House or busting at the seams, I said "as was his head," and certainly not making any reference to the lady that lives in the house or the poor unfortunate without a job. And for him to make reference to me as a nincompoop and as an ass, I say that's fine because I consider where it comes from and give very little consideration to it.

But we have the school teacher economist over there, who's going to stand in his place and tell us what to do and how to handle the affairs of the people of the Province of Manitoba, how to handle their money. He forgets that in the early 60s the Progressive Conservative government initiated the rebate, the tax rebate. And this man stands in his place and tells us what to do with money; how to handle our money; what this poor woman is doing for money. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that man can't handle his own money - and I have proof in my pocket which I will not -- (Interjection) -- which I will not divulge in this House, but I have proof in my pocket. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed the resolution stands in the name of the Honourable Member for Emerson.

. continued on next page.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Bill No. 45, Mr. Speaker. The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs. The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: Could I have the indulgence of the House to let this matter stand?

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if somebody else wishes to speak. If not, well then there's objection to it standing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

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

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

HON. PETER BURTNIAK (Minister of Highways) (Dauphin) presented Bill No. 20, An Act to amend the Highways Department Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Speaker, this is a rather simple act, it's a matter of consistency more than anything else. If you recall some time ago the Minister responsible for the Department of Public Works introduced a similar kind of a bill. Just for very brief explanation I might say that under Section 7, subsection 3 of the Department of Public Works Act; and also under Section 7 subsection 4 of the Highways Department Act provided only where the value of real or personal property is less than \$500 the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council is not required and the property may be disposed of on the authority of the Minister. Well with the use of administrative controls under the purview of the Management Committee of Cabinet, it appears no longer necessary to continue the practice of obtaining an Order-in-Council for items of a value of \$500 - and legislation of course is being amended to increase this figure to \$5,000 with the appropriate administrative machinery to handle lesser amounts at the discretion of the Minister or the Management Committee. And as I say this is a similar bill that was introduced by the Department of Public Works . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Pembina 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. 24, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BURTNIAK presented Bill No. 24, The Proceeds of a Contract Disbursement Act, 1972, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Speaker, I have a brief explanation on this one. It's a kind of a bill that I don't think too many of us like to introduce but sometimes these things to happen. And this is in connection with a contractor - which was the contract firm, was known as the Sentinel Construction Limited - and this contractor was awarded a grading contract back in March of 1968. Now under this contract an amount of \$6,466.14 was held back by the government and not paid to the contractor. This is the procedure that has been followed over the years and it's still being followed, that a certain amount of money is being held back until the job is satisfactorily completed. Now the department has - and this as I say, this contract was let in 1968 with a holdback of \$6,466.14. The department had been notified that claims - and this is about two months ago - that claims to date amount about \$8,401.24, and the contract payment has not been finalized. Now when this Act is assented to, it will enable the trustee which is the Creditel of Canada Limited, which is now the trustee - to distribute the holdback monies to the various persons according to the terms within the Act. There may be some questions as to why the bond company was not involved - one company was involved but claims came in long after the contract was completed. Also the majority of the claimed amount is for repair parts for equipment, which are not covered in the labour and materials bought. Let me also point out that this is a similar bill to the one that was passed back in October 10, 1969, Bill No. 24. It's a similar situation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, the Minister has briefly outlined the purpose of this particular Act and it does not appear from our point of view that any useful purpose could be served in debating it at this particular stage. It seems to me that if a - I should say "dispute" if such a word can be used between the government and a particular construction company - and I presume that the people concerned will be appearing before the committee to present their case, and it would seem to me that it would be far more appropriate to debate the particular terms of this bill at the Committee stage rather than - in the Law Amendments Committee I mean - rather than at this stage. So we're prepared to let the Bill go for second reading so that there is an opportunity for the principles to appear before Law Amendments if they choose to do so and then at that point we can perhaps determine more about the contents of this legislation.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I just have a few comments. I do realize that the explanation of the Minister was very brief and I am prepared to let the Bill go into Committee so we can hear the representation there. My question to the Minister would be why do we need a special Bill in this case. If there's something wrong with the Bankruptcy Act, then why isn't the Bankruptcy Act amended to take care of this situation or to take care of all the situations that arise. It seems to me that there's a special bill in this case and I'm sure that the government has the same right as any other lien holder and should exercise their same rights under the present legislation. But in this case we have a special bill, so my question is why do we need a special Bill, why doesn't the government exercise it's right under the present Legislation, and if the present legislation isn't enough then perhaps we should look at amending the present legislation instead of bringing special bills in situations like this. But I am prepared to let the Bill go to second reading.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is agreed? The Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, or Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Assiniboia, that debate be adjourned.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is it agreed? So ordered. Bill No. 29, An Act to amend the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund Act. The Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Labour, that Bill No. 29, an Act to amend the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund Act be now read a second time.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, this Act is a very very precise one, it deals with only a small number of points. As honourable members know, the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund Act is now looked upon by government as one that has a very limited purpose, and that is to deal with the cases that remain outstanding prior to the introduction of compulsory automobile insurance.

As honourable members may appreciate, there are cases that have been brought before the courts and then subsequently are brought back to the courts by application for attachment of the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund that are relatively ancient. That is they go back for periods in excess of a year and in some cases two years. It is considered necessary therefore to provide now for some specific termination of the time when claims can continue to be brought against the fund, or at least notice of claims. Because we want to be able to wind down the fund now that it's really - its purpose has been taken away by the provision of compulsory automobile insurance in the province. So the provisions of this Act therefore provide for time limitations on the bringing of applications under the fund.

I might say also, Mr. Speaker, that since the Act or the Bill was introduced in the House by myself earlier and the Bill had been printed, there is one further amendment that has been considered useful to make. However I intend to, with the permission of the members of the Law Amendments Committee make the introduction of that specific amendment at that time. And that will deal with the particular situation of those owners of antique cars who presently pay a particular levy in respect to the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund. I will be recommending that there be a waiver of the premium that has been invoked in respect to the antique car dealers. In effect then, Mr. Speaker, this is a relatively simple straightforward piece of legislation which I think should receive unanimous consent of the House.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is not a simple Bill, it should be considered in a very serious manner and I think it's a much more important Bill than a very minor Bill. The first thing, the Minister did not tell us by stating to us that he's winding up the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund; if he's winding up the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund what will it be replaced by? This is what I would like to know? Or is the Minister telling us there will not be any kind of an Unsatisfied Judgment Fund?

In the first place there will be cars without insurance travelling through Manitoba, in Manitoba, from out of province. So surely there must be some responsibility on the government to have some form of an Unsatisfied Judgment Fund. Secondly, there will be cars probably here in Manitoba without insurance that either their insurance has expired or the premium hasn't been paid even to Autopac and they can drive with a license plate on the car and they have no insurance. So what happens in that case, I mean what protection does an individual have in the respect to anyone driving a motor vehicle without any insurance at all? Is the government, or is there legislation under the Autopac Insurance that will protect these people? So I'm saying it's not as simple as saying that we're doing away with and winding up the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund. I would like to know what is it replaced by and what will happen if it's not replaced by?

The second point, I believe the Minister stated that you're reducing the limitations of time when all the cases have to be proceeded. Are you only reducing the limitations of time for the cases that are outstanding, or the claims that are outstanding; or if you're replacing this Act with something else, or if it will still be in existence will you reduce the limitations of time from two years to one year? And if the Minister is reducing the time from two years to one year I say to him that you are taking a backward step. Surely there's many people that are injured or hurt in automobile accidents and it's not very easy to bring a claim sometimes before the courts within a year. I feel that prior legislation had the two year limit; I think it should continue and should be in existence. So really I would like some explanations from the Minister. If you're winding it up what is it replaced by and if you're reducing the time of limitation, I say it's totally wrong. You're the government and I feel that all members in this House are concerned about the people and you're making it much more difficult, much more difficult, and I'm familiar with many cases how difficult it is to bring a case before the Courts and so on. So if you're reducing the limitation of time only to one year I think you're taking some rights away from the ordinary citizen, from the people that may not have access to courts immediately and quickly. So I would ask the Minister if this is what he's doing, then I would say, change your mind.

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

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word, a few words on this Bill 29. It's quite true, I think the Honourable Member for Assiniboia related my feelings fairly well on this particular bill because my thoughts are, and I mentioned before when I spoke on estimates on the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund, the Minister of Municipal Affairs I think it was that... The problem is going to rise with withdrawal of the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund as we still do have uninsured motorists on the highways regardless of whether you think you haven't or not. We still are going to have uninsured motorists. I mentioned before and I said look at all the farm tractors on the highways, the combines and other implements which don't have to be licensed in the Province of Manitoba. And every time you go out on the road, Mr. Speaker, you're going to meet a farm tractor, you're going to meet a combine or you're going to meet another implement, tractor's with bailers and other equipment behind. These implements are not insured and the only way farmers can protect themselves is to take out farm liability, which many of them do. But the fact is that these implements are not insured directly.

It was mentioned by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, out of province cars. Many of them are not insured. How about stolen cars taken from Ontario to Manitoba, come through the City of Winnipeg, the United States, Saskatchewan, Alberta, come into the Province of Manitoba? How about hit and run vehicles? Supposing a man hits my car, kills me, takes off. What good's that going to do my family? What action can I take? Who could I claim against? Who can my executors take action against? --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, I'm getting a little help from behind. But I tell you it is a very happy day when you think about the situations that can be involved. And you don't have to be killed to have a serious accident. I've talked to lots of people that have been in automobile accidents that have been injured for life and they are unable to earn a living, support their families. They no longer can sue anyone after this Act is passed.

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd)

This is a problem, Mr. Speaker. The old saying always preached by the socialists. Give us compulsory insurance and we'll eliminate the problem. I'd be safe in saying their problems won't be solved. And the worst mistake, Mr. Speaker, they could ever make is to wipe out the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund - and unless they follow the courses directed by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia who said: What are you going to replace it with, what are you going to replace it with. I don't suppose the Honourable Minister even knows even knows what direction they're going to take. He thinks that everybody's insured, so they're going to go down the road and be protected from day to day. But I know full well enough - and, Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Minister would read the regulations, would read the regulations to find out if I was over .08, how much protection I would have in my car if I hit someone. I know how much the other fellow would have - all he would be able to collect is accident benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I know as well as anyone what accident benefits mean in a case of injury, maximum of \$10,000.00. That's not much good, Mr. Speaker. What we need, what we need is a better protection like we had here, at least up to 35,000 as in the past. And it's quite true, it's quite true there's been a lot of claims. As mentioned, I took the Minister's word for it if they had to go for \$2.00 this year to compensate the fund, there's nothing wrong with that - nothing wrong with that if the need has arisen, the more claims. Let's pay the \$2.00. But let's have protection if we go out on the road - when we hit an uninsured motorist, which will be many of them in the Province of Manitoba. They aren't going to stop just because the government's changed. Motorists aren't going to respect the laws just because the government's in power, the socialist government's in power. They're going to do the same as they always do. They'll try many cases and they'll try to get away with it. Farmers who don't license all their trucks will have a spare truck at harvest time and they'll go across that road without a license and insurance as sure as I'm standing here. It's always been the way and yet it's one of those things. I don't know how you're going to protect the public against everything. But we do have an Act. We had an act that protected the public in case of personal injury and property damage, and I think that the government's making a serious mistake if they do away with it - if they do not have something to take its place. Mind you, if the government got something to take its place, that's fine with me; it doesn't really concern me what you call the name of the bill. Mr. Speaker, that's all I have to say at this time. I can readily understand - because the philosophy of the government has been through the years as I mentioned before, compulsory insurance will cure all the evils of insurance. But I know it won't.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, just a few words on Bill 29. I think earlier when we discussed the Estimates, the matter of the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund came up. And I think I pointed out at that time that there was considerable monies in the Fund; and we now were called on this year to put additional funds into this particular fund again this year as people who buy licenses and insurance. I would be very cautious on this one thing - that certainly we should not deprive individuals of a right that they've had under the Act heretofore, without proper notice. I think - the way I read the Bill - that we are going to shorten the time in which they can put a claim or bring action forth, action; and certainly the monies have been paid in, and why - if we're going to phase out the program, why did we have to put in that much money this year. It seems that if it's going to be phased out then certainly we shouldn't have been then called on to put in a large amount of money that was put in this year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, this is such a simple bill that I thought that it would be readily understood by the honourable members, but I can understand that after all it is a technical piece of legislation. But I want to assure particularly the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney that if some out-of-province motorist does strike him down and kill him - and God forbid, because we want him here, we want him here - that the provisions of our Automobile Insurance Act which I hope that now he is accepting in principle will cover his loss, loss to --(Interjection)-- well it depends on how valuable the honourable member is to society. Now it may be that the coverage that will be available will not in his opinion be adequate - he says \$10,000. But everyone who is the victim of accidental damage through no fault of their own as a result of the operation of a motor vehicle in Manitoba, is now protected by the compulsory public automobile insurance that we passed at the previous session of the legislature. And I think that's a very great and significant thing. And the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that no one

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) has been unable to lay a claim since November 1, 1971 and so we don't expect that there will be any claims.

Now there is an argument, there is a technical argument, that there might be some situation - I have yet to find anyone that has convinced me that that is so - but there might possibly be something that is unforeseen now where there could be some practical application of an Unsatisfied Judgment Fund, but the best advice I have, Mr. Speaker, is that we don't need it now. There is no way that we need this fund, but we have to continue with it. And when I use the words "we'll be winding it down" I did not say that I didn't ask the Legislature to repeal this act; there is nothing saying that we are doing away with the fund right now because we don't know how long it's going to take for the courts and the lawyers and the claimants to process the claims that are now outstanding. But we do want to provide some certainty as to when the last cases are going to be heard. That's all we're doing at the present time, and so it fixes a particular date from which applications must be made to the courts for redress.

Now the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney says there's all sorts of situations where there will be uninsured vehicles, and he highlights the tractor or the farm truck and so on. Well I can assure the honourable member that if he drives from this building he will see countless vehicles that are uninsured. Well I don't know whether a bicycle is defined as a vehicle under the Highway Traffic Act or not, but certainly and - you know, I might have checked that before I spoke - but certainly there are many many people who are involved in accidents that are not insured; but the Public Automobile Insurance Act which we passed in the previous session of the Legislature is to protect all people who are affected by accidents occurring on the highways, and that is a very significant thing. And they don't have to go cap in hand to the courts on application to get something from the fund, if they can establish through an exacting process that the person who struck them down doesn't have the ability to pay. It was a very demeaning and exasperating and a very unsatisfactory technique that was available for people pursuant to the provisions of this, and we're very happy to be able to say that it's been replaced or has been replaced by a very responsible public system.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Agreed? So ordered. The Honourable House Leader.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Education, The Minister.

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Education) (Burrows) introduced Bill No. 14, an Act to amend the Teachers' Pension Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, this bill honours several commitments made by my predecessor the Honourable Minister of Universities and Colleges Affairs and myself over the past 14 months, and performs some housekeeping chores made necessary by other legislation such as the change in the age of majority. The commitments fall into three separate groups. In the first group are amendments which permit teachers or the Department of Education employees who have joined or may join the staff of the Department of Colleges and Universities Affairs to retain their pension rights. Now I feel, Mr. Speaker, that we must protect the pension rights of all persons in the new department who have been contributors to the Teachers' Pension Fund, and this includes incidentally not only the administrative personnel but also many of the teachers in the community colleges in Winnipeg, Brandon and The Pas - and in fact this is very much in line with the existing legislation where similar protection is offered teachers joining the Department of Education insofar as their pension rights are concerned.

In the second group are teachers who become employees of either the Manitoba Teachers' Society or the Manitoba Association of School Trustees. Now for some years now it has been possible for teachers who become employees of the Manitoba Teachers' Society to remain contributors to the Teachers' Pension Fund, and it is proposed to extend the same privilege to teachers who may become employees of the Manitoba Association of School Trustees. Now this will never affect more than one or two people at a time but it seems only fair to extend the privilege to both Manitoba Teachers' Society and the Manitoba Association of School Trustees. By the same token it now seems realistic to remove the provision that teachers wishing to take advantage of the above provision must have five years teaching experience in Manitoba. We feel that if a person holds a teacher's certificate issued by my office that this

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) should be sufficient. Now since this is all that we require of teachers appointed by school divisions to positions other than as a teacher within the meaning of the Public Schools Act, it seems sensible to make it the same requirement for teachers appointed to positions with the two major organizations who are so closely concerned with education.

The third group, Mr. Speaker, is a small number of teachers who when they came to work for the Department of Education were not informed that they could elect to stay on as members of The Teachers' Pension Fund, and did not find out about this privilege until after the 24 month period of grace had passed - and in order to restore to those persons their unbroken service and to guard against this happening again in the future an amendment giving a TRAF Board discretionary powers is being proposed. Another amendment, Mr. Speaker, recognizes the growing investment and supervisory responsibilities required of the Chairman of the Teachers Retirement Allowances Fund Investment Board. The value of the fund is several times as great as it was ten years ago, and its management requires a considerable amount of time and care - and the suggested procedure for establishing the remuneration is the same procedure used in determining the remuneration given to the Chairman of the Civil Service Pension Plan.

The other amendments as I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, recognize that the age at which a person is considered to be an adult - it's been reduced to 18 - had to clear up an omission in an earlier amendment. And no one recognizes better than I, Mr. Speaker, that there are important areas with reference to pensions which are not mentioned in this Act. Now there is for example no reference to the age of retirement or the number of years required to qualify for maximum pension benefits. There's a growing feeling that the age of 65 plus 35 years of service is no longer realistic. We are aware that other jurisdictions have made or are in the process of making amendments to this particular provision. Other questions which are raised from time to time including the provision for a cost of living clause and pension agreements; the extension of war service provisions to include persons who through no real fault of their own may not qualify under the present regulations. There's a question of allowing interest on pension contributions returned to persons who leave the service or to the estates of persons who die in service. Also we're constantly asked to review the provisions on which pensions are based, to look at the possibility of the best five years as being realistic and equitable in determining pensions.

Mr. Speaker, Management Committee of Cabinet has a Task Force on pensions which meets every third year to review the terms of reference of all pension plans in which the Province of Manitoba has a financial interest. This Task Force has been called into action and will be meeting during the next few months to review the pension funds for which the government has a responsibility, to hear submissions and to prepare recommendations for legislation to be presented at the 73 session of the Legislature. And to this group, Mr. Speaker, the major items just mentioned have been referred and I'm confident they will receive thorough consideration - and I wish therefore to recommend this Bill No. 14 for the consideration of the House.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, it being 4:30, I would like to adjourn the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Seconder?

MR. G. JOHNSTON: . . . seconded by the Member for Assiniboia.

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

PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hour being 4:30, according to our rules we proceed to Private Members' Hour. The first item is Orders for Returns and Address for Papers referred for debate. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, before you call the order of business for today, if I may raise a point of order in connection with the method in which we are dealing with this particular item - Orders for Return and Addresses for Papers. It was the intention of the Rules Committee when we changed the rules dealing with private members' business that there would be no item of private members' business that would not receive priority consideration on the one particular day; and as a result our rules enabled us to deal with resolutions as the first item of business on two occasions during the day, one day with private bills and another

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) day public bills. We seem to have allowed - and I don't think this was intentional - and I don't think it was an intentional act on the part of the Clerks of the House - but this is the way it has turned out, and I wonder if we could not get some agreement as to a change in the method by which we deal with these Address for Papers and Orders for Return, so that on alternate Wednesdays the first priority would be Orders for Return and Address for Papers. In other words, if we are to deal with Orders for Return today, then next Wednesday the first priority would be Address for Papers - if the House Leader understands what I mean. I think it would enable us then to make sure that all the items of business that are scheduled for private members' hour do have an opportunity to appear on the Order Paper and be debated from time to time. If that meets with the agreement of the House, perhaps then the Clerk could be instructed that next Wednesday for example - instead of Orders for Return having that priority, Address for Papers would be the priority item followed by Orders for Return.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I recognize the point raised by the Honourable Member for Morris, and speaking for the government I don't think that there's any reason why we should not adopt the suggestion made by the Honourable Member for Morris. I don't think that it really requires unanimous consent either. I think that the honourable member is correct; that we did say that on Wednesdays the order of business would be Orders for Return and Address for Papers, but it didn't necessarily mean that one would always be ahead of the other. And I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if the Clerk of the Assembly listens to the words of wisdom from the Member for Morris and my agreement with those words of wisdom that on alternate Wednesdays we change from Orders for Return to Address for Papers and I think that would be quite satisfactory.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, the House Leader says it doesn't require unanimous consent. I don't see why not, but I certainly am in agreement with this - that we do alternate and that the Orders for Papers will not always take a back seat to Orders for Return.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? Very well. In that case . . . The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Of course, Mr. Speaker, . . . that we follow the Order Paper as printed and then next Wednesday we'll have the reverse.

MR. SPEAKER: Right. The proposed Order for Return by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. The following members have spoken on it: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia, the Honourable Minister of Labour, the Member for Portage la Prairie, the Member for Morris, the Member for Roblin, the Attorney-General, the Member for La Verendrye, the Member for Rhineland, the Member for Sturgeon Creek, the Member for Winnipeg Centre, the Honourable Minister of Finance and the Honourable Member for Osborne. The floor is open. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia will be closing debate. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: That's right, Mr. Speaker, I would be closing the debate. I will not take too much time, I will be quite brief. But I was somewhat surprised that we had something like three or four speakers in succession dealing with this Order for Return by the government side, and I don't know really if they were trying to bring forth their real arguments or were strictly trying to ridicule the Order for Return. Be as it may, Mr. Speaker, I do wish to say a few things. The first one, I was most disappointed by the comments that were made by the Member for Osborne. I believe that surely he's got the capacity to deal with an Order for Return and not to get involved into personalities - which he decided to do, and spent a considerable amount of time on personalities. I believe it's also below the dignity of any individual in this House to get involved; and in this case in my opinion I feel the Member for Osborne was trying to inject some, or a certain amount of racial discrimination into the Wolseley by-election. And this is exactly what's happened. I wish he would have resorted strictly to the Order for Return - and I feel this is wrong.

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

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER: You're speaking to which? The Honourable Member for Osborne is speaking on what?

MR. TURNBULL: I'm speaking as a matter of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. State the ...

MR. TURNBULL: The Member for Assiniboia is imputing not only motives but words to me in saying that I was attempting to inject racial overtones into the debate on the matter of civil service hiring with regard to a husband and wife team. That was not my intention; I think it would take considerable misconstruction of my remarks to give them that particular slant that he just did, Sir. And I would like you to ask the Member for Assiniboia to withdraw that imputation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, I don't know what he's asking to withdraw, because I never said anything. I said in my opinion I feel the Member for Osborne in his remarks could have really dealt with an Order for Return instead of dealing with personalities and in some respect trying to inject some discrimination into Wolseley by-election. I, Mr. ...

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

MR. TURNBULL: I was not in my seat, but I distinctly heard the words "racial overtones" uttered by the Member for Assiniboia. I don't recall uttering any such words. That may be his opinion; if that's his opinion then his intelligence is lower than I thought because he could hardly have been so ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. That was not a matter of privilege. The honourable member was debating a point. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia. Order, please. The Honourable Member wish to state another matter of privilege. The Honourable Member for Osborne.

..... continued on next page

MR. TURNBULL: The Member for Assiniboia said that I was attempting to inject racial overtones into the debate, I would like to have him withdraw those remarks.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia is entitled to an opinion. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I respect every member in this House, it doesn't matter if it's the Member for Crescentwood or any member on this side --(Interjection)-- And the reason I say this, Mr. Speaker, because I'm sure that every member in this House can make much more money outside the House, and any member that decides to serve the public I really feel that he's making a sacrifice and trying to make a contribution to serve his fellowmen. It doesn't matter who it is in this House; I say that every man can make more money outside of this House. But when the honourable member in this House - and knows the member outside hasn't got, you know the opportunity to protect himself - when he starts to attack somebody, and calling people by names as "shyster lawyers", which to some people have a connotation of racial discrimination - because I've had calls, the committee rooms have calls; and if this is the way he wants - surely the member, his intelligence, his height of intelligence is much more than that. And this is what he did in the Order for Return. So that's the point that I'm raising with the Honourable Member for Osborne. Surely he's got the capacity to have much higher level of debate than he proceeded during that day; he could have proceeded to argue the points that I raised as a matter of Order for Return; he could have argued each number of the points that I've asked for instead to get involved in personalities. And this is what he did, And I say, surely, surely the member is much more capable of much better debate than that.

Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General tried to sort of twist the thing; and he said that I was against women working; and he said well I'll make sure I'll refer him - or I'll have the Human Rights Commission see to it that the women have the right to work. I would like to tell the Minister or the Attorney-General, I agree with women working. I have never said that women shouldn't be working. In fact for his information I would like to let him know some 15 years ago, a company that I am associated with was the first company that hired real estate women, and at that time I was looked somewhat critical by the industry; and today with the same company that I'm associated with, I have a lady that's in a capacity of a manager of the insurance department of operation. I believe I feel that women have a right to work, but surely --(Interjection)-- but when the Minister says I'll get the Human Rights Commission after you because . . .

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

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, my point of order is that - at least it would appear that the Honourable Member for Assiniboia had concluded his address, and then the matter had been raised by way of privilege. Well I apologize if that's not the case.

MR. JORGENSEN: Sir, the Member for Osborne rose on a question of privilege interrupting the Member for Assiniboia.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, just for the First Minister's information I just started to close the debate. The Attorney-General stated that he's responsible to report to this House in respect to the Human Rights Commission, and assure you that every effort will be made to protect the women's rights. Well I would refer him - and I've told him that I believe in women working - but I should refer him to a letter from the Manitoba Action Committee on the status of women from Mrs. Menzies. And perhaps he can put the Human Rights Commission on his colleague right beside him, the Minister of Finance, because this is what Mrs. Menzies had to say: "The Minister of Finance" - I'm quoting: "The Minister of Finance is misleading the people of Manitoba by stating that husband and wife can own everything jointly by division of property without paying tax during marriage. Under the gift tax legislation, there is a limit of 5000 per year that can be gifted without tax by a husband to a wife and this amount is not accumulative from year to year." And they certainly have a real strong argument in this respect, so perhaps he can also advise the Human Rights Commission to look into what the Minister of Finance is doing in respect to the women's rights in this province. I hope that I have made it clear to the Attorney-General that I am not against any women working. I hope that he understands that what he really did, the Attorney-General, is try to twist things a little bit and he's quite capable of doing this because really, the purpose of - we had four speakers on the government side following one after the other dealing with one Order for Return which was almost unusual in this House; which really - there probably was some political gain to be

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) made in that respect, and that's their right, I don't argue. But this is exactly what happened.

But I wish to deal just briefly with what the Minister of Finance had to say. I listened to him in the first half of his speech, but I think when he continued to speak and took the full time, took his full time to speak till the time ran out, and he was sitting down two or three times and saying - questions anybody, please give me questions. At that stage of his debate I thought he began to sound really to some extent in my opinion ridiculous, because the wife and husbands working is not an issue. That's not the issue. Women working is not the issue. The issue in this Order for Return was - how were the spouses hired, how were they hired by this government? That's the issue and that's what I wanted to find out. It's as simple as that, I have never said at no time that I was against any women working. The issue is how are these people hired, Mr. Chairman - or were they strictly political appointments? That's what I wanted to know, that's what I wanted to know. So --(Interjection)-- I'll be finished in a couple of minutes and I'll answer all questions.

In fact there was some agreement with the House Leader that we were not interested in anyone that was making less than \$7500; we were not interested in the spouses of - be it women or husbands that were making less, because was not interested in an Order for Return that was dealing with somebody that's making that kind of an income. I was interested in someone that's making twenty-five or thirty thousand dollars, when there is many people unemployed in this province. On the other hand, the wives or the spouses of husbands are getting political appointments, and some out of province - that's what I was concerned about, and that's what I wanted to find out. Unfortunately I thought we had an agreement and something happened - when we proceeded on those basis, the House Leader either didn't remember or forgot. And I'm sorry to say that but I thought I would bring it to the attention of the House.

I'm also asking the Minister, is it right to have many able and capable people unemployed while some of the employees making \$30,000 - to appoint the spouses of these people employed to jobs at over \$10,000? That's my question. And it appears to me that the Minister and the front benches - or at least the people that spoke on the Order for Return approve of this. And they say well this is okay, this is what we've approved because we probably are appointing our friends to certain jobs. So what I'm interested in --(Interjection)-- No I'm not, but I'm replying to, I'm replying to some of the speeches that came from that side of the House; and as I say there was strictly some political gain to be made of that because we had three speakers in a row I believe - we had four speakers dealing with one Order for Return, which is almost unusual. I was interested in the New Democratic Party appointment, that's what I was interested.

Now I can't understand --(Interjection)-- That's right, that's right. I know one of the members said, well wait for the Public Accounts you'll get that information, and I know that - but I wanted the information now; I don't want to wait a year and a half or a year, which will be printed in the Public Accounts. Now the unfortunate thing is this government acts like they are still in opposition. Really, you can't ask a question, you can't ask them a question because they get pretty touchy. You can't put Orders for Return because it's wrong; you know, we don't approve of that type of an Order. But have they taken the time, have they taken the time and read some of the Orders for Return that are placed by the NDP members in the House of Commons - have they taken the time? You know it's not good enough to place these Orders here because you know, the government members are pretty touchy, you know they can't - you know, they don't accept it.

Now I'm sure the Minister of Finance is aware that it was the NDP members in the House of Commons - whenever there's a new Minister appointed in the House of Commons, this is the kind of Orders of Return that they put in: What kind of job do you hold? How much shares you got and what companies have you got your shares? How many companies do you own and on what company's board do you sit as a director? How much money you make? In essence this is the kind of questions they're asking. I haven't put that kind of a question. Maybe we should put a question like that to the Minister of Finance, to the Minister of Finance, you know - and I'm sure that we haven't asked that kind of a question.

I've put an Order for Return for a very simple question, and that was the appointments of the spouses of the civil servants that are working at the present time and making very high salaries. That's the question I asked. There was no need for the speakers, for the Minister of Finance or the Attorney-General or the Member for Osborne to twist and say, you know that you're fishing. That wasn't the purpose - or to twist that you're against women working, you're

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) against, you're against --(Interjection)-- Yes, I'm interested to know who the government appointed, that's right, that's right. But I believe, Mr. Speaker, it's double standard that the government has at the present time. It was fine for the NDP leader, it was fine for the NDP leader of the House of Commons, Mr. Lewis, to attack the Quebec judiciary - to call them stupid, incompetent, ignorant - that's what he did and -- (Interjection)-- that's what he said. But that was okay for him. I understand that there was a motion before the House to call the Leader of the NDP Party before the Bar to explain his position, what he meant. I don't know where the motion is at the present time. I understand that the Speaker has taken it under advisement. But that's okay for the NDP.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I would suggest the honourable member is straying from the topic before us. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia, --(Interjection)--

MR. PATRICK: When I'm finished.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, we're talking about charges and who's being political. And what I am saying, it is fine for the NDP to put that kind of an Order for Return; it's fine for the Members of the NDP Party to ask that type of question, but it's not fine for anybody else. It's not A-okay. Now I believe that in my opinion the motion, the Order for Return was a good one; and really I would have accepted if the Finance Minister would have got up and said look we're prepared to answer two but we're not prepared to answer the other two questions on these commissions - then maybe he would have had an acceptance. But he prepared, he prepared to, you know, to be political on it. On the other hand it's still public taxpayers money and I think that we have a right to know. And that's the reason I put the Order for Return. Mr. Speaker, I see there's a lot of flak coming from this side and a lot of noise, it's almost pretty difficult to say anything.

But, Mr. Speaker, it's A-okay to ask on the application of students, how much is your parent making, how much money is he receiving in a salary; that's okay, on every application that the students apply now for jobs. There is a question, how much are the parents making? How much money is your father receiving? But it's not okay to ask, you know, which of the spouses of civil servants were appointed; were they appointed politically - and how much money are they making? That's not okay. That's also public money. So is this not a double standard? It certainly is, Mr. Speaker. So surely the government members cannot deny it. You know we can't ask anything on this side because - you know the front benches are untouchable; don't touch us, don't be argumentative and don't criticize, we're nice people. Don't ask us anything. Well this is the attitude, that's the attitude that the members do present and the government presents. But it's okay for the backbenchers of the government to call the corporations in Manitoba "corporate thieves"; that's okay, but it's not okay for anybody on this side to say that. --(Interjection)-- Well, I believe that you can . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Lets get one thing straight. Would all members address the Chair, and that way we'll have less flak as the honourable member mentioned. The honourable member has one minute. The Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, I still feel that the Order for Return made sense, I hoped that the government would have accepted it. If there was one or two items in there that was not acceptable, I wish they would have stated so in the House and not accepted. But the Member for Inkster just mentioned, go ahead and call people corporate thieves - all I can say to him, he's probably chased out enough corporations out of this province, so I wouldn't resort to that type of a debate in this House. Because I'm listening to the Minister of Finance when he told us during his Estimates that we should be more concerned, not only this side of the House but every member in this House, in our debates; you know, how we address and how to be more concerned in our language with respect to corporations, with respect to kind of economic climate that we create. So I'll listen to the Minister of Finance.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member's time has run out. Debate is closed. Time has run out. Order please.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have support? Call in the members. The motion before the House. The Order for Return by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Watt, Craig, G. Johnston, Froese, Jorgenson, Einarson, Patrick, Barkman, F. Johnston, Mrs. Trueman, Messrs. Blake, Moug, Henderson, Allard,

NAYS: Messrs. Schreyer, Petursson, Green, Paulley, Maekling, Miller, McKellar, Bilton, Doern, Evans, Shafransky, Toupin, Burtiak, Pawley, McBryde, Hanuschak, Desjardins, McGill, McKenzie, Barrow, Boyce, Gonick, Gottfried, Walding, Johannson, Uruski, Malinowski, Adam, Turnbull, Jenkins,

MR. CLERK: Yeas 14, Nays 30.

MR. SPEAKER declared the motion lost.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed Order for Return of the Honourable Member for Charleswood. The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: Mr. Speaker, just one or two brief remarks.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Would the honourable member introduce it first?

MR. MOUG: I beg to move, seconded by the Member from Pembina, an order of the House do issue a Return showing the number of purchases by the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation within Greater Winnipeg Area . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sorry, it has been introduced. The honourable member may debate the question.

MR. MOUG: I just have a few brief remarks to make, Mr. Speaker. The order is reasonably clear. The concern I had more than anything else was in regards to brokerage fees that was being paid to real estate concerns that were not directly involved with the purchase or selling of the properties.

In the figures that I have available to me, in Greater Winnipeg Area there was over \$7 1/4 million worth of land purchased by the Government since July 15, 69 and most of this land is very very valuable, First Class R1 residential property. Some of it's zoned; but for the most part it's in pretty good areas and possibly it's going to be downrated if the wrong kind of housing goes in.

In the rural area there was close to a million dollars worth of land purchased in that same period of time, and this was strictly for Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. I know the Minister said casually in one instance that possibly it was the fault of the previous administration for not having picked up land from time to time and put them in the position that they're in today where they had to be out purchasing so much. Now whether they want to become the landlord of the Province of Manitoba is another story - but I don't think that the previous administration was after that, and therefore was taking land as they needed it or acquiring it as they needed it and didn't get involved in what this government is doing.

The key thing, Sir, is Item No. 5 in regards to brokerage fees. A complaint that I received from one vendor, a person that just owned an individual piece of land with a home on it; he was confronted - after the deal was made, the price was set, was accepted by both the vendor and the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. Aronovitch and Leipsic Brokerage firm, in the City of Winnipeg, received a letter from the Attorney-General's office, Land Acquisition Branch, signed by the Assistant Director - spells out the name and the address of the vendor. It states in there that he's willing to sell the land for the price he's willing to sell it at - says that the vendor has agreed to sell and convey the land to the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. Agreement has been set for the vacancy date as well as the split that will be taking place on vacancy date in regards to insurance and taxes. The Land Acquisition Branch also informs the Brokerage firm - and this is prior to the letter that comes from the Land Acquisition Branch of the Attorney-General's Department. It says: "The vendor agrees to pay Aronovitch and Leipsic Limited broker's commission . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews on a point of order.

MR. WALLY JOHANNSON (St. Matthews): Since the honourable member is reading from a letter, would he kindly table that for the benefit of some other members in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: Mr. Speaker, I'm not reading from a letter. But anything that's on this desk or in it I am certainly willing to give to the Member for St. Matthews if it's going to be any good to him whatsoever, because I certainly think he could probably make use of some of it.

In this letter from the Land Acquisition Branch, the Attorney-General's Department, it says that the vendor agreed to pay Aronovitch and Leipsic Limited . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. JOHANNSSON: Yes, I believe it is a rule in this House that when a member does read from a letter that other members are not privy to, that such documents should be tabled - and I'd like to know whether the member is going to table this document.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris on this same point of order.

MR. JORGENSON: I thought that the Member for Charleswood made it very clear that he was not reading from a letter; so therefore if he's not reading from a letter, so then there's nothing to table. Surely the honourable member understands that.

MR. MOUG: I said - and I'm not misleading the House, Mr. Speaker, for the Member for St. Matthews' information - I said, as well in this letter; and I will quote part of it, the letter that was mailed to the vendor or to Aronovitch and Leipsic from the Attorney-General's . . . --(Interjection)-- I told you I'll table anything I have on this desk or inside it because I think you can use something. I don't know what you need, but you need something.

Part of the letter said, Sir, and I . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Let's have it clear. The honourable member's stating he's reading from a letter, he has to table the letter. The other thing is that I would wish and I'll repeat it once more, that all members would address their remarks to the Chair and not across the Chamber to each other and that way we'll have less confusion. The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: I apologize, Sir, that made it clear. I've repeated it twice; it's in Hansard, but I'll table this document I'm reading from. Certainly it's not a letter to anybody, it was taken from a letter that I saw and had at my disposal. I'll table it after I've finished speaking.

The vendor agrees to pay Aronovitch and Leipsic Limited broker's commission of five percent and directs and authorizes them to retain and apply the cash deposit or so much thereof as required to pay the said commission as and when the deposit becomes properly payable to the vendor. Now this was after the deal was made, Sir; there was a set amount of dollars offered for that property, and not by Aronovitch and Leipsic but by Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. Certainly not Aronovitch and Leipsic. But in order to go down and sew up the deal he's lost five percent; I saw the receipt, it's five percent for \$425.00. At no time was this man contacted by Aronovitch and Leipsic. At no time did he list his property with Aronovitch and Leipsic. It was certainly just a plum handed to this brokerage firm and at no time was anybody brought into it in any way; they didn't see the deal up until such times as they were asked to go there and inform the man and collect their five percent. I wonder if there's any comparison or any way you couple this together; for the fact that Mr. Leipsic gets a headline in the Free Press - with a turnabout attitude on Autopac in less than 12 months, where he says that Autopac is the only thing - and I wonder if this is - one thing offsets the other. And I want to bring this to the attention of the House, Mr. Speaker, and certainly I hope I can have this information from the government as soon as possible. And here's the document.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, there are times that one finds it very difficult to restrain oneself, especially when one hears attacks upon individuals for no reason whatsoever in this House - for reasons best known to those that make those attacks upon individuals that are not in a position that they can properly respond to such vicious attacks. I regret that type of attack very much this afternoon.

I want to however make a few comments on the resolution itself. First insofar as the Manitoba Housing Renewal Corporation is concerned, the answer to (5) and (6) I can tell the honourable member now, though be carefully checked and verified, will be nil, nil, nil - so that the question is to brokerage fees paid by Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation.

The other day - and the honourable member again discusses his emotional feeling insofar as low rental housing is concerned to those of low income. I recall remarks by the honourable member that for some reason or other poor people, people of low income should not be living along the river banks in Charleswood; there was a very obvious attack upon that concept in this House the other day. I had hoped, Mr. Speaker, that that concept, that ideology, that bias, that prejudice, that bigotry would have faded away 50 years ago. We still witness it, we witness it on the part of the Honourable Member for Charleswood. And what that bigotry meant, Mr. Speaker, is that poor people were expected to live up against tracks, railway tracks, and up against stinking packing house yards; and this is the type of bigotry and prejudice that I want to say that I for one - I'm pleased to be on this side of the House and not that side of the House.

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd) And it's those outbursts, those comments that we only heard a few moments ago from across the way that this housing may downgrade - the exact words - may downgrade the housing within the area itself. These were the exact words that were uttered only this afternoon by the member across the way. I think it's very important that when these comments are made that they be underlined - that they be focused upon because they demonstrate these real attitudes and conduct and philosophy of the Progressive Conservative Party in this province.

Mr. Speaker, why is there a problem insofar as land purchases at the present time in the Province of Manitoba? I've said it before, I say it now - it's because they, they across this House had no policy insofar as land assembly was concerned in the Province of Manitoba. In the years 1961 to 1969 out of 28,000 housing starts in the Province of Manitoba less than 1,000 were housing starts by which those of low income, 5,000 and under afford to purchase and to acquire. Less than 1,000. How much land was purchased for a land assembly program in the Province of Manitoba by the previous government of the province? The answer, none. What was their policy? Their policy was to the effect that there should be no land purchases as little as possible by way of low income, low rental housing. Their policy in fact meant that those of low income were gettoeized into the core areas of the City of Winnipeg and into the other areas of the City of Winnipeg, crowded and compacted into small social groups. --(Interjection)-- this was --(Interjection)-- I want to say --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I should like to once again indicate I wish to have all the members - Order please. I wish to have all the members address the Chair, they'll all be recognized. But when the speaker is on the floor he should have the courtesy of being heard and listened to. The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: I want to say, Mr. Speaker, in respect to the comments by the Honourable Member for Charleswood that ever since a gentleman in this province indicated, indicated quite honestly that he could no longer accept views in respect to Public Automobile insurance that he had held a year or two ago - we've been faced with two attacks upon this individual in this House. The first was by the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney a week ago, and the second we heard this afternoon. The innuendos of both statements, both statements made in this House have been of such a character nature that if they were repeated outside this House I have no doubt whatsoever that the man in question could successfully bring legal action against both members for the innuendo and the insinuation that were made; and I challenge them to repeat those comments outside this House - and not hide behind, and not behind the cowardly cloak of immunity within this Chamber. --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. PAWLEY: So I say to the honourable member in respect to the Order for Return, we gladly accept it. I think he has made it clear - though not so clear I might say, that references to the word "purchases" he means to include land and buildings that shall be provided to him. We shall provide all the information we can possibly obtain in this respect. And in closing, I want to read a very brief little bit of poetry that a widow of low means - income means - put together only a few weeks ago and read out to an opening of one of the public housing projects. I think that the Honourable Member for Charleswood would want to listen to some of the thoughts behind that little poem, and I read it - and I read it. She authored it herself, she put it together, and the words are: "Let us conquer discrimination; let us smother hatred; let us with determination hold all these sacred; let there be wisdom; let there be the courage; let there be the altruism to strive for our anchorage; let us not be crude; let us bear the honour; let us not intrude on the one who is our neighbour; let there be love; let there be the unity; let there be the above in this our community.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to become involved in the debate of the former two speakers - but as to clause 5 and 6, the Minister of Municipal Affairs has said that he's sure that the answer would be nil. In other words, if he was so sure - this is the two clauses here that are really very important; and if he's so sure that clause 5 and 6 - if he's so sure, why aren't we given the information.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs on a point of order.

MR. PAWLEY: I thought I had made it very clear that we had nothing to conceal and that we're prepared to accede to this Order for Return - and in fact I'm not too sure why the Honourable Member for Charleswood wants to even debate it. We have no reluctance whatsoever to provide the answer to 5 and 6.

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

MR. JORGENSEN: I find it now in the light of the statement made by the Minister of Municipal Affairs - I find it very difficult to understand why we are debating this Order for Return.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. I want to indicate on that point of order that the Honourable Member for Charleswood asked for the debate and I had it transferred. That's why we're having the debate.

The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: There's still a point of order then, because according to our rules if an Order for Return is accepted by a Minister there is no transfer for debate; so I can't understand why this matter's been debated at this present time, if it has been accepted by the Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: . . . refresh members to the words that took place when this Order for Return was referred last week for debate. The Honourable Member for Charleswood introduced the Order for Return; my comment to him was that we would accept it; we wished clarification; the clarification requested was whether or not by the use of the word "purchases" it was intended to include both land and buildings. It was at that point that the Honourable Member for Charleswood requested of you, Mr. Speaker, that the matter be referred for debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Correct. The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I really wonder now whether I should be speaking to it at all or not, because it seems like as if the information -- you're willing to table the information. I happen to have a real estate broker's license myself -- What's the trouble now?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Inkster on a point of order.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. If indeed the clarification is given and is accepted, would that not now relieve us of the necessity of a debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. Once a motion is before the House it takes unanimous consent to take the motion off the floor of the House. The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I do find this rather amusing. However I do have a broker's license myself and have sold some real estate; and I'm of the opinion that all of this is supposed to be very clear between the vendor and the purchaser, and these things are to be made out in forms and signed and so forth. If there's any irregularities -- if there's something done wrong, then we have every right to ask for an Order for Return to try to check it because this is our job. However since it's been stated that they are willing to table the information, I don't see any point in going any further with any remarks.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Agreed? So ordered. Oh, the Honourable Member for St. Matthews wish to speak? The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. WALLY JOHANNSON (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, this debate came up because the Honourable Member for St. Charles presented a resolution that was so -- Charleswood -- poorly worded, that when the Minister attempted to clarify the initial clause the clarification was refused by the Honourable Member for Charleswood. Now I would suggest that first of all he obtain another draftsman for future Orders for Return, that might help us avoid a lot of unnecessary debate. The Minister did say that this information would be forthcoming, but in view of the comments that have been made in this debate and in other debates by the Honourable Member for Charleswood, I'd like to read to the House a little quotation - a lovely little piece of poetry - published and I'll table this --(Interjection)-- Author? Mrs. Jamieson. This is published in the Wolseley News, a . . . sheet that has been apparently handed out in the constituency . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I would hope it's pertinent to the motion before us. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. JOHANNSON: Mr. Speaker, this is pertinent to something the Honourable Member just stated in the House a few moments ago --(Interjection)-- Authorized by the Wolseley Progressive Conservative Association and this quote is beautiful, Mr. Speaker, by a Mrs. Jamieson: "All my experience of the world teaches me that in 99 cases out of 100 the safe side and the just side of a question is the generous side and the merciful side." That's a beautiful

(MR; JOHANNSON cont'd) piece of sentiment, Mr. Speaker. And I think -- it's perhaps unfortunate that this isn't made required reading for the Honourable Member for Charleswood, the Member for Riel and several others. They have made statements -- Sturgeon Creek, yes -- they have made statements about people who live in our public housing developments that I consider frankly disgusting.

Today the Honourable Member for Charleswood said that people who were moving into the public housing that is being built were downgrading his area. And he previously said that these people were downgrading good residential areas. Now the Honourable Member shows very vividly to us how generous and how merciful he is in his social thinking. He made all sorts of innuendoes against these people; he stated that booze was being moved into the area among other rather absurd statements. And in his last statement prior to today he stated that the slum housing that now existed in Point Douglas was probably old public housing. Now, Mr. Speaker, how stupid can a member of this House get. The Honourable Member for Charleswood gives us more and more illustration of just how stupid arguments can descend to in this House. He moves into realms of fantasy, which make arguments frankly impossible, and this is supposed to be an arena where policies are seriously debated. He makes a mockery of serious argument.

I would like to make a couple of brief comments about our land banking policy and our land assembly policy. So far we have - the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation has purchased roughly a figure of something less than 300 acres in the City of Winnipeg - in different parts of the City of Winnipeg - 300 acres. Now I frankly think that that's an insignificant amount. We have to get far far more land which will be available for future housing and for future planning and development before we can have a really successful housing program. I might point out just in contrast that the Ontario Housing corporation has a land bank of 12,800 acres - 12,800 -- in other words 12,500 acres more than we have. Oh yes, they're real socialists. Their public housing program has a great deal to recommend it. There are roughly six to seven times as many people in Ontario as in Manitoba and their land bank would be roughly 30 times as large as our land bank - 30 times - and they consider their land bank to be inadequate.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The hour of adjournment having arrived, the House is accordingly adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon.