

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Friday, May 2, 1969

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if I might take a minute and introduce our young guests today. We have 42 students of Grade 5 standing from the Ruth Hooker School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Kuly and Miss McQueen. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Selkirk.

We also have with us today 30 students of Grades 7 and 8 standing from the Kleefeld School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Hildebrand and Mr. Fast. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Carillon.

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

The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, if I have leave, I propose to ask you to turn to Page 15 and call the items on Page 15 in sequence.

PRIVATE AND PUBLIC BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debates on second readings. The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Portage - Bill No. 65. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. DOUGLAS M. STANES (St. James): Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned the debate . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, possibly just for the record you might ask for leave in order that we're not establishing a precedent.

A MEMBER: He did.

MR. PAULLEY: He did but the Speaker did not.

MR. EVANS: I now ask the other parties in the House, Mr. Speaker, if I have leave to request you to proceed in that way. A nod of approval from the Liberal quarters; I think perhaps my honourable friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party is nodding his assent, and for the record I inform the House that I have spoken to the Honourable Member for Rhineland and I speak for our party. And now I am in a position to assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I have leave to ask you to be good enough to call the adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 65.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, Bill No. 65. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. STANES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I adjourned this debate on this Bill because I had some reservations. I've checked it; I now completely agree with the Bill and it should go to second reading. Thank you for allowing me to adjourn it.

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

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank the Honourable Member for St. James for his interest in the Bill but I had thought that he had adjourned the debate because his colleague, his seatmate the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources seemed to take some objection to a principle that he was upholding. About all I can say in that regard is that if there had of been any answers required I would have attempted to get them. I presume this closes the debate, Mr. Speaker, on second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: I must compliment the honourable members for the mood of the House; it looks well for the rest of the afternoon.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Selkirk, Bill No. 30. The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable Minister, could we allow this item to stand?

HON. SAUL M. CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, I believe, if I may, that this Bill is not itself going to be spoken on by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture but rather the motion which sends it on to a committee, and I just point that out because the impression one gets from reading the Orders is that the Minister is holding the Bill on which to speak. But the Bill has been voted on and been passed, and it's the motion to send it to committee which is being held by the Honourable Minister, and that committee I think meets on Wednesday.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the honourable gentleman for his opinion but I have no way of reading the Minister's mind. Is it the wish of the House that this matter remain on the Order Paper until the Minister appears?

MR. EVANS: He's joining us now perhaps in the nick of time. I was about to suggest we might be able to return to this item later in the afternoon, but I would enquire now whether the Minister of Agriculture is in a position to proceed.

HON. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Minister of Agriculture)(Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry that I wasn't in my seat. On this Bill I adjourned it just to have a look at the areas we wished the Bill might travel. I have no objection now to the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: I take it the Bill is on its way and that it's been voted on. The question was put and the Bill was passed?

MR. CHERNIACK: I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the motion before us is that the Bill be referred to the Committee on Professional Associations.

MR. SPEAKER: Oh, I misunderstood the opinion of the Honourable Member for St. John's. I understood him to say that the Bill had passed the second reading. However, I'll put the question. Are you ready for the question?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, if I may. You're correct, I said and I was right, the bill has passed second reading, has been approved, and now the motion is what committee it goes to.

MR. SPEAKER: I get the drift.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Selkirk, Bill No. 43, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface in amendment thereto, standing in my name. Remember before the House I took it under advisement. The motion presently before the House in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface has received consideration in that it suggests that Bill 43 be not now read a second time. This by rules and practice is the privilege of the honourable member. In the matter of the second part, I do not read into it an order or instruction that this House refer the matter to outside organizations for study, but I take it as a suggestion that might be accepted. Consequently, I rule the motion in order.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I gather you agree that this is an acceptable motion to the House. I would just want to say that with respect to remarks I made previously - and I gather as this is an amendment I am in order in speaking at this time. The feeling is that of course we have the greatest respect for the member and the manner in which he's presented it to the House and the intent of this. I tried to point out in my remarks to the House on this subject that this matter was one which has been under continuous review in recent years and is again under review by the department, and within our department under our Director of Welfare we now have the five children's aid societies of Manitoba, plus two of our regional directors, on a committee continuing to study this Act. I am advised by my department that at this time the Act is working, and I think it would be the contention of our group that we would very much prefer to study this matter further in the coming year prior to making changes in the Act because I think the fullest consultation should occur in the coming year, I think some of the suggestions made by the Honourable Member for Selkirk are most praiseworthy. I think the idea of possibly having the Director of Welfare permitted to place a child rather than taking it before a judge might be a method of expediting adoption and I think it's a very good suggestion.

Also, I would like to have the Act carefully studied for further streamlining, as I mentioned in my remarks, and a la Royal Commission in Alberta and the wording in that particular Act. I am not in any great -- no great principle that I oppose sending this to the Community Welfare Planning Council and the societies concerned for study, but I think the mechanism as I say is established. These societies are the creatures of the government and I think we have the mechanism, as I'm saying, to give this the fullest consideration in the coming year, especially in the light of the assurance that the present Act is working very satisfactorily and that children are not being unduly delayed in their adoption because of this factor, and I just want to put this on the record at this time.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this amendment. This is the third time that I have brought this Bill before this House and the government has had ample opportunity during the past three years to study the contents of this Bill. I have not

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd.) . . . . changed my form of presentation one iota since I first brought it in. Every welfare society in Manitoba knows the contents of my Bill, and quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, unofficially of course, I have the support of most of these associations, and if a vote were taken on my Bill today among the social workers of Manitoba it would carry by about 75 percent majority. This is nothing more or less than a stall, and I intend to vote against this amendment and I would ask every member in the House to do the same thing. It's absolutely absurd to say that further study is required. No further study is required; all that's required is a little intestinal fortitude.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I want to join in this debate and I want to suggest to the House, or inform the House that the stand and position that I am taking is not that as Leader of my Party but a personal opinion, and I'm sure that in that I will have the respect of the members of the Assembly.

I think that the points just raised by the Honourable Member for Selkirk are perfectly valid and correct. I reject the contention of the Honourable the Minister of Health and Social Services that this matter should be further delayed for consideration. The subject matter of the original Bill proposed by the Honourable Member for Selkirk has been debated in this House on many an occasion, and not only has it been debated within this House, it has been the subject matter of consideration of all of those groups mentioned in the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

I do not want to argue with the Honourable the Minister of Health and Social Services as to whether or not at the present time in the area of adoption all is rosy and all is well. From my own observations, or information relayed to me, such is not the case, that there are areas in adoption where the question of religion is barring potential parents of having within their household adopted children of their choice on considerations other than religion, and the barrier is still there.

I want to point out to the House that in taking this attitude I hold no brief for those who may approach this matter on a non-religious basis, and I want to assure the House that as far as I am personally concerned I am a great believer in my adopted faith, and I'm sure that I'm speaking on a basic principle of ecumenicalism in its broadest sense when I suggest that the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface be rejected and that the Bill proposed by the Honourable Member for Selkirk be accepted by this House. Because if this is done, Mr. Speaker, surely it will give the organizations mentioned in the amendment proposed ample opportunity to appear before this House, or a committee of this House, to give us the opportunity of discussing with them the pros and cons of the principle attempting to be established by the Honourable Member for Selkirk. This to me is the proper procedure. To procrastinate and delay further in this important area of human endeavour and of social concern in my opinion is like throwing a tent over your head to keep the sun out.

I join with my honourable friend the Member for Selkirk this year, as I did last year, in supporting his contention; and I think that we are evading, procrastinating and delaying bringing about proper justice for the children who are up for adoption in Manitoba by referring this matter to somebody outside of the House for their recommendations to be brought in at a subsequent session of this House, because we can not and have not got the authority to require them to do so. But surely if the Bill goes into second reading of a committee of this House we can invite them and I'm sure they will accept the invitation to appear before that committee and give us the value of their experience in this vital field.

So I want to assure my honourable friend the Member for Selkirk, apart from any political consideration, that he has my personal support and that personal support is based on some knowledge of the situation prevailing at the present time respecting adoptions, and a situation that has prevailed too long in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I did not speak on the original motion on second reading and so whatever I do say now pertains not only to the motion before us but also to the Bill.

We heard from the Minister that the way the Act reads at present that there are no undue delays in adoption procedures and adoptions, and I for one believe that as we respect the will of a person when he passes on, that that will is upheld in court and also is acted on consequently, and I feel that the same thing applies here, that if a certain person wishes that his children shall be brought up in a certain way, if the person in charge cannot do so that he should certainly have that right, and under the present Act that right is there. I for one uphold the principle contained in that Bill and in that Act and I feel that it should remain that way. I certainly would

May 2, 1969

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) . . . . not like members of my family to accept a different faith than what I accept, and therefore I think the same thing should apply to other people, that if they bring up a family, that naturally they would want members of their family to accept the faith that they had accepted. Therefore, I feel that the legislation as it is at present is good and it should remain that way.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JOE BOROWSKI (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this subject and I spoke on it on second reading. The Minister indicated a minute ago that there are no problems. Well, I'm not going to dispute this with the Minister because he is one of the few ministers on that side that I have a great deal of like and respect for, except to say to him that I think he is wrong in saying that this Act works because I don't think he's got any facts or statistics to support his statement that it's working.

The Member for Selkirk indicated that if there was a vote taken that probably 75 percent of the people who are involved in this thing here would probably vote for it, and I go along with it. I'm not an expert on this but I've talked to a lot of people, I've talked to a lot of clergy about it, not just since I came into the Legislature, it's something that I've been interested in for some time. I think he's wrong and I think the Member for St. Boniface is wrong, and I'd also like to say to the member for St. Boniface, although he's a Catholic like myself, when he speaks he speaks ex cathedra. I think some of the people here have got the impression that he's speaking for the Church. I can assure you he's not. I have spoken to some . . . .

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I think I'm allowed on a point of privilege - I've never pretended this, I've never said this and I don't pretend that I'm speaking for the church, I was speaking for myself.

MR. BOROWSKI: Well, we get the impression that you are. I know you're Catholic and I know the position the Catholic Church has taken. . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: I have corrected that impression right now.

MR. BOROWSKI: The impression has been left because you're Catholic - maybe it's accidental - but because you are Catholic someone may get the impression you are speaking for the Church. I have spoken to one priest and I'd like to quote what he said: "Larry is twenty years behind times," and I would suggest to the Member for St. Boniface that he is. He hasn't been listening to the Pope. He certainly hasn't been listening to our Pope.

MR. DESJARDINS: I haven't seen the Pope lately.

MR. BOROWSKI: Well, perhaps you should join the government side and maybe the Attorney-General will take you to Rome with him the next time he goes.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote from his April 29th statement in Hansard, some of the remarks made by the Member for St. Boniface and comment on it. He says on Page No. 1718, "I certainly agree that the welfare of the child should be the prime factor to be considered." He goes further on, "I believe in the individual's natural right of freedom," and he believes in "ecumenism". Now this is what the whole thing is about. If you really believe these things I don't know how you could turn around and say what you are saying, because what we are talking about is the rights of a child, and this here legal religious roadblock that is in there is the one that's going to hurt the child. Your concern, it seems to me as I read this, your concern is for that mother, the mother that had the child, but you know I am more concerned about the mother that's going to have the child and the child itself.

You say in your statement that we shouldn't be so holy, this woman has already paid the price, we shouldn't make her out that she's a monster and we should have pity on her and she's paid for her mistakes many times over. Well, I don't know how this is going to help her by keeping this particular section in the Bill. I am concerned about the woman who is going to take this child and wipe his bum and change his diapers and get up in the middle of the night and look after him and raise him. Surely she has more right than the woman that's abandoned, legally abandoned the child. So I think when you put that kind of strings to it, it's just like saying when you get a divorce --well, I'm getting a divorce, but after I'm divorced from you I don't want you to marry a Frenchman or a Catholic, or I don't want you to get married at all. Really this is what he is saying.

Here is a woman saying I don't want my child - for whatever reason, it's none of my business - you take the child, look after it, be legally responsible for it, send it to school, dress it, educate it, but I'm going to put some strings to this thing. It's nonsense! If she really cares, as he suggests, if she really cares about this child she wouldn't give it up. There are occasions where the mother may really care for the child but because of circumstances

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd.) . . . . she has to give it up, but we can't pass a law to look after this small percentage. Let's pass a law that's going to look after the majority, and the majority is that the women they give up their child, they don't care, and as far as I'm concerned, we as legislators should be concerned first with the welfare of that child; secondly, about the mother that's taking the child, who is going to look after it. This is really where the prime consideration should lay. He can talk about the rights all he wants, but what it boils down to is we seem to be, the law seems to be more interested in the rights of this mother that has given this child up and I think this is wrong. And not only I think it's wrong, but the church thinks it's wrong. The Member for St. Boniface may not agree with me, maybe he's talking to priests that are ready to retire and they do think this. But there's no question about it, I have talked to my priest, Father Levasseur, in Thompson over the weekend when I was down and he said, "Well, I think Larry is 20 years behind the times", but he says "I think you are 20 years ahead of your time," so he says "I don't agree with any of you."

There's another thing when you are talking about rights, and I want to bring this thing in because our Church is involved in this also. You have often heard of problems arising out of giving blood transfusions. I know where our church stands, but the Jehovah Witnesses, they'll say, "well I won't allow my child to have a blood transfusion." And he knows what the position of our church has been and what the position of the lawmakers has been . . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Will the honourable member permit a question?

MR. BOROWSKI: I'm liable to get all lost - you can ask me the question later. Our lawmakers see no objection to taking a child away from the mother because they say the child comes first. They take that child away and they give him a blood transfusion. Now he has no objection, our church - and I think the church is wrong on that point - but the church sees no objection in this thing. In fact they condemn the Jehovah Witnesses, because they say when it comes to the welfare of the child even the natural parent who is looking after it doesn't have any rights, we'll take it away and give it a blood transfusion. I haven't heard him complain about this, yet in this instance he can come out and in some way justify the fact that we are wrong when we do this thing. Well, I disagree with him, and as far as I am concerned I am supporting the Bill of the Member for Hillhouse and I think -- (Interjection) -- for Selkirk - maybe we should call that Hillhouse Riding from here on in. But I think this thing is wrong, this hoist, this six months' hoist, and I'm certainly going to vote against it. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I believe there is a question and answer coming up.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, he said he'd welcome a question. I'd like to know if the honourable member is speaking for any church, I've never pretended to be. He accused me or said I was, and he kept talking about the church, that I didn't represent the church. I didn't, I was speaking for myself and I didn't speak to anybody. But were you speaking for the Church? I'd like to know.

MR. BOROWSKI: No, I'm not even speaking for my Party.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, I don't rise to prolong the agony of some members in the House, I simply rise to congratulate the Member for Selkirk for having had the foresight long before this day to introduce this kind of a measure to the Chambers of the people who form the laws of the province, and hopefully laws that will enhance humanity in the Province of Manitoba and indeed hopefully across the world. I think this is a very progressive step. It's one that society has procrastinated on for too long a time, and I seem somewhat set back that I find the Minister of Health and Social Services not allowing himself to let his true feeling be known but that he is willing to further procrastinate on this vital human issue.

I think that it isn't important that we always maintain past standards, the status quo in things, whether it be laws or other things in society, but that we ought to have a fresh approach at all times to all problems that confront us, and this is one that has been before us for, well ever since time began I suppose, and I was hopeful that this session would indeed take this progressive step and endorse the principle adopted by my honourable friend the Member for Selkirk. I know that it's been a trying thing for him to keep re-introducing a measure of this nature over the years, but I give him a great deal of credit for having that kind of intestinal fortitude in the face of the obstacles that we see, and hopefully, Mr. Speaker, members on all sides of the House will break with tradition, if you like, break with the past and launch into a new era whereby we do give the ultimate consideration to the human element in society.

(MR. USKIW cont'd.)

I seem to recall a moment ago the Member for Rhineland indicated that there is some holiness, if you like, to respecting the wishes or wills of people that have either gone by or otherwise, that we must have full respect for the wishes of those people and that he sort of put this in that category, that it is the parent that is most important. I want to go back and remind my honourable friend from Rhineland that he should be aware, if he isn't, that something like 90 percent of the children that are offered for adoption are offered by mothers who do not have much of an interest in those children, that they are by and large not willing to accept the responsibility that is truly theirs.

And having said that I have to say the other, and that is that in assuming the responsibility for those children I would hope that we would do what is in the best interests of those children.

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

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I just rise to say a few words on this resolution. I am not speaking for no church, simply on my own behalf. I have been involved through the years in many adoption cases and I am not aware of any difficulties because of this part of the Act. I am aware of cases where kids of different faiths were placed in different homes through the Act the way it is. I think this resolution gives the people who are working on the practical part of the Act, that is the placement of children, the people who are involved are asked to make a study and report, and I think it is on that basis that I intend to support this resolution. I know they could appear before the committee, this is true, I realize that. However, in my opinion there is no real real hardship being placed on anybody at this time and this would give them time to make a good profound report, that everybody involved would have time to take part to prepare a detailed study, bring its findings, and then in my opinion I would be in a better position to vote on the Bill of the Honourable Member for Selkirk. I appreciate his concern and so on. However, I think that the resolution is a good one and I intend to support it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CARROLL: I move, seconded by the Minister of Municipal Affairs, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Virden, Bill No. 35. The Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this debate the other day to try and be advised on the background leading up to the need for this special Bill. I find that the owners of land fronting upon a portion of 7th Avenue petitioned the council to have sewer and water installed upon that street and council proceeded with the construction of the improvements. Notice as required by Section 691, subsection (2) of The Municipal Act was omitted. Since 100 percent of the owners of the property fronting upon the improvement signed the petition the notice would not have been necessary, except that the cost of the improvement was not being charged entirely against the land referred to in the petition. It is the policy of the council to charge a front foot rate of 40 cents per year against land fronting upon sewer and water improvements that are installed and with the remainder being charged against the local improvement district at large.

Now the owners of the lands fronting on this particular improvement will benefit by reason of others paying towards the cost of their improvement, but these owners similarly contributed to the cost of other installations that have been made at the same charge per front foot to the owners fronting thereon. The method of charging for this improvement is consistent with that used historically by the town of Virden. The problem arises by reason of failure to post notice pursuant to Section 691, subsection (2), but it should be noted that such notice makes it possible for persons to apply to be heard before the council but makes no provision for anyone to petition or vote against the carrying out of the improvement.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. ROBERT STEEN (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, I would request the indulgence of the House to allow this matter to stand in my name, but I have no objection to anybody else speaking if they so desire.

MR. SPEAKER: (Agreed) The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Roblin, Bill No. 82, The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I don't have anything to say on this Bill. I was hoping I'd have some information. The information I have been waiting for I don't have and I don't think it's fair for me to hold the Bill up, so as far as I am concerned you can go ahead.

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

MR. SPEAKER: I take it we go back to . . . .

MR. EVANS: Bill No. 52, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Go on with 52?

MR. EVANS: Bill No. 52.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 52. The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. OSCAR F. BJORNSON (Lac du Bonnet) presented Bill No. 52, an Act respecting The Village of Lac du Bonnet, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. BJORNSON: I was just hoping that someone would ask for the explanation because the Lac du Bonnet Co-op Water Company President has made it very easy for me to explain just exactly what this Bill consists of, and with your permission I'll read excerpts from it. "As you may know, the present village water system was commenced and incorporated by a group of interested citizens almost 20 years ago. This came about because of the desire of a number of citizens to obtain a water system for the village when it was decided that the village council of the day were not in a position financially to provide the system throughout the whole village. Although the system had a modest beginning and only covered a portion of the village in the beginning, it was extended each year until it eventually covered the whole area.

"The system is considered a municipal one since it is owned by the property owners of the Village of Lac du Bonnet. It has been operated and administered by a five-man board of elected citizens since its inception. The present board agreed, and suggested to the owner-citizens two years ago that the original purpose of the system had long been accomplished, and because of its present size and the increasing growth of the community, that it was now in the interest of all concerned to transfer the water system over to the jurisdiction of the village council so that its future growth and improvement could be planned for on a long-term basis and by a continuing body.

"Two other points which influenced the board's thinking were the fact that the village sewage system and the fire department are owned by the village and are administered by the village council. Therefore, it seemed only logical that this body should also control and administer the water distribution system. The board's suggestion and recommendations were agreed to at a general meeting and a motion passed that the board take the necessary steps to arrange with the council for the eventual transfer of the Lac du Bonnet Water Co-op Limited to the village jurisdiction. The company is debt free, and apart from its physical assets of pumping equipment and other facilities and . . . . ., had cash assets on hand. All assets are to be turned over to the Village of Lac du Bonnet when the official transfer is approved, the cash reserve to be used by the village for the future maintenance and improvement of the city." And this is signed by H. P. Smith, the President of the Lac du Bonnet Water Co-op Limited.

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

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We have no objection to this Bill. There's only one question I have in mind and that is in respect to the \$150. 00 for connections. Is that to be paid for each connection from now on in or just for those that are owing up to date?

MR. BJORNSON: The only outstandings of water connections are those that have been taken up by a man who owns a subdivision. He put the line in at his own expense and they have incurred - I think it's about \$1,500.00 now. As the property is being taken up by the purchaser of the property, he is assessed \$150.00 and this is an obligation of the Water Co-op to pay the accrued amounts. If we take it over then he will get \$150.00 - he'll get the whole amount and any further connections will be recovered from the purchaser of the property at \$150.00 per connection.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 76. The Honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. DAWSON presented Bill No. 76, An Act to validate By-law No. 5/69 of The Rural Municipality of Strathclair, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

May 2, 1969

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. DAWSON: Mr. Speaker, on this by-law a fund was established for the purpose of erecting and maintaining a medical nursing unit in the unincorporated village district of Elphinstone, which is in the said Municipality of Strathclair. In accordance with their by-laws, an annual levy amounting to \$88.30 per year had been raised from the year 1949 to the year 1968. This was raised against the Village of Elphinstone and part of the adjoining area. This resulted in an accumulation of \$1,677 in a fund known as the Elphinstone Medical Nursing Unit. The need of erecting and maintaining a medical nursing unit in the said unincorporated village district of Elphinstone no longer exist in so much that other facilities have been provided. They desire to transfer such funds as they have been levying to the trustees of Elphinstone Community Centre to be used in the development of an Elphinstone Community Building. The Rural Municipality of Strathclair Council enacted the following: That the sum of \$1,677, together with any interest that had accumulated, that was being maintained by the Elphinstone Medical Nursing Unit account, be authorized to be closed and that the moneys in that account be transferred to the three trustees who are Mr. Henry Thomas Morton, Mr. John Roger McMurachy and James Andrew Muir." They're all of the Village of Elphinstone. They were appointed the trustees of the Elphinstone Community Centre on behalf of the Community Centre people, and they are empowering the trustees to use this money for anything that they feel will benefit the community in the Village of Elphinstone.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, may I thank the honourable member who introduced the Bill for paraphrasing the by-law which is attached as a schedule to the Bill, but may I also ask of him to clarify for us how the Elphinstone Community Centre is created, how the trustees are appointed, to whom they are responsible, and what powers do they have, because this being public moneys in effect, moneys, which as explained have been paid in by the people of the Elphinstone district, then I think there should be an assurance that the purpose for which the money will now be used is one which is still within the control of the people.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, the question that I wish to put to the mover is why was the Community Centre project chosen as beneficiary of this fund which the municipal council could see no other way of spending. I believe that the Honourable Member for Hamiota mentioned that other medical facilities are now provided. I'd be interested in knowing what they are because to the best of my recollection of the town of Elphinstone, which I do visit from time to time, I have no knowledge of a hospital within that town. I do not know which town in that area does have a hospital, and it just makes me wonder why they took a fund which was earmarked for the provision of health services and designated it to a community club activity such as this rather than putting it into the hospital facility that is in that area - and I presume that there is one and this is what I would like the honourable member to tell me - for the purpose of expanding it or -- well certainly \$1,600 isn't going to expand the building by that much, but I'm sure that all hospitals could use funds of this type for the provision of more adequate facilities. So why was the community club project chosen and not the hospital serving the community?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, according to the Bill the moneys that were set aside were set aside for a definite purpose, namely the erection of a medical nursing unit. This has been proceeding for at least 20 years or more and they claim that the needs are no longer there for this unit. But how come action wasn't taken in the immediate time over the 20 years in getting a nursing unit sooner?

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

MR. DAWSON: To answer the last member's question first, Mr. Speaker, I think the people of that village made a decision on their own of what they wanted to do. They decided that there was no longer any need to have the setup that wasn't being used that existed in their village.

To go on to the second member's question about why wasn't this money put into a fund for a hospital, I can't say why they decided not to put this money in a fund for a hospital. As the member knows, he's familiar with that territory, Shoal Lake is their nearest hospital and it is the one that they use. The clinic that existed I think was merely an office where the doctor visited once or twice a week. This is what they called their clinic, and they've dispensed with that because doctors are not that readily available to be servicing these smaller towns.



(MR. DAWSON cont'd.)

To go on to the first member's questions, I'm not sure that I remember in what order he asked them, except to say that the community centre people are appointed by the council and are responsible to the council. They are to act as trustees for that money and I imagine that they would have to be responsible to the Rural Municipality of Strathclair's council.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 77. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS presented Bill No. 77, An Act to amend The St. Boniface Charter, 1953, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, in explaining this Bill, I wish to tell you right now that I'm not speaking for my church, just for myself. This Bill, the five first sections would propose an increase from 10 percent to 15 percent in the penalty charged on land sold in tax sale and an increase from seven to 10 1/2 percent being the interest on tax sale properties after the first year.

Now a few years ago - quite a few years ago - 70 years ago the City of St. Boniface provided penalties of one-half of one percent per month and this was charged only after January 1 of the year following the year in which the tax had been levied. There were some amendments to the St. Boniface Charter and the Municipal Act came about and the result of those amendments were that it would permit the city to charge penalties during the year of imposing the tax instead of waiting till the following year, permitted the city to compound the interest charge by adding it to the tax roll at the end of each year, and it increased the rate charged on tax arrears from one-half of one percent - six percent per year - to three-quarters of one percent - nine percent per year - and the City of St. Boniface having this in mind, this is why it asks for these changes. We had an increase as I said a few years ago in some amendments from six to nine percent, which is a 50 percent increase, and they are only keeping this ratio when they are asking this.

Now the main reason, and I think that it would be very understandable to all the members, that right now, Mr. Speaker, some businessmen would sooner -- it's a lot easier for them to keep the municipality's money because it costs them more than six percent to borrow. Six percent is not logical any more so I think that this is certainly a very reasonable amendment.

I might say that the City of course, if the members see fit to see this go to second reading, I'm sure that the representatives of the City of St. Boniface will be here to answer any more question, but I'm giving you the principle, the idea of the Bill now. The City Solicitor tells me that the city would be prepared to accept an amendment to its charter which would provide a penalty of one and one-quarter percent per month as opposed to a flat 15 percent per year. This obviously would work in favour of this person redeeming his property earlier in the year - you know, starting every month instead of waiting at the end of the year.

The amendment that is proposed now in Bill 77 would mean that as soon as you're in arrears for the full year you pay the 15 percent. Now they would be ready, if it's the will of the members, to put this one and a quarter percent which would work to the same thing, but then if you're only a month in arrears you won't be penalized the full time.

Of course I must say that some members might want to oppose this and say, Well, we've got to treat the municipalities the same. Well this is not the first time that I bring a Bill like this in the House. St. Boniface has to make changes in the St. Boniface Charter. Now it's up to the Minister -- it's up to the government, it's not up to the city to say: Well, we want to bring a bill that will amend the other municipalities. The city recognize that maybe this should be done, and I don't see any reason why we shouldn't pass this and if the Minister and the government - unfortunately, the Minister of Municipal Affairs isn't here today - he might clarify -- they might have some suggestions to make.

Now I think there were some other points also. Oh yes, there's also an increase in the rate of interest in the city's debentures from seven to nine percent - it's all keeping on the same ratio; to provide an increase from four to seven percent on the interim interest rate chargeable on a local improvement; and also this section replacing the position of Municipal Commissioner, which has been abolished by the Municipal Board of Manitoba -- or replaced by the Munisipal Board.

And also in this Bill there's an amendment that would provide for an increase of one member of council and one citizen member on the St. Boniface Police Commission. That would be two members.

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.)

Then they brought a further amendment, the last amendment in the Bill, Mr. Speaker, the last clause - or I should say Clause 12 - to place all the matters pertaining to collective bargaining under the jurisdiction of the city council.

So I trust that this is the information needed. As I say, I think I gave you the idea of the principle behind the Bill and there might be some other questions that you wish to ask from the representatives of the City of St. Boniface.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, the only concern that I would have at this stage is justification for the increase on tax sale redemption of a penalty from 10 percent to 15 percent. I don't think that normally businessmen are pleased to pay 10 percent on their money and thus take advantage of permitting their lands not only to fall into arrears but actually to be sold in tax sale, and it just occurs to me that it is a high rate to pay as a penalty if there are many small homes that may be affected by this.

Now I don't think that the honourable member has the information to justify this and we know that he is doing a courtesy to the city to bring the Bill in, but I hope that when the city's representative appears before committee that there will be some indication of the number of parcels that have been involved in the past and an indication of the amount involved, say, as an average per parcel, so we have some idea as to who is being penalized as between the businessman and the small homeowner who may well have fallen somewhat behind and may have difficulty extricating himself and to whom this penalty may be high. Now I'm not suggesting that that is the case, but I'm raising this as a possibility of a hardship which I'm sure that the city and certainly the Member for St. Boniface would like to make sure about at the proper time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I was going to make the same point in connection with raising the 10 percent to 15 percent. We know that a number of municipalities throughout the province have proceeded with raising the interest rate on taxes overdue but I think in most cases this was raised to nine percent. Now we find that they want to raise it from 10 to 15 percent for those lands sold in tax sale, and I'm just wondering whether this will not impose a very large burden on people who might already be overburdened as such and that we are placing too heavy a burden on these people. I think 15 percent is not reasonable; I think it's getting to the point where it's unreasonable and abnormal. I certainly would like to hear from the people in committee on this very point because I feel that the way things are going in Manitoba that we might have increased number of tax sales, and if we're going to add to that burden an excessive cost of interest, I think we are doing the wrong thing.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. BAIZLEY: Mr. Speaker, concerning the Bill the honourable member is presenting from St. Boniface, I'd like to tell members of the House it would be my intention to request that those sections relating to the increased interest rates be held in committee, because there is a special committee of the House - Municipal Affairs - and I would like to see if we couldn't arrive at some uniformity of rate for cities and municipalities in their dealings with the people.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs - I believe the question would be pertinent to his statement as to uniformity insofar as cities are concerned - is it the intention of his department to produce a uniform city charter for Manitoba at this session?

MR. BAIZLEY: Not at this session, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Wellington, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 63. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. WALLY McKENZIE (Roblin) presented Bill No. 63, An Act to validate Certain By-laws of The Town of Dauphin and The Rural Municipality of Dauphin and to enlarge the Boundaries of The Town of Dauphin, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. McKENZIE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it's pretty well a straightforward Bill. The Rural Municipality of Dauphin and the town of Dauphin have entered into an agreement to transfer

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd.) . . . . approximately 100 acres from the municipality to the town. The necessary by-laws have been passed and the present Bill is necessary to give effect to that agreement and the by-laws as appended in the schedules of the Bill. The owners of the land in question, Mr. Speaker, are a husband and wife, and prior to the agreement the husband owner, on behalf of his wife and himself, made written application to the municipality and to the town of Dauphin to have the land transferred within the boundaries of that town. Subsequent to this application and the making of the agreement between the town and the municipality, the owners sold approximately 17 acres of the affected land to Dauphin-Ochre School Area No. 1 as the site of the proposed composite high to be constructed in Dauphin. The transfer of land in question will enable it to be served with water and sewer by the town of Dauphin, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MICHAEL KAWCHUK (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Speaker, we have no objection to this Bill receiving second reading. It is my understanding that there will be an interested party appearing before the Law Amendments to state the particular case and we'll judge ourselves accordingly when this is heard.

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

MR. SPEAKER: I take it we go back to Page 4?

MR. EVANS: Yes, if you please, Mr. Speaker.

#### PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. The Honourable the Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, I believe when the hour of adjournment came the other day I was making some comments about the degree of decentralization of provincial government services within the Province of Manitoba, and I had just been making the point that a very substantial degree of decentralization has taken place throughout the province and that applies equally to services in northern Manitoba as it does to services in other parts of the province.

The final point that I wanted to touch on, Mr. Speaker, was the (c) portion of the resolution in which it says: "request the government to give consideration to a more equitable return of tax monies and royalties by way of a speedup in road construction." Well, I have two points that I would like to make with respect to that, Mr. Speaker, the first one being I don't think that it's good public financial policy to allocate funds according to the source of the revenue; and the second point of course is that there is an implication here in the resolution that the north is not getting an equitable share today, and I would hope to make a few remarks which will I think prove that particular point.

I find it rather amusing really that this whole resolution is brought in by a member of the Liberal caucus, because I think one only has to look at the record of the former government in office to know that very scant attention was paid to northern Manitoba during the period of time in which they occupied the treasury benches of the House. As far as I know, between the year 1950 and that famous year 1958 when the government changed, I don't believe there was one mile of provincial trunk highway built in northern Manitoba. I don't believe so and I could be wrong with respect to that item, but if I am I would like to know, because since that time I think there have been very very substantial changes made in the road system in northern Manitoba. I would like to comment on some of them to refresh the memories of those in the House that may have faded over the years of time since we've been sitting here.

To begin with, there was a complete rebuild to standards, to high standards, to standards required by modern traffic, of the highway from the town of Swan River through to Flin Flon, a distance of some 250 miles. I believe there are one or two minor sections that have not been fully completed with respect to the complete rebuilding of that road and I understand that they will be done this year. But for all intents and purposes a rebuild job of something in excess of 200 miles at least. A road construction program of 112 miles from Grand Rapids to Gypsumville; a road from that particular highway through to the new community of Easterville, some 40 miles; a road from that highway to Long Point, a distance of some 12 miles; No. 10 Highway to Thompson, a distance of 202 miles; Snow Lake Road - 21.3; Osborne Lake Road - 12 miles; Chisel Lake Road - 8 miles; Road from Lynn Lake to Fox Lake, a distance of some 30 miles; Lynn Lake east to Reindeer Lake, a distance of some 62 miles; Road in the Sipiwesk area to service Churchill Forest operation - 20 miles; the highway in the south from Ponton, a

May 2, 1969

(MR. CARROLL cont'd.) . . . . distance of some 20 miles; The Pas to the Saskatchewan border, a distance of 7 miles; Mafeking west to the Saskatchewan border, a distance of some 26 miles; The Denbeigh Point Road in the Gypsumville area - four miles; Namew Lake - 20 miles; an additional road for Churchill Forest - 4 miles; Paint Lake - Thompson to Paint Lake - a distance of some 8 miles. A total new road program, Mr. Speaker, of 608 miles over the period of the last ten or eleven years; a rebuilding of another road in excess of 200 miles; a very very substantial road program, and the resolution of course is saying that the north is not getting its share of roads. I'm not saying that we shouldn't have more roads in the north. I would be the first one to be promoting faster opening up of our resources, faster airroads to service the isolated communities of the north.

But I do want to say that I think there has been fair consideration given to the needs of the north with respect to highway construction. The road - Gypsumville to Grand Rapids with its tributaries - \$6,425,000; No. 10 Highway - Swan River to Flin Flon, including the bridge at The Pas - \$18,336,000; Simonhouse-Thompson, with roads to Chisel, Osborne and Snow - \$14,330,000; Fox Lake - \$790,000; Lynn Lake area - Sipiwesk, Ponton south - \$3,335,000; for a grand total of \$43,216,000 in road works since the change of government in 1958. I think that one must recognize that this is a very substantial extension to a provincial highway system since the present government took over. I don't know what percentage of the over-all road program was expended in the north, but my estimate is somewhere between 10 and 20 percent of the provincial road budget has been spent in northern Manitoba since the year 1958.

Now there are a great many other items of new provincial government service in northern Manitoba that I think I should touch on very briefly. We know something of the changes in administration, in municipal affairs, the establishment of additional local government districts, the establishment of the Northern Commissioner and the services he is providing, the per capita grants that are being given to Indian Reserves in a form in which they now have control over those funds which they never had before. It was always at the discretion of the Indian Affairs Department. We've given this to them in such a way that they can make use of those funds for local programs.

There have been many improvements in local government services to many of our isolated communities in the north, and I'd like to refer to some of them because I think some members of the House have little knowledge of the extent to which government services are being provided in northern Manitoba. There have been roads built under the Department of Municipal Affairs, the Northern Commissioner's office at the following points: Berens River, Brochet, Split Lake, Moose Lake, Cross Lake, Nelson House, Ilford, Oxford House, Island Lake, Poplar River, Bloodvein, Red Sucker and Wasagamach. Airstrips were provided at a large number of isolated communities: Ste. Therese Point at Island Lake; an airstrip at Cross Lake; an airstrip at Brochet; a 4,000 foot airstrip at Split Lake settlement; an airstrip has been cleared during the past winter at York Landing; an old Inco airstrip at Ilford has been renovated and put back into service; an airstrip has been cleared at Pikwitonei and Thicket Portage; an airstrip started at Little Grand Rapids, and the portage between the lakes there has been cleared and widened; a 4,000 foot airstrip at Poplar River. Well these are some advances in communications and in roads, certainly not tied into the provincial trunk highway system but very important roads for the local people in these communities and ones that are much appreciated by them.

In addition, there have been footbridges provided in a great many places; docks at Split Lake, Ilford, Poplar River, Sheridan; a rock weir was provided so that it would eliminate some seven or eight portages for the people between York Landing and Ilford, and this one might refer to as a river highway system because that's the way the people travel in that part of the country. Wells have been provided at a number of communities in the north - I won't mention them all - but a safe water supply has been assured to many of them. There have been water systems of rather unsophisticated but of very practical nature provided at Thicket Portage and at Pikwitonei. Housewiring programs have been conducted in a wide number of areas now serviced by Manitoba Hydro. And you may not think that important, but I suspect a person who had his stove fixed thinks differently. I have forgotten so much in the detail I have brought here to the House that if I had taken a little time I could really add to these lists very substantially, but I didn't want to burden the House with too much detail. New community halls have been provided at a large number of points and I won't list those because I know members will get tired of hearing them.

(MR. CARROLL cont'd.)

The Manitoba Telephone System has provided very substantial services in the north - \$10,254,000 has been spent to improve the communications network in providing telephone systems in a large number of communities; in providing radio telephone service of a much more reliable nature than was available before; a tropospheric scatter system to provide a large volume of long distance lines, or the equivalent of lines in some areas, as well as the microwave system that is serving northern Manitoba.

I mentioned in another debate that Manitoba Hydro is providing a very substantial thrust into the northern frontier in providing a very great impetus for development there. We know something of the development and investment they have made in the north at Kelsey and Grand Rapids and the present Kettle Rapids site, the transmission lines and the related facilities to carry that power to its ultimate destination, but what members may not know is the extent to which Hydro has provided diesel generation in northern communities to service people who otherwise would not have this amenity. There have been some 19 installations of diesel units in northern Manitoba since 1958, and there have been distribution systems provided in some 27 communities in Northern Manitoba providing services to people who otherwise would not have had this kind of service; many of these or most of these in isolated communities. If members of the House are interested, I would be very glad to oblige them by providing the detail on that.

We recognize that very substantial investments have been made in our recreation areas in provincial parks and in roadside facilities in the north, some 30 roadside parks that I counted quickly on the map the other day and some 9 provincial recreation areas that did not exist in years past. To show you the kind of use that is being made of these new recreation facilities, in the year 1968 there were a total of some 32,465 campers who spent overnight in our northern camping areas. And these were only those areas where we sell permits for overnight accommodation; a great many people would spend overnight in areas where camp permits were not required. I would like to inform the House, of the overnight campers that used our northern parks and recreation areas, some 22 percent of them have their destination in the United States, providing some of those export dollars that are so much needed by our province and our Provincial Treasurer and our country.

We know something from estimates of the Department of Mines of the very extensive work that has been done in geological surveys in the north; we know something of the forest inventories that have taken place, not only for Churchill Forest Industries but in the Playgreen Lake area as well as to the east of Lake Winnipeg. We've had an expansion in fish hatcheries to stabilize and improve our commercial areas for commercial fishing as well as for recreation purposes. We've had an extension of game management areas in a large number of points in northern Manitoba to protect our wildlife for future generations. We've foregone, I suppose, some revenue - and this may have the same results as what is being recommended in the resolution - in the foregoing of revenues to provide the incentive for the development of our northern forests, and we know what that will do for the people who live in that part of the country and who will be working in the development of this new industry.

We know something of the work of the Department of Industry and Commerce in the north, its emphasis on northern development in the COMEF report and the TED report; the Development Fund in providing recreational facilities and assisting in the kind of development that is taking place at The Pas.

I've listed a large number of programs that have a capital investment and I think equally important and probably a great deal more important are those programs in which we have invested in the people of the north. In this regard I suppose I might mention first the development of Northern Services Health Program where we have provided a very substantially upgraded service to northern people who were substantially without treatment facilities prior to that time; the establishment of nursing stations and the training of people to run these operations, providing medicines and regular visits from medical doctors and nurses, provided dental clinics on a less regular basis, an attempt to provide preventive health services throughout the north, improved water supplies and things of that kind.

We know something of the improved services from the Department of Welfare, the Community Development Program that has made a start on helping people of Indian origin to take greater advantage of opportunities that exist within our province.

In the field of education, the Frontier School Division providing new opportunities, better opportunities than ever existed before to the people scattered throughout the northern hinterland.

(MR. CARROLL cont'd.) The Frontier Collegiate at Cranberry Portage, and those in the House who had the opportunity to visit that a few years ago know of the excellence of the facilities there, and I can assure you the quality of the teaching staff is just as good. The northern Manitoba Vocational School at The Pas is a facility that is second to none in Manitoba, possibly second to none in the North American continent, with its emphasis and its orientation toward the people of the north, to try to provide the special training that is required by many of them in order to fit into the sort of society that many will have to make their way into. Moose Lake Training Program sponsored by the Department of Mines and Natural Resources, a very excellent effort in co-operation between the Department of Education, the Resource Department and industry in taking the finished product that will be produced there. There's been excellent co-operation from the local people and I think it's a program that will result in very substantial success with the people taking it, and hopefully may be expanded in other directions in the future.

Well, we've seen the expansion of driver training - driver licensing programs rather into northern Manitoba; we've got a full-time Compensation Board - the member for Churchill may be interested in that - with a labour representative on it who comes himself from the north and whose views I think have been reflected in many of the changes in workmen's compensation legislation.

MR. PAULLEY: Who is that?

MR. CARROLL: Peter McSheffrey.

MR. PAULLEY: May I ask my honourable friend a question, Mr. Speaker?

MR. CARROLL: Sure.

MR. PAULLEY: Did I understand my honourable friend to say that the position of Mr. Peter McSheffrey on the Workmen's Compensation Board was that of representative of northern Manitoba?

MR. CARROLL: No, I didn't mean that.

MR. PAULLEY: That is what the Minister said. If he didn't mean it he shouldn't have said it.

MR. CARROLL: I said he was the labour representative but he came from the north, the labour representative meaning that he represents the trade unions, that phase of that segment of the board that's represented there. If you got the impression he was a representative from the north, he does come from the north, he makes no bones about that, he's proud of it, and I'm happy that we had a man of that calibre that could fill that position.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if I might take a moment and remind the Honourable Minister that he has five minutes.

MR. CARROLL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We've had the extension of other services of the Department of Labour in the north with a Labour Inspector; we've got an ag rep in northern Manitoba for the first time providing the wonderful services from that department to our new farmers in the area around The Pas; we've had substantial extension of probation services in the north, in rehab camps providing work opportunities for people who find themselves in custodial care, and we think these are very worthwhile measures. -- (Interjection) -- That may come ultimately I don't know - I don't know - I think that's a question that the Minister of Mines may well want to deal with sometime in the future.

I think that one would recognize that there have been very substantial investments in the north in terms both of program and in terms of capital facilities, in terms of roads and other services, so I think it doesn't matter, you know, how large the program is, if you don't provide service to the individual community involved, or he doesn't have access - or that community doesn't have access to the outside, he's going to be unhappy and I think that it's our responsibility to try to continue to extend services in the north as quickly as we can so that all of our people may share in the services of our government. We recognize that there's a big job yet to be done. We're spending more money each year in the north, since 1958 the government, and its utilities, than was spent by all departments of government prior to 1958, if you want to get some measure of the investment that's taking place in program and in capital facilities in northern Manitoba.

I would like to say that I welcome the support for the northern road program that is implied in this resolution. I have sympathy with this point of view but I have a very great difficulty in trying to determine what kinds of programs the government is going to have to cut out in order to accommodate greater expenditures in this area, and this poses a very real

May 2, 1969

1881

(MR. CARROLL cont'd.) . . . . . problem for me and for other members of the House. I think it's wrong in principle to allocate government services based on sources of revenue. I think we all recognize how difficult it would be to combat economic disparity, or regional disparity, if you could only put back into those regions the monies that you took out in revenues from that area, and I think the fallacy of the argument that's placed before us shows up when one considers it in the light of economically depressed areas.

I would like to say that the party that introduced this resolution has certainly demonstrated little support in the past for progressive programs such as Roads to Resources, but I do welcome their new interest and their new support for this kind of program, and while I agree in sentiment with many of the things that are contained in the resolution, I think that the resolution itself would not lend itself to practical application and I therefore intend to vote against the resolution.

..... continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: The Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, it's always a privilege to listen to the Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs in this House, and I presume that the reason that he was speaking of northern Manitoba was because of the same reason that he gave to us a few moments ago for the appointment of Peter McSheffrey to the Workmen's Compensation Board is because he comes from the north. I suppose that if we approach . . . -- (Interjection) -- No, I do not - if you want a direct answer. And it's becoming more evident every day that there's a lot of just reasons for my statement. But, Mr. Speaker, if this is the basis on which my honourable friend is speaking, because he comes from the north, may I respectfully suggest that he talks to his colleagues in the Cabinet and have changes made in the portfolio in order that he may be the Commissioner of Northern Affairs.

MR. CARROLL: Would the member permit a question?

MR. PAULLEY: I believe I would.

MR. CARROLL: Do you know the basis on which those appointments were made, that there were two names came forward from the Manitoba Federation of Labour, one of which was Peter McSheffrey.

MR. PAULLEY: Are you talking of the appointments of the Commissioner of Northern Affairs? I am not here to justify the recommendations from any organization such as the Manitoba Federation of Labour or any other group in the original appointment. I do know that the honourable gentleman, and I have a lot of respect, personal respect, for Mr. McSheffrey, I do know he was appointed by that government for certain reasons best known to them, and it might have been, as the Honourable Minister has indicated this afternoon, he was appointed because he came from north of 53, because that is what my honourable friend -- (Interjection)-- made the basis of the appointment as being one from the north. So I say to my honourable friend -- (Interjection) -- maybe the . . . my honourable friend is chirping today, Mr. Speaker, as he was a month ago when I last heard him in this House, a slightly different subject possibly but still chirp, chirp, chirp, chirp, chirp, without any basic sense, without any intelligent approach to the problems of Manitoba.

I would suggest to my honourable friend that if he is desirous of being the spokesman for the north, the one who is so well versed in the problems and the history of the north, that possibly he should talk to the First Minister and have a few changes made within the Cabinet in order that he may be the Cabinet Minister responsible to this House for the affairs of northern Manitoba. Or may I ask my honourable friend whether he's speaking the way he is this afternoon to give some more substance to the speculation that is rife in Manitoba today that the government may show a little gumption and appeal to the people of Manitoba for support, and my honourable friend the member for The Pas may be speaking of the north today and giving substance to the rumors that are prevalent today. Because if he is, Mr. Speaker, I want to say to him, I enjoyed listening to his oration of the accomplishment of the last ten years in northern Manitoba, and how thankful, how thankful must the people of northern Manitoba be, that there by the grace of God goes this government, and there by the grace of this government, northern Manitoba has expanded to a degree where everybody is well satisfied and to the degree, to the degree that a former conservative representative in this House was so disgusted with the conduct of the government on behalf of northern Manitoba that he resigned his seat and that the candidate in the by-election in northern Manitoba who represented his benefactors, in accordance with the verblage of my honourable friend, lost his deposit in the by-election. Surely, surely to goodness the evidence that we have received of the opinions of the people of northern Manitoba have more substance in their opposition to this government than the platitudes that my honourable friend has just attempted and endeavoured to heap upon the ineffective and inadequate government we have in Manitoba insofar as northern affairs is concerned.

Of course over the last ten years we've made progress in Manitoba. I suggest that my honourable friend should look over a little more thoroughly the progress that we have made - and admittedly I say we have - but how much more progress we might have made had we had a government that showed real concern for northern Manitoba. My honourable friend in his long oration this afternoon finished up by saying there is much substance in the resolution proposed by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie and much that warrants support, but because it's not our idea at this particular time I'm not going to support it. He made reference to the natural resources of northern Manitoba, the wildlife, the recreation facilities available in northern Manitoba, and while he was speaking, Mr. Speaker, he forgot one of the



(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . most debated subjects that we have in this Assembly this year, namely, the depletion, in the opinion of many, of a large area where we have an abundance of natural resources and wildlife, recreational facilities, and of course it's obvious that I'm referring to Southern Indian Lake. How can my honourable friend stand up on one hand and extol the virtues, the glory and the forward-lookingness of the Conservative administration, when at the same time they have matters for consideration before this House that are adversely going to affect, in the opinion of many, until we have greater proof to the contrary, of a considerable section of northern Manitoba.

I would prefer in this House, if the Commissioner of Northern Affairs would speak on northern Manitoba; and if the Commissioner could not speak, then possibly the second in command as far as northern affairs is concerned would speak, the acting Minister, the Honourable the Minister of Government Services. Lo and behold, no. We hear our honourable friend the member from The Pas, the Minister of Consumer Affairs talking of the virtues of roads, the establishment of health units, which probably would come about in the natural development not only of northern Manitoba but of Manitoba as a whole. He exhibited no concern in his oration whatsoever for the higher cost of living in northern Manitoba, that should be his concern as Minister of Consumer Affairs. I heard not from my honourable friend.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, possibly our friend wasn't here. I made whatever contribution towards that part of the speech on Tuesday.

MR. PAULLEY: Whatever the contribution was or what it lacked, I am not aware, but I do think if my honourable friend was really concerned in those fields, instead of just prior to sitting down said I can't support this resolution because of my concern, he should have said then I will support of it. And if he did give some lip service previously to the high cost of living in northern Manitoba I congratulate him for it but I'd like to see the proof of his thoughts, in support for a resolution, the objective of which is the further and increased support in northern Manitoba.

The resolution suggests that we should have a full time minister of Northern Affairs. I heard nothing from our honourable friend as to whether or not he did suggest that northern Manitoba -- (Interjection) -- just stop chirping, you can ask me questions afterwards if you like, but please cease your chirping unless you have a question; and if you have a question I'll answer it.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. It's not a question. He keeps saying -- (Interjection) -- He keeps saying -- (Interjection) -- He keeps saying that in this debate I have not done this and I have not done that. He obviously wasn't here on Tuesday, and he obviously hasn't seen fit to read what contribution I made on that day and therefore I think he should cease to make comments except on that portion of my speech that he's heard.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I tell my honourable chirper, my honourable Minister, I've heard him so often in this House, I don't have to read Hansard, because year by year, by year he digs up the same balderdash that he gave us the year before without adding at all to its substance, and chirps merrily along his way -- and I want to assure my honourable friend that if I'm doing him an injustice by recalling what he said last year, and the year before, and the year before, and the year before that, then I apologize to him.

But I do want to know from him and from his government, when this government is going to truly recognize the people of northern Manitoba and their problems; when my honourable friend as Minister of Consumer Affairs is going to cause an investigation into the higher cost of living in northern Manitoba; when my honourable friend is going to recognize and try to take steps to alleviate the additional cost of living in northern Manitoba in the fields of housing and other areas. The mere building of roads would have come even despite the government opposite, and the chances are without them we would have had these roads a lot earlier.

The resolution calls for a more equitable return of tax monies and royalties by the way of a speed up in road construction. I think this not only deals with northern Manitoba but the rest of Manitoba as well. The part that I heard the Minister dwell at length upon this morning was the question of roads in northern Manitoba. And here the resolution which my honourable friend rejects, suggests that the Manitoba Government should request the Government of Canada to re-establish the Roads to Resources programs in order that there be greater sharing in the construction of roads in northern Manitoba. But my honourable friend doesn't want that. He said during his oration that we'll go along, we're going to muddle our way through and as we get a buck extra we may give it to the north or somewhere else, instead of asking the

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . . Government of Canada to return to the program previously in effect on the development of roads to resources. I recall when that program was withdrawn there was a loud loud holler from across the road and now my honourable friend the Minister from The Pas says he's going to reject the contention contained in this resolution.

I did anticipate that he might have produced an amendment to the resolution which would take care of at least many points contained in the resolution and might remove those points that were so objectionable to my honourable friend, who is now vacating the Chamber, because he doesn't like what is being said of his approach to northern Manitoba --(Interjection) -- I see the Commissioner of Northern Affairs is now back. I sincerely trust and hope that the Honourable the Minister from The Pas, the Minister of Consumer Affairs, has indoctrinated him as to what the Minister of Consumer Affairs said, so that the Commissioner of Northern Affairs can now take over from me and fully explain to the Assembly how many more electric stoves have had their switches fixed under the program, the progressive program of the Conservative Party on behalf of the people of northern Manitoba.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that as far as the resolution is concerned in my opinion it is worthy of support. As I said at the offset I don't know whether the contribution of the Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs is prompted to try and substantiate rumours that are rife as to the possibility of an early provincial election. If it was, then I suggest the guff that he handed us will not be accepted by the people of The Pas constituency anymore than it was by the people of Churchill constituency during the by-election. -- (Interjection) -- Pardon? -- (Interjection) -- No you can't win them all and I want to tell my honourable friend the Minister of Municipal Affairs, I would like to make a bet with him that they win far less at the next election in Manitoba than they hold at the present time.

And I want to say -- (Interjection) --

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, I didn't hear what the wager was.

MR. SPEAKER: . . . if I may say to the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party it delights me to see him in fine fettle today but I hope he won't provoke a row across the floor.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, one of the objectives that I have really, and I'll make the confession, is to provoke some row in this House with my honourable friends opposite, because if by provoking a row I can get them into some action instead of inaction, I think I will be doing a service to the people of Manitoba. This is what we're here for basically, to try to get them up off their proverbial sit-me-downs.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sure the honourable member misconstrued my remarks. I think we could go on from there.

MR. PAULLEY: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. If I misconstrued your remarks, I'm very very sorry. Possibly you would like to repeat them so, that I would be fully conversant with what you . . .

I appreciate anyway, Mr. Speaker, you coming to the defence of the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I'm sure that on many occasions in other debates he would welcome it, just as I'm sure he welcomes it at the present time.

My honourable friend says that he didn't hear the wager. -- (Interjection) -- I merely said that I would bet --(Interjection) -- Pardon? --(Interjection) -- Gee, sometimes you hear chirping from that side that are incomprehensible they're not understandable and -- I better get an interpreter in to indoctrinate me, Mr. Speaker, because while you just a few moments ago said apparently I misunderstood you, I certainly can't understand the members opposite -- and this is no fault of yours.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): He should stand up and take a bow.

MR. PAULLEY: Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I am surprised at the attitude of this government to the resolution that is proposed. A resolution that in my opinion is proposed to do something for the people of northern Manitoba. The mere recital of accomplishments or the lack of accomplishments over the past ten years as given to the House this afternoon by the Minister of Consumer Affairs really don't hold water at all, because even with an inactive, incompetent government that we have had in Manitoba for the last ten years, I think most of these things would have been done in any case. And I would like to hear from the Commissioner of Northern Affairs really what do the government intend to do from now on out other than the depletion of natural resources such as Southern Indian Lake and other areas, what really do they intend to do for the people of northern Manitoba.

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . .

The Minister of Consumer Affairs says that he rejects the proposition of the Member for Portage la Prairie. Well I would like to have an opinion from the government as to the alternatives that they are proposing. Again I repeat, they lost their so-called previous spokesman of the Conservative Party in this House because of his rejection of the attitude of the Conservative Party of Manitoba, in northern Manitoba. The official candidate, or the candidate of the Conservative Party in the recent by-elections, I repeat lost his deposit. The gain, of course, to this House is the election of my colleague from Churchill and a supporter of this group. In all seriousness, how can, how can the Minister of the Crown stand up and object and reject a resolution that calls upon the Government of Canada to go back in co-operation in a roads to resources program for northern Manitoba without giving us any constructive alternatives as to what the government intends to do.

I ask, I beg, I plead with the Commissioner of Northern Affairs, or the second in command of that department, the Minister of Government Services, to tell this House on this resolution what really are the intentions of the Government of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. DAWSON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Turtle Mountain, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Logan. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. STANES: Mr. Speaker, the first part of the resolution amongst other things states the need for housing and the high priority that it should have, to which I completely agree. I have, like many of us, Mr. Speaker, been to conferences run by various organizations, many hours are spent, a lot of money is spent discussing housing and I sometimes wonder if all the effort and the money put into the ones that I've been to were converted to housing, we would have a few more houses. I think it is an extremely high priority. I think bringing up a child in an apartment block or a converted section of a house is not the same as that of bringing one up in a house. I do think it's a very high priority. We've got in some way to cut some of the red tape. But as the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Services yesterday said, it's a most vexing problem, and it is.

The second part of it says that the federal sales tax greatly increases the cost of construction beyond the reach of many. This is only partly true. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia when he was speaking on this resolution, Mr. Speaker, stated - I think he was quoting Central Housing and Mortgage, that federal sales tax and provincial sales tax is 20 percent, was that correct? I just wonder sometimes what the total cost of taxes are on a house. I believe I'm correct in saying that still the largest portion of the cost of a house is not material but labour, in the construction of a house, and on that point perhaps members saw TV last night and saw some prototype houses being built in Toronto where they're cutting the cost of labour very considerably by pre-slab concrete basements, using steel for joists and so on - purely experimental. Maybe this is one of the answers where we can cut the cost of labour, but we still have of course a large part of labour, and quite rightly so, in getting that material in its final form and then getting it to the construction site.

It is a most important problem. I don't think anyone will underestimate it. However, there is a problem with this type of resolution and this is the reason, Mr. Speaker, that I adjourned it. I sometimes wonder what happens to our resolutions when they go to Ottawa. I sometimes wonder perhaps whether they're worth the postage stamp. If one accepts this resolution, surely we can accept then from the federal government a resolution about the Manitoba sales tax. I wonder if we've ever received such a resolution, I don't know; but I do think we've got to be credible in these matters. They are a responsible group, they are duly elected the same way as we are, and they're executive types, they're responsible men. I may not agree with perhaps their partisan politics, I may not agree with some of their decisions, but I do give them the benefit of the doubt, and I do say that they are able - certainly they are very competent to make decisions and certainly justified in making those decisions. So I'm wondering perhaps, bearing in mind the number of things this province wants, whether perhaps we are not perhaps damaging ourselves by making such resolutions, important though they may be, and that perhaps we might be crying "wolf" by pouring in resolutions which they themselves would like to accept I'm sure, because to them it is as important as it is to us, that perhaps we might

(MR. STANES cont'd) . . . in the long run be doing ourselves great harm, bearing in mind the substance of the TED inquiry report, and so therefore Mr. Speaker, rather than amend the thing till it's watered down to almost nothing, which I think is not honest, I think the responsible action here is to defeat the resolution and when we do go to the federal government with something which is extremely important to us and we are credible in asking for it, that we'll have then more success. It's on that basis at the moment I feel like defeating the resolution, Mr. Speaker, but perhaps we'll hear more along these lines in discussion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I listened to the comments of the Honourable Member for St. James with extreme interest, and there are two statements that he made that leave me entirely at a loss to really appreciate what in fact he was attempting to say. He said that the people in Ottawa - I presume he means the elected representatives, members of parliament - are a responsible group and therefore we should leave them to managing their affairs and we ought not take it upon ourselves to inform them in Ottawa, 1,500 miles away from here, as to what is going on in our own province and what our problems are. And then he goes on to say that we in fact may be damaging ourselves by crying "wolf".

Now, Mr. Speaker, is the honourable member not familiar with the critical housing situation in the Province of Manitoba at the present time? And this to him is crying "wolf"? I believe some time ago I had mentioned some of the statistics related to housing in dealing with the welfare estimates, and I would like at this time, Mr. Speaker, to present some others more closely related to this particular resolution than they were to the department under debate at that time. In the Province of Manitoba, and this is one that I'll repeat, I'd like to refresh the honourable members' memory on this one: "In the Province of Manitoba there are over 75,000 homes out of a total of 240,000 homes that were built prior to 1920." Now my elementary knowledge of arithmetic tells me that there are approximately 75,000 homes close to 50 years of age. Now I'm sure that these homes are not going to last indefinitely, and I'm sure that the majority of people living in these homes are not people earning incomes of 10, 15 or 20 thousand dollars a year. I'm sure that there are many people living in these homes earning the average wage in Manitoba, earning much less than the average wage in Manitoba. In fact I would suggest to you Mr. Speaker, that probably the majority of occupants in these homes are people living at or below the average wage in the Province of Manitoba. This, Mr. Speaker, is to the honourable member crying "wolf"! Is he not aware of the fact that over a third of the homes in rural Manitoba, over a third of the farm homes in rural Manitoba are 50 years of age or older. Is he not aware of the fact that over 25 percent of the rural non-farm homes in Manitoba are 50 years of age or over? Is he not aware of the fact that practically one-third of the urban homes, 50,000 homes, in Manitoba are 50 years of age or over? This to the Honourable Member is crying "wolf"!

MR. STANES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I would appreciate it if the honourable member would use the expression I used in its correct context and not put it into distortion.

MR. HANUSCHAK: As I listened to the honourable member, Mr. Speaker, the way it came over the public address system to this side of the House, I'm sorry that is the way I understand it. And if the honourable member meant to use it in different context he had ample opportunity to explain to this House the sense in which he wished that term to be interpreted.

Is the honourable member not aware of the fact that in rural Manitoba over half the homes are without adequate waterwork facilities, are in fact lacking waterwork facilities, because there are some that have waterworks facilities of some type or another, but over 52 percent are lacking waterwork facilities, and these figures, Mr. Speaker, are from the Dominion Bureau of Statistic reports, the latest reports that are available in our library. Is the honourable member not aware of the fact that our homes in Manitoba are far more crowded than those in most parts of Canada, that the average for the whole country in Canada is .74 persons per room, in Manitoba it runs around .8? Is he not aware of the fact that the average is even higher than that in the Interlake area, the area that the government talks about so much, that that is the area within which it's going to do wonders for the people, that that is the area within which it's going to improve the welfare of the people? And with that being the situation as it is the honourable members says this is crying "wolf".

Now surely, surely Mr. Speaker, it is high time that we recognize that the provision of housing is and ought to be a public responsibility in much the same as the provision of other services that we accept today, as the provision of health services, the provision of education, as the provision of any others that the public has accepted as being its responsibility, and so

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) . . . should housing be. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member would not reject the notion that every individual, every person in the Province of Manitoba is entitled to decent housing. I'm sure he accepts that; and yet at the same time in the same breath he says, let's not disturb the tax structure, let those people pay, let them pay the extra costs. He says, maybe there are other ways of solving the problem, maybe we can cut down on labour, maybe we can find cheaper labour construction costs of homes. But, Mr. Speaker, those labourers or those labourers that will become unemployed because of mass production or what have you will still need homes in this province of Manitoba, and as long as the sales tax remains on those homes it'll be just as difficult or in fact more difficult for them to obtain homes, to obtain decent housing. This is a fact that the honourable member fails to take into account; and that being the situation in our province of Manitoba he has the audacity to stand up in this House and say, let us not cry "wolf". In other words, the situation isn't all that bad, the housing shortage isn't all that bad, and if there are any problems there are other ways of solving it, but let's not disturb the sales tax, let's continue taxing the poor.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. DAWSON: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I was called out while the Honourable Member for St. James was speaking on his resolution. All I could do was listen to the member who spoke before me on this resolution and I'm very disappointed if that's the attitude they took. He says that they didn't take that attitude. However, I would say that the very reason that they are not supporting this resolution is they know that should they accept the resolution which is only a recommendation, that this government request the federal government to rescind their sales tax, they feel that they'll be put in the same position and will have to rescind the five percent sales tax that is on houses and agricultural improvements that are made with lumber. He suggests you find cheaper ways of lumber. I'm not sure whether he cried "wolf" or not, I really don't care, but I think that this government doesn't realize that there is a crisis, particularly in agriculture, and every cent that can be saved for the farmer is certainly a step in the right direction when things are so difficult for them. But the attitude that this government takes is whenever you discuss taxes they refuse to make a move.

I can give you an example, one that is not too far away from me, from where I live. The Town of Russell is going to build a new hospital. I don't know how much it's going to cost, but the federal government are prepared to give up their 12 percent tax on the building materials, but the provincial government won't give up their five percent; they're going to make about \$37,000 off that hospital. This is the reasoning they take, if they take it on themselves to adopt this resolution they're going to be put in a position where we're going to ask them to rescind their five percent to go along with the federal government, and it's very obvious to me why they refuse to do this, but I think they're taking the wrong step. This is one of the things that the Task Force on housing recommended, that the 12 percent be removed, and I am sure that if the provincial governments got behind the Task Force that maybe the federal government would have paid more attention to the Task Force request.

I want to repeat that I am fully convinced that this government doesn't realize the two points that are mentioned in this resolution, that building a house is a problem for the average person because it is a large expense and a crisis that faces the farmer in Manitoba, not only in Manitoba but in Saskatchewan and Alberta as well, and anything we can do to help them, regardless of how small it is, at this particular time should be done. And there is nothing wrong with this resolution, all it means is that if they support it they will make a request to the federal government to remove the 12 percent sales tax on building materials and other things for agricultural purposes. I think that they could show some initiative and support the Task Force, and they could also be the first province in Canada to show that they do support the Task Force's remarks on housing. I know that they're prepared to take the best of the Task Force report, but I think the Task Force on housing need some support from provincial governments and this is one way that this government could take some initiative and show some leadership, alleviate the problems of housing and building materials for agricultural purposes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. HARRIS: Mr. Speaker, if nobody else wishes to speak, I move, seconded by the Member for Burrows, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I had originally intended to stand this today but on reading the resolution over and reading some of the remarks that have been passed by other members who have spoken, I felt that it would be foolish to stand it and I felt that I may as well go on.

Back in 1951 there was a committee established by the government which was then in office, a municipal-provincial committee on which there was representation from the Cabinet and representation from the various municipalities in Manitoba. That committee held numerous hearings and after approximately two years it brought in its findings, and one of these findings was a recommendation for the per capita tax which was then introduced at that time. It was also recommended in the report which was submitted to the Legislature at that particular period that this committee or a similar committee should sit every so often, every three years or so, to review the relationship between the province and the various municipalities. I think that this resolution in a certain way does make that suggestion, that a similar committee be now set up by this government so as there can be proper dialogue between the executive branch of the government and those representing the municipalities in Manitoba.

When the Honourable Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker, spoke on his budget debate he made it abundantly clear that the question of taxation between Canada and its provinces must be settled and that each of these respective jurisdictions should come to a definite understanding as to the various taxation powers that they would exercise. The Honourable Minister also made it abundantly clear that Canada vis-a-vis its provinces should not enter into any tax sharing agreements without the prior knowledge and consent of these provinces. In respect of both of these positions taken by the Honourable Minister I wholeheartedly agreed and I think that the situation existing between a province and municipality is similar to the situation existing between Canada and various provinces. It is true, it's on a lesser scale, but provinces today have delegated to municipalities powers and responsibilities which municipalities never entertained when they were first incorporated.

I had occasion a few weeks ago to look over one of the budgets of the Municipality of St. Andrews back around the 1890's and the total budget of that municipality at that time only amounted to about one-third of what you would pay a school teacher today. I also had occasion to look at the budget of St. Andrews School District and it was amazing to me to find out that that total budget was under a thousand dollars. Now transpose these figures into 1969 and what have you got? So it's absolutely essential that there must be a meeting of minds between municipalities in the province and the province, so that there can be a complete delineation between the two jurisdictions as to what their responsibilities are going to be, and where their sources of revenue and taxation are going to come from. That is all that this resolution suggests. And I wholeheartedly support the resolution and would urgently suggest to the government that they reorganize a permanent municipal - provincial committee so that there will be more liaison between the two jurisdictions; so that there will be a better understanding between the two jurisdictions; and by means of that understanding and dialogue, some solution will be found to the problems confronted by municipalities today.

I don't think there's anybody in this House who is not appreciative of the fact that the load of taxation imposed on municipalities today is beyond, and completely beyond their financial needs and I think the first step towards solving that problem must be by establishing a permanent committee of liaison between this government and the various municipalities in Manitoba. And I would strongly urge the government to give consideration to that suggestion.

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

MR. ROBERT STEEN (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Fisher, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate of the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain. The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. D. MORRIS MCGREGOR (Virden): Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this matter for the Honourable Member for Brandon.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Mr. Speaker, it is a ridiculous position normally for a backbencher to offer anything that might appear to be criticism of current and government policy. However, since the proposed provincial-municipal tax structure group has been

(MR. LISSAMAN cont'd) . . . . announced and that the matters of assessment and taxation will be referred to this committee, then I think it is incumbent upon a person to offer their viewpoints regardless of which side of the House they sit on, because certainly when the problem is so vexing - and you can see, Mr. Speaker, even from the last resolution that there is a serious problem presented in the manner in which taxes on real estate property are raised and the burdens that the municipalities have to face.

Now I would like to acquaint the House that when I first entered in '52 I sat across on the other side in opposition to the then Campbell Government and we on that side then were making speeches which were very very similar to the speeches being made by opposition groups since that date, in that municipal taxes were too high, in fact approaching a point of danger. And incidentally I think I should in all fairness say in passing, that both the government of that day and the ensuing governments - the provincial governments - have always attempted within their capacity to ease the burden on the municipal government, both the government under the Honourable Member for Lakeside and the government under the Honourable Duff Roblin and our present Premier, have all made a real effort within their financial capacity to ease the burdens upon municipalities. But it is obvious that municipalities are being called upon to render services the like of which was not contemplated in the early days, so that it now has reached the point where there is a really dangerous situation involved. I would think, particularly those of us who have had experience over the years in municipal and provincial financing, all of us tend to hope and think that the tax burden should be equitable. But I'm afraid that over the years because of the needs and requirements of both municipal and provincial governments, taxes are no longer equitable. Literally it is my opinion that governments tax where the money is most easily accessible and as a result you have these various inequities develop.

But the real iniquity of the situation as applies to taxation on real estate, in my opinion, lies in the fact that whatever other taxes are imposed upon one, the only hazard involved is the actual amount of the taxation; but when a tax is applied to real estate, not only is that money required to direct taxation but the entire property is hazarded. Obviously a farmer or a cottage owner or --(Interjection) -- market gardener for that matter, just managing to get by runs into a bit of tough luck, his property can be sold for the taxes which were assessed upon it. So I think that this puts real estate taxation in a field apart from all the other taxes. And then one other thing one must really recognize is that taxes represent a lasting and permanent mortgage upon the real estate involved, and it doesn't take much arithmetic to realize that \$400.00 in taxes is the equivalent of a \$5,000 mortgage at 8 percent. I know all members are quite acquainted with the fact that many quarter sections are paying in the four hundred dollar neighbourhood, and this would mean a permanent mortgage with no particular benefit - he hasn't had any use of the capital involved - this represents a \$20,000 mortgage against a section of land.

Now you can say, and it's certainly logical as members who sat across that side in my day, including myself and members since, that the only real cure is the shift of those burdens upon real estate which apply to persons and only assess the burden of services to property upon real estate. Now this is so obvious it becomes simple, but the actual transition then becomes no longer simple because where do you shift the burden? That, in my opinion, gives the real problem and the reason for the Premier's decision to set up a provincial-municipal tax structure body.

Now having said that I feel that all arguments, since there will be such a group to study the tax structure of Manitoba as it relates to the municipal-provincial relationship, having said that, then I would like to cover a few points - and I must say that in very large part I found myself almost completely in agreement with all that the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain said in his address a few days ago.

Now it is my opinion that the Act has been misconstrued, or misinterpreted by the assessment group and in the fourth whereas relating to Section 1010 (1) of the Municipal Act, and I'll read the last phrase - "for the purposes for which they may be used." Now I believe the original intent -- and of course this is what so often preoccupies our legal minds in court, I believe, is what was the original intent -- but I believe in this instance that the original intent was that "for the purpose for which the land may be used at that particular time." I believe the assessors have taken the imaginative meaning of "may" and said, "Oh yes but this is out in an area, a growing area of a city, or beyond the bounds of a city and tomorrow there might be a factory or a commercial building placed there and so the land is of more greater value and we must assess it higher." It is my opinion that agricultural land should be taxed for the purpose for which it is used, and I further believe that only when a portion of farmland is actually used

(MR. LISSAMAN cont'd) . . . for commercial purposes, should the assessment be reflected upwards.

Now I know that there are those who say well we can't feel sorry for these people, their lands appreciating in value, they can sell it. And I say that that is pretty small comfort because obviously if everybody within that type of an area, and I'm speaking about the area now beyond the bounds of a city, but which faces potential expansion of a city into that area, if they all sold at once well obviously the market wouldn't be worth a darn, and the value would not be there. I've said for years that there is no common denominator between rural and urban land. Now, of course, when you use the policies in assessment as presently being used, there is the common denominator, because you can say it's the sale value, and whatever sales are recorded in the area, then you have that common denominator. But I feel that this presents and has given birth to a really iniquitous situation.

First of all, let's look at the farmer pure and simple whose farm happens to lie in this area and he wants to keep on farming; through no fault of his own his taxes are jumping year by year till it gets to a point where he can no longer afford to farm. Now surely the fact that he chose originally to take advantage of some of the proximity to the town and so on, he would certainly be willing - and these things all enter into it, the various factors that reflect upon the total assessed value - but when you take the sale values in the area, because an industry comes in and buys one particular piece of ground, then to say this broad band, the taxes must reflect this increased value, then you put this individual in a bad position, this farmer. Then you look at the case of the market gardener, and heaven knows we heard from these people at the time of the producers marketing debates, he is in an even more embarrassing position. He has to be close to the town because of his markets and he has a perishable product and we can't keep on proceeding to move these people out, drive them out by increasing assessment, because this is a brutal way of handling the situation. We are probably ruining many people, denying the things that they can give their family because the state is absorbing it in taxation, because he happens to be in an appreciating value area.

Now there is another danger involved, in my opinion, in these areas, these very areas, and that is this, that I have accused the present policy to be one of those dealing in futures. The emphasis on the taxation area naturally is always upwards because there are going to be odd sales year by year in the area at fairly high levels which naturally is going to reflect taxation, and instead of it affecting the immediate property involved it affects the whole band of property. But the danger is this, that all the pressures tend to be upwards, and let's suppose we have a year or two -- which may come about much sooner than many of us expect due to the agricultural situation in the province -- when there are few, if any, sales, let's say none even, well you'd expect some possible relief in taxation to people in this area but you won't get it because there are no sales for less than that value; the market gardener will say to himself, I have been assessed at this price, surely the land must be worth it, why must I sell at a depressed price, and he will tend to hold on if there were a lower offer made even. So there will be no sale recorded. If we actually went into a slight slump, or some degree of depression, it would be even worse because any assistance those individuals might expect in the way of relief would be miles away from them, years away. So I think that the method presently being used is dangerous and it's most iniquitous and unfair.

Now in areas across the line the suggestion I think has been adopted actually and in use in some jurisdictions, whereby this increased taxation which is caused by the increased value can be deferred over a period of years. Personally I am utterly opposed to this because I believe it to be the first step toward state ownership. I can certainly manufacture the situation in my mind where a family might have deferred the taxes on say, a market garden area or a farm in this particular belt of properties, and then faced with a death in the family and having some succession duties to pay, it could completely destroy that operation. I think the cure must lie in reverting to what must have been the original intent of the Act, in that real consideration must be given to the purpose for which the land, and I'm going to substitute the words "is being used". Now I know there are those who say, "oh yes but you can end up with a farm in the middle of the town." Well I don't think this would be so bad. We're urging green belts, and then you come into area definitions with planning, and I'm not a great lover of long term planning, I believe the safest ground you can be on is to meet adequately the needs of today and that you're always in a good position to move on in any direction in the future because you're on a sound base. I'm afraid of long term planners who can map out a trip down one road and maybe events take us down in a different direction and we've wasted all that time and effort and caused



(MR. LISSAMAN cont'd) . . . a great deal of hardship in the meantime. -- (Interjection) -- I didn't hear the comment. Within this area, as I started to say, the land should be taxed at the value which is relevant to the use to which it is being put -- (Interjection) -- Yes, I'll accept the Minister's suggestion "or the current productive capacity," although in this instance when you deal with production I don't know just how you'd be fair in assessing it because much of the production today is being paid for by the farmer himself in the way of fertilizer that he plows into the ground, and I wouldn't like to see him doubly taxed on this, buying it and then taxed with the increased production. However, all these factors, I know it's a very complex thing, and they must be taken into consideration.

But when we talk about and revert to my original consideration of the equity of taxes then we come to a situation which surely must exhibit the fallacy of the current method of assessment, and that is this, that supposing you have a farm within this area threatened by the encroachment of the city and the values, assessment-wise, have shot up tremendously, now, I think all of us would agree that taxation at least should be equitable within classes. Now you have the position of Farmer A in this belt of property and competing with a Farmer B a little further out in the country, and this fellow may be paying three times the taxes as the farmer a little further out. Now if this doesn't exhibit something of the unfairness of this method . . . I think that this tax structure group must look very very carefully upon planning which create zones; it must certainly look very very closely into the methods of assessment, and of course in addition it will be looking into the proper burdens of municipalities and the related responsibilities. So it is a very complex problem all in all.

I would like to suggest this, although it's not strictly related, it comes into relation with this matter of planning and zoning as I mentioned in committee the other day. When property is expropriated for use of the state then very fair consideration is given to values and I think particularly under our new Expropriation Act much, if you can use the term, more benevolent attitudes come into force; nevertheless there's a fairness there, values are taken into consideration, and compensated for. But in the method of planning, which does Mr. Speaker, also relate itself to assessment, the state, in my opinion, expropriates certain rights of the property owner, but there is no compensation in return, and I think that the planning itself must be examined and see what things we are taking away from people and what we must return them in the way of compensation.

I think Mr. Speaker, I could probably ramble on for a great deal longer; I think I've got my main points across. One thing does strike me though before I take my seat, to display I think quite well how this method of assessment in times of adversity will not offer any reduction or comfort to the person being taxed. Before one of the committees recently we had the Mayor of Rivers, and in his discourse he mentioned that the assessment in Rivers they were informed would likely be upwards, raised 15 percent, and because I wanted to establish in my mind this point I asked him, I said, "do you mean to say your assessment is going up despite the fact that the Rivers airport is being threatened with closure?" And he said, "oh well there's no relationship between this and value," or words to that effect. Now I can be corrected, but the words implied that. I may not be quoting the exact words, but the intention was the same. So I think things like this surely show that certain people in this province, property owners, who really in essence are the backbone of the country, are not receiving fair and equitable treatment and I think we must thank the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain for proposing this resolution because it does afford a debate in which some of the problems before us can be displayed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. USKIW: I move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Honourable Member for Churchill, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Emerson. The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. EDWARD I. DOW (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Speaker, in rising to support this resolution of the Honourable Member for Emerson, I feel that the proposed resolution to set up a standing committee on education is one of the maybe more important decisions this House has to make. When you consider that the budget of the Province of Manitoba is in the neighbourhood of 377 to 378 million and the Department of Education is spending 149 million or 40-odd percent of the total budget, we surely should be in a position whereby a committee of this House should be set up whereby they can hear representation, can advise the government from time to time

(MR. DOW cont'd) . . . . in regards to the various factors of education. I know it's true that the Department of Education has an advisory committee appointed by themselves, but I think in setting up this committee of the House, you're setting it up on the basis of the representation of elected people, and here I believe that we can get the feel of the people in regards to the different activities that belong to the educational field.

I don't think that this committee can be used as a clearing house for the various, say the criticisms that might come up from time to time, but I do believe that it has its place whereby representation from different bodies when the committee is meeting and when the public are advised of, it can be a very very good sounding board and it certainly is not going to be detrimental to education. We could go on and elaborate, Mr. Speaker, of the many different changes that we're having in education in the past few years, and will be more to come as we travel in this society that is advancing, and sometimes two heads are better than one, and particularly when we get the advice of the people that are elected to this House on the committee, they can make a decision that I think will be beneficial to the Province of Manitoba and to education as a whole.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation in suggesting that we should support this resolution because I believe it is something that I know the educators themselves would take advantage of. Mr. Speaker, I understand and know that this resolution was brought up and had been brought up before and had not been agreed to, but you know it's sometimes the repetition of a resolution one year to another that you get to the ear of the members of the House and they agree to it and I would like to commend the Honourable Member from Emerson for bringing in this resolution to give us an opportunity to express our opinion on something that I think is very very beneficial to Manitoba and to education as a whole.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I was very interested in the remarks of the last speaker because although I agree with him in principle I'm not sure that I agree with his illustration in general. I do agree with it in general. He said that two heads are better than one, but sheer numbers alone is not always a significance of superiority. For example, I'm not convinced that three leadership candidates are better than two leadership candidates.

MR. DESJARDINS: How about 31 MLAs?

MR. DOERN: Schreyer, Green and Doern, that sounds like a good slate.

MR. DESJARDINS: No, no, it doesn't sound good, no.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, in the last few years we have spent time debating the estimates of the Department of Education, and although perhaps some years we did spend a significant amount of time relative to the other departments, yet in view of the expenditures of the department, I think this time is totally inadequate. The first session of this Legislature, some 25 hours or so, were spent on the department, which is a considerable amount. The second year I believe only some five or six hours were spent and this year some ten or twelve, I'm just not certain. But if you average it out it comes to something like a dozen hours a year or so on this department. Now although in terms of the general debate, this may be a fair amount of the 80 hours; in terms of the significance of the department it is totally inadequate, when you consider that \$150 million is spent, that 50 percent practically of a person's property taxes goes towards education, when you consider that 250,000-odd students are involved in the process and 10,000 teachers, then this is indeed a small amount of time.

I also think that one of the problems we have now in terms of examining this department is that there is ability in this Chamber that is being ignored. For example, the government has the opportunity of meeting with delegations, they have the advantage of continually being in touch with the top civil servants in the department, and these are privileges that really are denied to the opposition. I'm aware of the fact that we have the right to speak to the top people in a department, but when one does make appointments or one wishes to contact someone such as a Deputy Minister or one of the professional people at the top you can't help but feel that you're in a sense infringing on their time and possibly by meeting with you they may appear to be somewhat uneasy because you're a member of the opposition, maybe looking for ammunition or probing around and I think this tends to put the top administrators in a sense on the spot. I also think that we should on many issues, and I think particularly on education, sort of have almost a non-partisan approach to some issues. I don't say that we should attempt to exclude debate or play down controversy but I think that on some of these questions there's a need for a broad consensus and I think that this is not being achieved at present.

We have had debates in this Chamber over the past few weeks and months about many

(MR. DOERN cont'd) . . . important issues and a lot of these simply degenerate or simply wind up being almost a matter of opinion. We have argued with the Minister that there was a pressing need for more assistance to students for example, in terms of bursaries and scholarships. Ultimately we put the case and attempt to back it up and ultimately the Minister in a sense takes the opposite position and the debate simply evaporates. In other words, we say this is so and the Minister says it is not so and that is the end of the matter. I think that if we had a standing committee or a special committee of the Legislature on education, then I think we could examine together these issues, we could gather information, we could investigate and so on and I think we would get better solutions to these questions. Under the present system we're attempting to score points on the government and the government is attempting to maintain the status quo or to not "rock the boat." I don't think this is satisfactory on many issues.

One of the problems of having this type of committee, however, is that the government's record on standing or special committees leads me to support this resolution, and I would like to support it with enthusiasm but I can not because I'm afraid that even if we did achieve what the member for Emerson argues for, or suggests should be established, that we would not in effect get very far with the government. If we look at some of their records in terms of calling committees in the past few years, we can see that some of the committees have hardly ever met, and too frequently they meet only during the session. For example, the Municipal Affairs Committee, from information that I have, suggested in 1968-69 - they met at least up until the month of February only twice and then of course held more frequent meetings. The Committee on Privileges and Elections met only four times. A number of committees had meetings in the range of a dozen or so but these are usually just prior to a session or they're actually during a session. The Committee on Consumer Credit was to have met in 1966 but of course was dissolved for a June election. And when committees do meet they frequently run a whole series of meetings together. In a month or so they may meet the entire year's quota, or whatever it is. I think a standing committee on education has to meet regularly and I think it has to meet throughout the year.

So I think that pretty well concludes my comments, Mr. Speaker. I think that there is a definite need and a value in establishing this committee, and I would certainly support that all the way because we are not really grasping or groping with tackling the problems of education in the Legislature. There just is not enough time, and try as we may we run into the other departments; we run into the 80-hour block, and this is the same with this year, there'll be certain departments that will not be dealt with. Last year Education came at the tailend and we certainly gave it short shrift - five hour's worth.

So I think that given the overwhelming significance of this department, along with the Department of Health and Social Services, there'd be great value in a standing committee, but I'm reluctant to support this resolution as I do support it because I am afraid the government might simply accept the resolution, although I don't expect them to, but if they did accept it, I wonder how often it would really meet.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. DAWSON: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the resolution as submitted by the Honourable Member for Emerson. If you recall, Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution that has been presented for three years in a row and has not been accepted by the government. I can't help but agree for a change with the Member for Elmwood when he suggests that if we are to proceed with such a committee that the emphasis must be placed on meeting regularly. There is no sense on this committee being struck off for the sake of having a committee like many of the other committees that the government has struck off in the past. --(Interjection) — Pardon?

MR. DOERN: Dawson for Leader.

MR. DAWSON: The Member for Elmwood says "Dawson for Leader."

Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons for my favouring such a committee is because there's so many priorities in education, particularly in Manitoba. I know that one of the problems that we do have in education is a standardized curriculum. This does not exist. We have people that are transients - and when I say transients I want to point out to you that there are five Armed Forces bases in the Province of Manitoba and these people are moving in and out about every two to three years. They move their children to Manitoba; they could come from any one of the other provinces in Canada and the problem that they face is that their children will either be moved up a year in the grade of their schooling or the other may happen, where they may be

(MR. DAWSON cont'd) . . . . moved down a grade because we haven't got our curriculum standardized. Now if a committee such as the Member for Emerson suggests was in existence, we could in all probability start from Manitoba, and let us say that we work west, if we could standardize the curriculum in the west, then I am sure that it would be no problem to have meetings from the west with the people in the east and I am sure we could accomplish one thing, that we could have a standardized curriculum throughout Canada.

Another point that I would like to mention at this time is that this committee could also do something about, one of the pet peeves I have, this is the equalization of education, particularly between the rural area and the city. This committee could probably set up a sub-committee called an Education Committee, for the purpose of standardizing and giving the children that are in the rural areas the same opportunities that are given to the city children, such as I've mentioned before, music, vocational training and arts, things like this. This sub-committee of the Education Committee could very well handle this. This sub-committee I'd suggest could probably have school teachers on it and civil servants and some public-spirited citizens from Manitoba, and once again they could do something for Manitoba and then encourage other provinces to form the same type of committee. Then we would have an education committee for the west and we would also in all probability standardize the education in television. And I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, by doing it partly in the manner that I'm suggesting would probably cut down the cost, not only for the Province of Manitoba but for Saskatchewan, Alberta and B. C., the same as what I've suggested on the other.

Now this committee could also discuss the different courses in the schools throughout the province; they could be responsible for the curriculum - I realize there is a group already responsible for this, but they could work in conjunction with this group that is handling this, to discuss the various courses throughout the schools in Manitoba.

Another area that I think this committee could serve, and serve well, would be in scholarships. As you know, Mr. Speaker, there are many many scholarships each year that are there for the taking, but in many cases the teachers, school principals, the school divisions are not aware that these scholarships exist. To give you an example, I was very surprised last year when I was informed there was an Order in my constituency called the Eastern Star that had a scholarship of \$250.00; this thing was up for grabs for any student that could qualify and no one had ever applied for it for ten years. And I'm told, and I'm sure the Minister of Education would verify this, this is typical in Manitoba. Last year there was a scholarship of some \$1,800 put up by one of the motor companies. No one applied for it. It was worth \$1,800.00.

MR. SPEAKER: . . . I wonder if I might interrupt the honourable gentleman. I'm sure he has a great deal more to say but I must remind him it is now 5:30.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Transportation, that the House do now adjourn.

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