

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, May 6, 1969

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: I'd like to direct the attention of the honourable members to my gallery, where we have 14 visitors who came to Canada from Czechoslovakia in December of last year. These good people have recently completed a course in English and they are travelling across Canada under the auspices of the B. C. Department of Education in conjunction with the Vancouver Y. M. C. A. They are under the direction of Mr. Carr of the local Winnipeg Y. M. C. A. From here they will journey east to visit major cities, ending in Ottawa, then return to Vancouver to settle in B. C.

On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you here today and wish you well in your adopted land and certainly your province.

We also have with us today some 56 students of Grade 11 standing from the Portage la Prairie Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. Bills and Mrs. Hecht. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you all here today.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. The Nissan Automobile Firm of Canada announced that they've been very impressed with an offer made by the Industrial Estates Limited, which is a Nova Scotia Crown Corporation, to establish an assembly plant in Nova Scotia, and apparently they've had several offers from other provinces to establish the plant in the respective provinces. Has Manitoba made any effort to draw this firm to Manitoba?

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C., (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(River Heights): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Has the Minister any correspondence with respect to this request?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Minister of Industry and Commerce met with the officials of the Nissan Company in Japan in June of last year. Last week I met with the official of the Nissan Company who is stationed in Vancouver at the time of the opening of some new franchise operations in the province, as well as with the representative of the Nissan Company who is also stationed in Vancouver. My understanding is that they are not considering an assembly plant but they are considering warehousing and storage for parts.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. EDWARD I. DOW (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Could he tell the House how many debentures of municipalities are standing as unsold at the present time? I understand that several municipalities have had approved debenture by-laws and the debentures are standing unsold. The number and the amount.

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I'll take the question as notice.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. In yesterday's paper there was a number of ads - they're Calls for Proposals to build for the Manitoba Housing Corporation. My question is why does not the corporation call for bids, and also, why does not the corporation supply a set of plans that the bids can be based on?

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Health and Social Services)(Gimli): Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to see the particular ad in question. I'm not sure I'm familiar with that one, but is this in connection with the full recovery housing? Once I've got ahold of that I'd be pleased to answer the question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) First Minister. Will copies of the proceedings of the Constitutional Conference held in Ottawa earlier this year be made available to members of the House? I know they are at the Queen's Printer and available now, but on previous occasions I got copies of other reports and later on got another copy from the government, so I didn't want to get an extra copy if copies will be distributed.

HON. WALTER WEIR (Premier)(Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, according to the information that I had before, they would be as soon as they were available. So that the honourable member won't spend \$4.00 of his own, I understand from talking to the Clerk, they'll likely be distributed this afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JOE BOROWSKI (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, there was an article in the paper the other day having to do with DDT. It's banned in Michigan and it's banned in Arizona, and I'm just wondering if the government is considering any legislation to stop the use of DDT in Manitoba because of its harmful effects to fishing, wildlife, animals and humans.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Finance)(Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, the other day the Member for Wellington asked about the power sites on the Nelson. I referred to a pamphlet that describes them and I'd like to give a copy of the pamphlet to the member now.

Then the Member for Churchill asked about the men who are working at present in the vicinity of Southern Indian Lake, and I have to inform him that they are engaged in exploratory work. There are approximately 100 men in the neighbourhood of Southern Indian Lake on exploratory work concerning the general arrangement of the Southern Indian Lake development and particularly the foundation conditions to be expected, especially in consideration of the contract at Missi Falls. The foundation conditions have to be determined before bids are called for the contract, and this would be necessary in any event to be done before a contract is called and certainly before a contract is let. Approximately 91 men are currently employed on such exploration work in that neighbourhood.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may ask a supplementary question of my honourable friend who has just taken his seat. Are these employees working there on the basis of the report, that the government has refused to table, dealing with the reallocation of people in northern Manitoba that was conducted by Hedlin-Menzies and Company?

MR. EVANS: I don't understand the question.

MR. PAULLEY: My honourable friend says that he does not understand the question. If I have your permission, Mr. Speaker, maybe I might be able to penetrate to my honourable friend. There was an investigation made by Hedlin-Menzies and others insofar as the reallocation of people in northern Manitoba, also in connection with the development at the Nelson complex. The government has refused to table the contents of that report. The Honourable Minister has now said that the 90 persons who are working in the general area are dealing with the question of the building of the Missi Falls complex, dam and the likes of that - my question to him is this - as a result of the investigations or the report of Hedlin-Menzies and others that the government has refused to table for the information of the Assembly?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I don't understand the question any better. I simply reported that these men are engaged in exploratory work in the area, particularly to do with the foundation conditions upon which any structures would be built.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, for the edification of my friend, I'd better write him a letter explaining fully what I mean.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to repeat my question of yesterday to the First Minister when I asked him if he's going to do anything about the severe cutback of work at the Port of Churchill, which we all know the worst poverty and unemployment in Canada is at Churchill. This is a very important matter and I think it's the responsibility of this Minister to make some statement so these people could be reassured that some other jobs will be found for those that are being laid off.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, my answer of yesterday would still have to hold.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, that's not a satisfactory answer. The Minister has sat there like a water buffalo without making any contribution to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The honourable gentleman knows better than to make a statement such as that.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Is it correct that the Manitoba Government Air Services, or the Manitoba Government is planning on the purchase of one helicopter?

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources)(Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, it is correct that this has been under consideration for some considerable time within the department. My understanding as of the moment is that we are continuing to lease, as has been the practice, the helicopter hours that we require for departmental use.

MR. MOLGAT: A supplementary question. Do I understand correctly that the government is not purchasing a helicopter then?

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed -- Order please. The Honourable the Minister of Finance.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if it would be agreeable on all sides if we dealt with the second readings of Public and Private Bills on Page 13.

MR. MOLGAT: It's agreeable with us.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I regret to say that there isn't agreement, or at least there can be partial agreement as far as this group is concerned. I understand that the Committee on Professional Associations will be held tomorrow morning. I realize that there is one of the Bills in debate on second reading dealing with the Optometry Act before us. I would be prepared on behalf of my group to agree to a consideration of Bill 49 this afternoon in order that it might possibly get into the committee dealing with professional organizations. I have been informally told that there is the possibility of an amendment to Bill 49 referring this committee to the Committee on Professional Status. With that reservation that we go into consideration of second reading of Bill 49 in order that it might get into the committee tomorrow morning, we would be in agreement with the change of procedure. I think that it is now time that we started to consider some of the Private Members' Resolutions. So if the House will accept my partial agreement of the consideration of Bill 49, then I would agree with the change of the orders of procedure; if not, then I would very reluctantly suggest that resolutions be considered first.

MR. EVANS: Well, if I have the agreement of the Liberal Party, I'll ask the Speaker to call Bill 49.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to calling Bill 49. Do I understand correctly the Leader of the NDP to say that he does not want the other Bills called? It was our view, Mr. Speaker, that at this stage in the House, while it is true there are many resolutions before us, that there are a number of these Bills which could be passed now, or considered, and if they were to go to a committee it would permit those who want to appear and make representations before committee a little more time possibly to prepare for them and give them an opportunity. This is the reason really that we are agreeing to proceeding with Bills first in order to get them in the committee stage - if they are in fact going to pass second reading - to permit those on the outside who wanted to come the opportunity to come. So as far as we are concerned, we are not objecting to coming forward with Bill 49, but we would recommend that we proceed with all of the Bills on that basis.

MR. PAULLEY: If I may again, Mr. Speaker, the reason that I'm expressing preference so far as Bill 49 is concerned is the fact that we have received notice that the Committee on Professional Associations will be held tomorrow morning at, I believe, 9:00 o'clock. I appreciate very much the point taken by the Leader of the Opposition, but I think in this particular instance the others can come after the committees are called, and at that time we would be prepared to consider the point raised by my honourable friend. We're very co-operative - the Leader of the Opposition and myself these days, seeing as we're both getting booted out - but I do in all due respect suggest that preference should be given to Bill 49 and we get to resolutions, mainly because of the fact that the committee will be meeting tomorrow morning. And it's on this basis, if I may say to my honourable friend the Member from Ste. Rose, that I raise this point.

MR. MOLGAT: I'll make a compromise offer; Why not go to Bill 49 first, and if we should happen to go through it quickly, then maybe we can deal with some other Bills this

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) afternoon and not delay Private Members. If it's Bills on which there's no debate, let's proceed with them and get them through.

MR. PAULLEY: I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, however, there will be considerable debate for instance on the Bills being presented by my honourable friend the Member for Wolseley dealing with the Winnipeg Charter that may be of lengthy duration. There may not be too much to debate on Bill 49, for that reason I appeal to my friend the Leader of the Opposition to join me in allowing Bill 49 to be proceeded with and then get back to resolutions. Or, my honourable friend and colleague from St. John's

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I hesitate to give an opinion. It's been a very interesting discussion, but I wonder if we might not start with 49 and then see what happens after that. And then discuss the remainder of the Bills or the resolutions.

MR. PAULLEY: With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, to your wisdom - and I respect your wisdom - we are now dealing with private resolutions and the control of the Order Paper does not rest with - in all due respect - the Speaker or with the government but with all of us. My colleague from St. John's has offered a further compromise to that offered by the Leader of the Opposition, that is the consideration of the adjourned debate on Bill 43, then Bill 49, and hopefully then -- (Interjection) -- and 77, and then back to resolutions. Would that be agreeable to my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition?

MR. MOLGAT: Agreeable, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I wonder if I might recap the suggestion that's before the House. I take it we're to deal with 43, 49 and 77 in that order. The Honourable Member for Rhineland, do you have an opinion?

MR. FROESE: I will agree with what is being proposed.

PRIVATE AND PUBLIC BILLS

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. The Honourable the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs)(The Pas): Mr. Speaker, to add to the spirit of co-operation I would forego speaking on this occasion -- however, I would ask leave to forego speaking at this time, but I have no objection if someone else wants to continue at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: (Agreed to Stand.) That wasn't too difficult. The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, Bill No. 49. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. ROBERT STEEN(St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, when the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre introduced this particular Bill at second reading he mentioned that it covered three different matters, two of which I think there's general agreement on all sides of the House that they would like to see enacted into the legislation as soon as possible; but a third one, and I refer to the use of the title Doctor, is one that has received a great deal of discussion both inside this House and outside. The professional associations, which as I understand was originally contemplated during the course of the last Legislature and over the last four years, I believe that this is one of the matters that this committee was set up originally to look into, to weigh the use of this title and to conduct studies upon its use and the effect it has, and the meaning that the general public of our province has taken by the title Doctor. I believe that this Bill should be referred to the Professional Associations Committee - not to be buried there - to receive second reading today with the idea that tomorrow representations might be heard by the committee, that the Bill can be dealt with by the committee, and that the members of the committee might make a decision regarding that portion of the Bill that is dealing with the title and the use of the title Doctor.

I would point out to all members of the House that Manitoba is one of the provinces that has included the profession of optometry in its medicare scheme. I would also point out to the House that a comparison that has not been favourable to Manitoba has been made with the Province of Alberta and the graduates that are coming out of the School of Optometry in the University of Waterloo. But I would like to say that I would be much more interested in such a comparison with our sister Province of Saskatchewan, and no figures have yet been elucidated to show any form of comparison.

So I think there is so many questions on this particular Bill that members of the Professional Associations Committee will be looking forward to a discussion on it, and if this Bill

(MR. STEEN cont'd.) should receive second reading today it is my intention to get up immediately afterwards and make a motion, similar to the one made the other day by the Honourable Member from Selkirk, that the Bill be referred to the Special Committee on Professional Associations.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I agree to a certain extent with the previous speaker. I've had discussions with people that are opticians but not with optometrists. They have reservations too, and I'm sure that we will have this group represented before the committee that will be dealing with this Bill. I have no strong feelings either way. I certainly will support the Bill on second reading so that we can deal with it in committee and hear the various groups on this particular point, namely the use of the title Doctor. I think this is the contentious point of the Bill. On the other parts I think we can give support and I for one will support also the motion to refer to the special Committee on Professional Associations so that the matter can be dealt with in committee tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): I didn't speak on optometry. I'm having an argument with my deskmate at the rear. Mr. Speaker, regarding the suggestion made by the honourable member who suggested that the Bill should go to the Professional Associations, I'm in favour of that as long as our voting for second reading of this Bill does not amount to a parliamentary estoppel.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared to go along with this suggestion. It's been my view all along that the Legislature should not be the body that decides who is entitled to have the title Doctor and who is not. This basically is a university degree, and we have established universities to be degree granting institutions and the universities ought to be the ones who decide who in fact is qualified to bear the title of Doctor or not. This has always been a problem to me in this House, because over the years we've had all sorts of bills from all sorts of groups wanting to be called doctor. If they are qualified to be called doctors, if they have a university degree that entitles them to do so, then I'm all in favour of them having that title; if they are not, then I don't think that they should be taking advantage of what is, I presume in this case, an advantage to them professionally in using the title if it isn't properly and from an academic standpoint theirs.

I frankly don't know that the House itself is in a position to make this sort of decision. Some years ago I had suggested that this be handed over to the university and that they decide; go through all of the bills that we have presently on our statutes allowing other groups to use the title doctor, and decide whether they are entitled to it or not. As I recall it, the university was not anxious to accept this responsibility. Well now the Committee for Professional Associations as set up may be a very good vehicle to do this sort of a study, and I have no objections to having this go there. I would hope that the committee would in fact study this in depth and take advantage of the university itself and get advice from the university - not that we would want them, if they are not prepared to make the final decision that they apparently weren't before, to now simply do it through a committee of ours - but at least get their views and get their point of view.

So I'm prepared to support it on that basis. I would hope that the committee will make an in depth study and at the same time look at the other statutes that we have enabling other groups to use the title Doctor.

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

MR. JOHNSON: I'd just like to say a word on this. I feel that in view of the statement made by the Leader of the Opposition it probably should be drawn to the attention of the committee that my colleague and last year's Minister of Health, under Section 17 (1) of The Optometry Act, referred this matter to the Senate of our university and received the reply that they didn't feel competent to judge on this matter in summary. This to me poses a problem to our Professional Committee tomorrow - and the correspondence of which I can make available to the committee at that time - and on that basis I feel that this is a matter which at this time -- for the information of the honourable members of that committee should go there, and this time I would support the motion to send the Bill to the committee.

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

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. John's.): Mr. Speaker, in considering the problem of the labelling, or the request of optometrists to be entitled to use the prefix doctor to their names, my first reaction was that one should jealously guard a recognition of

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) scholastic attainment and not make it free and easy to come by, so that people dealing with a profession would know the recognition that the profession has acquired. I'm of course deeply conscious of the fact that there are some places other than Canada and United States where lawyers are called doctor and must recognize that there must be some reason.

However, in thinking about this problem I had to recognize the fact that Manitoba has done certain things in recognition of the prefix doctor by recognizing chiropractors who are not recognized by a very large number of people, probably the majority in the healing profession. And what really got me was the recognition given by this province apparently, by some government of this province, to the chiropodist, who is really known as a podiatrist in the yellow pages, and when one looks at some of the advertising that is in the yellow pages for a podiatrist, who is entitled to call himself doctor, one wonders just why people are aspiring to be permitted to use that prefix to their names. And just for the record I'd like to read one which starts out with the so and so Foot Specialist Clinic. Underneath the name of Doctor so and so: "The Foot Man" - across Medical Arts. The same gentleman is advertised under his own name as the so and so Doctor, "The Foot Man," and it says: "Feet Hurt - Instant Relief," and it says: "You Are as Young as Your Feet". And this is the professional status apparently given to this group of people who are apparently permitted to advertise in this fashion. If that is so, I must really approach the problem in a different vein than I had approached it earlier, and I am therefore interested in seeing this Bill proceed into second reading, to committee level, where the whole principle can be discussed.

I might say, and many lawyers have been involved in the question of what value there is to the initials Q. C. that appears after the name of some lawyers, and various suggestions have been made. One which might be practical, and that is that every lawyer should be named a Q. C. two years after he has graduated so that that will then probably put a number of people in the correct position in which they ought to be, having been given the right to use that name.

So that I do encourage, or like to encourage the House to vote the Bill into second reading and then to follow through with the next motion, which I think will give us an opportunity to study the entire question of status.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to again point out that this Legislature at one time decided that it was satisfactory for optometrists to be called doctor but they left it to the Senate of the University of Manitoba to decide which university graduates would obtain that right. The university declined to pass upon another university, so that was one of the reasons, the chief reason this question comes back to the Legislature today. The use of the term doctor for optometrists is permitted in most of the provinces of Canada; it is permitted in Saskatchewan.

There was some discussion as to whether or not the title Doctor could be granted by some small private American university and that it would be acceptable to the Manitoba Optometric Society. I would like to point out that the Manitoba Optometric Society would be accepting graduates from the University of Waterloo who were called Doctor, and from the University of Montreal who are called Doctor - they are the only two schools now in Canada - and from the universities which are accredited by the Council on Education of the American Optometric Association, and that Association only recognizes optometric schools, the universities that have those schools that come up to a certain standard, so that there's no danger of the society recognizing graduates from small private American colleges that have low standards. As a matter of fact, there are only about ten graduates from American universities and colleges that are practising in Manitoba today. By far the larger portion come from graduates of the Canadian schools.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, can I ask a question of the mover of the resolution? Could the honourable gentleman tell us how many optometrists now practising in Manitoba have received a degree from Waterloo University?

MR. COWAN: I don't know. Before the Waterloo University had the course, the optometric course in Canada was given by the School of Optometry in Toronto. Waterloo University is not a very old university so not very many -- none I guess will actually be graduating from that university because the university is only a few years old and I think the course only started there two or three years ago.

MR. DESJARDINS: There are none that received a degree from Waterloo then so far? There are no optometrists that have received a degree from the Waterloo University so far?

MR. COWAN: I think that would be right but I'm not quite sure. You'll be able to find out tomorrow morning.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted to raise one point. I noticed that the Honourable the Member for Winnipeg Centre was most anxious to speak. I don't know if all of the members realized that he was the sponsor of this Bill and when he rose to speak of course, according to our rules, he closed the debate. There is no opportunity now for anyone to take any further part except by question, and it wasn't pointed out to the Assembly that in effect that was what my honourable friend was doing.

I would like to direct one question to him though. As sponsor of this Bill, has he any objection to it going to the Committee on Professional Associations tomorrow morning?

MR. COWAN: Well, I think they would like to have the Bill passed at this Session. It would ordinarily go to Law Amendments, and we would hope that the committee would deal with it tomorrow morning, and having regard to the privileges that have been given to the chiropodists and others that I've mentioned.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

MR. STEEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Roblin, that Bill No. 49, An Act to amend The Optometry Act, be referred to the Special Committee on Professional Associations.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a comment at this time on this motion. I wouldn't want the members to misunderstand this. The sponsor of the original Bill more or less indicated that he expects this question to go to the committee tomorrow and then the committee will be ready to report on this immediately, and the mover of this motion that we are debating now seemed to indicate anyway that he was expecting the same thing, that this should be dealt with. I think this is what he said, that he didn't want this Bill to be buried.

Now I might say, Mr. Speaker, that I will vote in favour of this motion, but one condition - and it's not a condition, I want to make it quite clear that the members of this House cannot force the committee to do anything or to bring in any recommendation. I personally don't like the way this was done. I think that if it's going to be brought in this year that we should send it to the ordinary committee and see what we want, because we cannot rush the work of the Committee on the Professional Association. I can't see -- and I for one will vote for or against this matter tomorrow. I think if we're going to decide the use of titles, who is going to confer degrees and so on, we have to have all the facts in front of us and we have to deal with all these professions - all of them - because they should all be treated the same.

And I for one can guarantee, can tell you that I certainly am not ready to let this thing come out of committee tomorrow. It would be wrong if we're going to start dealing one at a time. If this is the case, we should have let this go the ordinary way, and this House in its wisdom could have said: All right, you can use this title - I'm using this as an example - and then the committee will review all these things. It's going to take a while, we've got to have all the facts, and I certainly think that there's no point of establishing a committee if we're going to direct or insinuate or even suggest that we expect the committee to hurry up and tomorrow you just go through and be a rubber stamp and you bring it back this year - tomorrow, this Session, because it's got to pass at this Session. I think this would be wrong and I for one will take the responsibility of this committee very seriously.

I'm not suggesting I'm against this; I'm suggesting this, I'm stating this, that all these people should be treated the same. We are going to decide once and for all, I hope, that either the politicians will confer degrees or the university will. But there is one thing I would hope, that we look at this in a larger scope treating everybody the same. If one has this privilege, if the chiropractors have this privilege, definitely the optometrists should get the same privilege. But this is the reason of this committee. We're going to study this, and Mr. Chairman, I would vote in favour of this resolution but I want to make it quite clear now that I don't expect to, for one anyway, to bring in a recommendation at this Session; I cannot see how this could be done.

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

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to concur in what the Honourable Member for St. Boniface has said. We have - and I just can't recall the number - but we have 30 or 40 Acts to go over, and to take one and hope to do something with it during this Session is impractical. I think that the sponsors of this Bill should know that if the Bill is treated in this

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd.) manner and sent to the Professional Associations Committee, that there will be nothing done until next Session at least, and I'm just wondering if people who wish this Bill to go through know that this is the manner in which the Bill will be treated. I don't see how any action can be recommended back to this House before next Session, and I think the sponsors of the Bill should know that.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, Bill No. 77. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I adjourned debate for the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a few comments on this Bill. In introducing it the Member for St. Boniface pointed out that he was simply acting on behalf of the City of St. Boniface and simply brought forward the request of the City of St. Boniface.

There is one aspect of it that I'm a little concerned of, the request for an increase in the interest rate on taxes which are in arrears. The request is quite substantial, and I would be concerned that we should study this matter with great seriousness, because it's all very well to suggest, as we did last year, and permit as we did last year an increase from one-half percent per month to three-quarters of a percent per month because many commercial and business enterprises were not paying their municipal taxes and using the savings, or the amount they didn't pay in order to capitalize their own business. They found that the six percent annual interest was much better than if they borrowed the money from the bank. So they were using their tax money really to operate their businesses, and in order to discourage that the Legislature permitted municipalities to increase the interest from one-half percent to three-quarters of one percent - in other words, nine percent per year.

But I think having done that I think we achieved our goal, and I can't see very many businesses still permitting tax arrears and hoping to save interest rates thereby, not at 9 percent. I'm concerned that if we go along with permitting a 15 percent rate per year we would be hurting the people that we really don't want to hurt, and that is the homeowner who is in arrears, not because they're using the money to capitalize a business or to operate their business but the homeowner who is in arrears simply because they haven't got the finances; they're in arrears because they just haven't got the money to pay to the municipal offices, and I would hate to see us increase the interest that much more again and put these people in an untenable position, because they not only are in arrears through financial circumstances, we're making it that much more difficult for them to try to pick up their arrears or to save their lands from tax sale.

So these are some of the questions I think we have to look at very closely, and I hope in Committee, the Municipal Affairs Committee, the City of St. Boniface will have its representatives there to justify their request in the light of the remarks I have made.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to think the members for their comments. I think that they're certainly valid, at least that we should have more information on this. The Honourable Member for St. John's hit the nail right on the head when he said that I thought that I should extend the courtesy to the City of St. Boniface of introducing this bill and this is exactly what I did. There are certain questions that I'd like to see answered myself but I'm satisfied. I think that the members of this Party and the Minister of Municipal Affairs felt that maybe it should go to committee and then we could grill the representatives of the city. I certainly would welcome and say that we all agree on this, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if the mood of the House has changed to what it was, or shall we go to resolutions.

MR. PAULLEY: Back to resolutions.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I take it that we are now agreed that we should turn to Page 2 and ask you to call Private Member's Resolutions No. 22.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

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

MR. EARL DAWSON (Hamiota): Mr. Speaker, when we started off on Friday I would just like to run over the few suggestions I made at the time when I was speaking in support of this resolution. I thought it was an excellent one because a committee such as we are speaking about could standardize the curriculum between the provinces of Canada.

As I pointed out on Friday, I think this is very important, particularly for the Province of Manitoba where we have the five armed forces bases which is a possibility of 10,000 people who would be considered transients moving from Manitoba to Ontario or B. C. or Alberta and various provinces. What is happening, not only with these people, is when they move into a community in Manitoba, in some cases their children's standard of education is higher than that of the Manitoba pupil and they are raised one grade; then the opposite can happen when they come from a province where the standard of the curriculum is not as high as what we have in Manitoba, therefore they are dropped down one grade; and I think that if we had a Committee on Education, such as suggested by the Member for Emerson, that this is one of the things that they could do. In all probability they could start off with the western provinces and work, once they had the curriculum standardized between the western provinces, they could work towards the east. Eventually, we could have the curriculum standardized throughout Canada.

There was another thing that I thought that this committee could concentrate on, and this would be to narrow the gap between students of urban and rural in Manitoba. As you know, the children attending schools in the urban centres have better opportunities because of the larger schools, because of more teaching staff and more facilities available. The Committee on Education could investigate this, and one of the ways that they could improve on this would be through using television to a greater extent than what is already being used now. And once they come up with a good television educational program in Manitoba, this could also be done in the manner I suggested of standardizing the curriculum throughout the western provinces, we could have the television programs standardized as well throughout the western provinces.

One more thing that I think that this committee could do, which is a very very important one from the point of view of the students from rural areas and northern Manitoba when they attend university. There is a growing feeling throughout Manitoba that the present setup for university students is very very unfair. For any centre that has a university, such as the City of Winnipeg and Brandon, the students that reside with their parents in that community certainly have a tremendous advantage over those coming from rural areas such as Dauphin, Flin Flon, Rivers, any town that you could mention that hasn't a university, because we are faced with the fact that the parents or someone must provide room and board for these people and this has come to be the greatest cost for a university student is his room and board. It used to be \$60.00 a month; for the coming season it will be increased to \$70.00 per month, which approximately for eight months is \$560.00 that a rural student must put up in comparison to a student who has the opportunity to live at home here in Winnipeg or in Brandon and attend university.

Now I think the points that I have mentioned are just some ideas that I had that the committee could go to work on. I think the one of subsidizing university students from the rural areas is a very important one. I want to repeat that there is a growing feeling with the people from rural and northern areas that it's an unfair situation and the provincial government should be doing something towards remedying the situation. After all, the universities are supported to a great extent by the federal government and the federal government are continually telling us about a "just society." This is one place where I figure the society is not just.

I'm very interested to see that there has been a number of speakers from this side of the House speak on this particular Bill and I'm disappointed that no one from the government side has had anything to say. In view of the fact that we spend so much money on education in Manitoba each year, I am sure that the committee such as has been suggested by the Member for Emerson would be one way of making sure that the money we are spending is being spent properly towards being a great assist to the Minister of Education.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Chairman, I rise just to make two or three brief observations in support of this resolution. I believe that we had seen evidence of this in this House a few weeks ago when we were dealing with the Education estimates, of the difficulty in attempting to receive any information from the activity of various boards, commissions, bodies established by the government. From some of these groups all we receive is a written report, but we have no opportunity to question them for further information, for clarification, or to

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd.) in any way establish a dialogue between them - and I am thinking primarily of the universities. We have three universities in Manitoba; we receive their reports tabled in this House; we have an opportunity to read them, and I'm sure that members do wish to ask of the universities further questions related to the reports but the opportunity is not there, not unless some Bill related to education should come up before the Law Amendments Committee and a representative of one of these bodies should appear before it. If the subject of the Bill should in some way be related to a matter of concern to some member sitting on the committee, then there is the opportunity, but other than that there is none. So that is one reason for my support of the resolution, to enable the Legislature to make direct contact with various boards, commissions, colleges, universities under the jurisdiction of the Department of Education.

My second reason is education, the largest expense item of the government if you wish to think of it in those terms, and being such, I do believe that it warrants a separate committee to deal with bills related to education to give the members of the committee more opportunity to deal with them more thoroughly and to allow more opportunity to those of the public interested in education to make themselves heard. Now it's true we do have various committees within the Department of Education containing representation from various segments of our society, but there again there is a breakdown in communication between the members of the Legislature and them, and this would give further opportunity for a dialogue between the members of the Legislature and members of other segments of society interested in education.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that the 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 Logan. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. HARRIS: Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this resolution I would like to read a little bit -- I would like to read the resolution as it is:

WHEREAS the need for new housing, and buildings used for agricultural purposes, and for repairs and improvements to such existing buildings is recognized as a high priority for the welfare of a great number of Manitobans;

AND WHEREAS the Federal Sales Tax greatly increases the cost of construction beyond the reach of many;

RESOLVED that the Government request the Government of Manitoba to rescind its sales tax on building materials used for

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member said "the Government of Manitoba" - I think he meant to say "the Government of Canada."

MR. HARRIS: Sorry, Sir. -- (Interjection) -- Well, that's okay. Now, Sir, I have listened to everyone speak from this side of the House and they all agreed that this was a good resolution that had been brought into this House many a time, over and over again, and I can remember it being brought into this House by the Member for Souris-Lansdowne in 1966. I think he spoke to it once and we all agreed to let it go to the Federal House, but it seems to me from that time onward we have had a change of heart on the other side. I think that you and I, Sir, know why that is. It's all right to point a finger at somebody else if he's doing something, but when you're going to do it yourself, you've got tar on you too, and this is what has happened to the government on the other side. They have brought something into this House which they had said they wouldn't bring in. Now I'm only saying that in passing.

The Member from St. James was speaking from the government side and said: "I do think it is a very high priority." - He said it was a very high priority for this resolution on housing, but to go along and talk against it afterwards, it seems to me very foolish, Sir. As you know, I won't go too far, but I was looking at the paper there on Monday and there was an editorial in the Winnipeg Tribune: "Throwing Good Money Away. Since 1950 Canadians have been called on to spend 31 billion on defence. It would be in the interest to know how much of that vast sum of money had been spent on questionable military equipment, particularly aircraft on various and sundry projects that never come off for one reason or another." That is a lot of money, Sir, and I have said in this House recently that it seemed across the world that we are given the money in the Legislature, but what do we do with it? It seems to be frittered away all over and this just proves it right here. How much could we do for our

May 6, 1969

1949

(MR. HARRIS cont'd.) Canadians, for our Manitobans, with that amount of money - a part of it coming into Manitoba - for housing? We talk of this 11 percent or 12 percent tax, whatever you might want to call it, but after you put on the tax that this government has put on in Manitoba, it comes out to around roughly 20 percent. How many low cost houses could have been built with the millions of dollars sunk into military hardware, most of it out-of-date and ineffective? Think of the vast amount of good this kind of money could have done in aid of undeveloped countries. In fact, just think what it could have meant to the Canadian taxpayer in lieu of taxes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is something we touched on - all of our members on this side have touched on it; the Member from Rhineland, he went to some extent on it; the members behind me, my colleagues; the members from the Liberal side; they all did it. We weren't going to get a reply from the government side, but the Member from St. James got up and spoke and he only did a half-hearted job as far as I'm concerned, because for every word that he had said there had been a dozen words spoken in this resolution on this side. Now I know that this resolution, as far as I am concerned - and I know it for a fact - will go down the drain, but as far as this side is concerned, we know we need this actual housing for our people and what is holding it back tremendously is this 20 percent sales tax, Mr. Speaker, I would say, I would urge this government to do something for the people who can't do something for themselves. Thank you.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Borowski, Campbell, Cherniack, Dawson, Doern, Dow, Fox, Froese, Guttormson, Hanuschak, Harris, Hillhouse, Johnston, Kawchuk, Miller, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Petursson, Shoemaker, Tanchak, and Uskiw.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Bjornson, Carroll, Claydon, Cowan, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Graham, Hamilton, Johnson, Jorgenson, Klym, Lissaman, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Spivak, Stanes, Steen and Witney and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 23; Nays, 26.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the resolution lost. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. STEEN: Mr. Speaker, I might ask the indulgence of the House to allow this matter to stand in my name, but if anybody else would like to go ahead and speak, please feel free to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: (Agreed) The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. The Honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. DAWSON: Mr. Speaker, I hadn't intended getting into this, but after listening to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs speech to us on Friday, I guess I became annoyed and thought I would like to say something.

One of the things that the Minister inferred was that the northern development that exists there now was attributed to the present government. I take issue with this because I am sure that the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, as much as he'd like to take all of the credit for the starting of Thompson, it was the previous Liberal government that started Thompson. And you know, it seems to be that this is their tack, Mr. Speaker, because I read in the paper where the First Minister is reportedly speaking about the Floodway that was built to protect the City of Winnipeg against future floods, and once again the inference is there that this was the present government that started all this and want to take full credit for it. But I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, you can recall reading, just as well as I did, that it was the previous government under the Member for Lakeside, Mr. Campbell, who instigated the study, which was called the Manning Commission, for the floodway and it was really the previous government, and the Liberal government that can take credit for the floodway and not the government that exists today.

The Minister I think went on to read us lengthy pages of the half a mile road here and a half a mile road there. I want to give credit where credit is due and I know that the present government have done some things for the north, but I think that all the things that they have done for the north they've been forced into them, because the thing has just grown and they had

(MR. DAWSON cont'd.) to give something here and give something there and it's only natural. It's been less than a natural growth really, because the people who reside in the north wouldn't feel the way they do if they thought enough things were happening.

I think the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs misunderstands the resolution that has been presented by the Member for Portage. He misunderstands that the people are not saying that some things are happening up there, they're saying that not enough things are happening for the kind of money that is being taken out of the north. They feel that the price that they have to pay for housing, the price that they have to pay for transportation to come out of the north to visit friends or relatives in Winnipeg or other southern points in Manitoba, they feel the price of groceries are too high, and I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, after checking some of the prices that presently exist in some of the stores in Thompson opposed to the prices that exist here, one can readily see why they're objecting. They're saying that it's not the grocery stores that are making the money, Mr. Speaker, it's the freight rates, and it's not the people that are involved in the freight hauling that are making the money because they have to charge that kind of money to justify their existence and to make a reasonable and fair profit. What the people of the north are saying is that there should be some form of subsidization for the freight people that are hauling the supplies to the north. They're also saying that there should be a special income tax credit for residents of northern Manitoba, and I think it's rightly so.

And one of the things that I believe the Minister missed the real point on, that the people of the north are saying that they should have a university. And isn't it something that should be happening in the north when we consider how many students and how many people are living in the north now? And once again we get back to what I was speaking about on the first resolution, that they have to come down to Winnipeg or Brandon or into another province for university education. Now there certainly are enough people - Flin Flon, The Pas and Thompson - throughout there, that could well enough have enough students at a university. It doesn't have to be a university on the style of what the University of Winnipeg is, but it could be a university offering a full curriculum for the students of the north, and I'm sure that when this request is made by them that it's certainly justified. You can see just one little instance - I know it's not that important but it's one that I know of - the Town of Flin Flon have always been very very active in sports, and one of them is in hockey, but any time they have a Junior A hockey team in Flin Flon they must tell their students there is no way you can get a university education up here so if you're a good student we can't take you. They're being fair to the student and I think this is right. They say we just haven't got a university so we can't compete with Winnipeg, Brandon and these other centres.

Now, as I said, I hadn't intended getting involved in this until the Minister started saying about all the things that were happening up there, but I still think he missed the whole point of the resolution. He agreed with some points that the Member for Portage la Prairie had submitted but he thought that his was just to show us that things were happening up in the north, but I repeat that I think the only reason why things are happening up there is because the government has just been forced into it. It has been a lip service type of deal because one thing has grown into another and not through the efforts of the present government.

I think he also missed the point that the people of the north feel they should have concessions and considerations, and the fact that the kind of money that comes out of the north in mineral, etc., certainly justifies the spending of more money to give them more comforts.

I think one of the most important things in the member's resolution is the fact that he calls for a Minister of Northern Affairs, something which many members on this side of the House have mentioned in speeches since I've been sitting in here, and they feel that there should be a full-time Minister of Northern Affairs. We know that there is a Commissioner of Northern Affairs, but I'm sure that this is not the same thing.

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

MR. MICHAEL KAWCHUK (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to participate in this debate; however, the remarks made by the Honourable Minister of Corporate and Consumer Affairs the other day certainly would warrant a few comments. Listening to the Honourable Minister, one sometimes has to stop and think for a minute whether or not the Minister is describing the same part of the province that the former Member for Churchill used to refer to. As you will recall, Mr. Speaker, the former Member for Churchill had some

May 6, 1969

1951

(MR. KAWCHUK cont'd.) dull and gloomy pictures to paint to this House with respect to some of the conditions that prevailed in the great frontier of northern Manitoba. The Minister, he went on at length to indicate to us what all this government had done insofar as providing improvements in living conditions and the like of that in the northern portion of our province. Mr. Speaker, as you will recall two years ago when I participated in the debate with respect to northern Manitoba, I had at that time the income tax statistics data with me which indicated beyond a shadow of a doubt that the people of Manitoba are contributing immensely more than the rest of the provinces by way of income tax to the Federal Government, then of course in turn to the provincial government, and on that basis alone the people of northern Manitoba are entitled to some recognition, that is of immediate nature, to help to improve conditions which would make living conditions more pleasant in that area.

Our Minister went on to make it a great point that as far as the income tax credits were concerned they were beyond the scope of this government because of the fact that there was arrangements made with Ottawa to administrate this aspect of it. Well I'm sure when the provincial government enters into these arrangements with Ottawa this could be one of the stipulations that could be entered to, and this certainly is no reason for not having this income tax credit available to the -- (Interjection) -- Yes, as you are probably well aware, Mr. Speaker, there is indications in the budget debate that this government is contemplating taking steps insofar as the refunding of the estate tax is concerned, which is also collected by the Federal Government and in turn rebated to the provincial government. In that respect the provincial government foresees no problem and is willing to go ahead. I say, Mr. Speaker, wherever there is a will there is a way. But the truth of the matter is this government apparently is not willing to give the people in northern Manitoba equal opportunities insofar as enjoying a reasonable standard of living as is enjoyed by the rest of our population, even though the Minister of Finance in bringing down his budget debate had indicated to this House that if it wasn't for the great influx of investments by the International Nickel during the early '60s we would have been suffering in Manitoba a recession, the same as had been suffered by other provinces. That point alone, Mr. Speaker, the sheer fact that the development of the north had made it possible for the people of Manitoba to prosper and not be set back by the recession that had affected other regions is a point in itself and it should be given due consideration and, in turn, should give the people in northern Manitoba extra recognition.

He also mentioned the fact that there was at least 10 percent of the road budget spent in Northern Manitoba. Well perhaps that is the case, but one only needs to drive on some of the roads that prevail in northern Manitoba at the present time and one would certainly not begrudge that even a greater portion of the road budget be spent in that province to make communication easier for the people who have chosen to reside in the northern communities so they can come back to the bigger cities in southern Manitoba, whether it be for visiting purposes or pleasure. I think that with the present state of affairs in the agricultural sector, and as statistics point in other countries whereby additional farm families will be readily moving off the farms to find a higher standard of living in greener pastures and some of them will probably contemplate going up to the northern frontier and making their home there - is even more reason for this government to provide some leadership and improve the road conditions to this northern community.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think there's any need for me to spend a great deal of time on this resolution. I think that all of us agree that it is a good one, and I would certainly hope that this government would give the people in northern Manitoba greater recognition and provide greater services, and above all, provide the type of leadership that they are entitled to to make them equal with other citizens in this province.

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

MR. JOHNSTON: Just a few

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I believe the honourable member would be closing the debate. Does the Honourable Member for Rhineland wish to speak?

MR. FROESE: I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. John's, that debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, I did not want to speak on this point at the moment and I wish to have the indulgence of the House to let the matter stand. However, if there are others that want to participate they can do so.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, if it's in order I would like to make a few comments at this time on this resolution. The resolution is an important one and it points a spotlight on an irritation that has been plaguing Manitoba and most other areas for many years, the entire question of assessment.

This resolution pretty well limits itself to dealing with the problem of agricultural assessment only and ignores the larger problem of assessment generally, both urban and rural. Now the mover of this resolution of course feels perhaps that someone else should worry about the urban assessments and he's limiting himself to the agricultural problems only. But I think we can't deal with one aspect of it in isolation. I think the whole matter of assessment is something that has to be looked at, examined, and hopefully to find what we're all trying to achieve and that is equity, because that is supposedly the key term in any assessment system, the equity as between a man who lives in the city and a man who lives on a farm, the man who owns land only and a man who has a business. It is the equity between them that really counts in the final matter. It doesn't matter whether assessments are high or low; it's the relationship between one and the other that should concern us.

In the matter of agricultural assessments, I know that this has been a matter of disagreement and sometimes violent arguments between many people who are expert in the field. I think that it's too limiting to simply say that the basis for agricultural assessment shall be productivity. I think the term productivity itself requires definition, because to ignore the fact that land values are often established by the market value, by the sales of lands adjacent to a particular piece of property, to ignore that is to ignore the fact that in the final analysis the holding is supposed to reflect not just the use to which the land is put but the money that can be earned from the sale of that particular property, whether for the use that it's being put to now or for some future use.

And I would point out that in the city the same problems really apply. I know that one of the members when he spoke, I think it was the member from Birtle-Russell, who said he's concerned about how we constantly raise assessments while the same amount of grain is being produced, and that the farmer isn't really better off today than he was 10 years ago and maybe he's worse off, yet his assessment is going up. Well, Mr. Speaker, the same applies to a home in the city. It's still a home; it's still a shelter for a family. It's not serving any other function today than it did 10 years ago, and yet I can tell you assessments have risen and have risen very high and very sharply, and they've risen because of the market value, because of the pressure on it.

I believe the Member for Brandon last time when he spoke said that this is a false assumption that the land value is really greater. After all, if all of the land was suddenly put on the market place there would be no customers; there wouldn't be the pressure for it. And he suggested that really to suggest that land sales in the area should affect any particular farm wasn't valid, because if all lands were sold at once then the market value would drop. Well, the same would apply in the city. If tomorrow 5,000 homes were put on the market in Winnipeg, I can assure you the market value would drop; you couldn't get the same price that you're getting today. And this is one of our problems; there isn't enough homes being made available. But so long as that situation continues then certainly the value of the homes will remain high, and this will be recognized by the assessors, that they have to take into consideration the sales within a given area and the impact of those sales on the land values in that area.

Now one of the reasons I think that the agricultural areas have a problem - and I admit they do, because I recognize, particularly in areas adjacent to expanding urban growth centres where the urban community is impinging upon the rural areas, where it is pushing out beyond the boundaries of the growth centre into the agricultural land surrounding it, that there certainly is a pressure brought to bear, and too often we have found that lands affected by urban growth are increasing in value and the assessment is being increased to such an extent that it makes farming uneconomical and people may be forced off the land. I recognize this is a problem, and one of the reasons for it is - we've heard it - that somebody from an urban area city comes in and buys a piece of land and he's prepared to pay what is considered an outlandish price for the land, although basically it's not very high compared to city prices, but that starts

(MR. MILLER cont'd.) setting the pattern and before you know it the assessment rises throughout the area.

One of the problems I think is that we've never faced up to the simple fact - and it has been recommended over the years and I'm not coming up with anything new - that there must be a division, a separation of the assessment of land and structures qualifying as a working farm. We've got to recognize that a farm is a working farm, separate that from the residences and the buildings on the farm - the other buildings on the farm, and by doing that we can then maybe find a relationship between the worth of farm residences and measure them against urban residential values, because it will be in a sense dealing with like and like, and by the same token we can then assess the farm itself, the farm business property, and try to find a relationship and compare it to business properties within an urban area.

I know it's not simple, but I say that if we persist in ignoring the residence on a farm and simply say no residence is going to be taxed, or no residence is going to be assessed, as in Manitoba where we say a residence and the buildings are just part of the farm and they're just part of the farm land within an acreage basis and we should use productivity and soil conditions and so on and so forth and that's the only criteria, we are making it almost impossible to face up to the problems which the farmer truly faces, and that is how can he remain on his farm, work his farm economically, try to live off it, make a living off it, and at the same time recognize that assessment will be increasing, the value will be increasing and that it will be judged with equity throughout the province.

So I seriously suggest that when this matter is studied, we have to finally come to terms with the fact that a residence is a residence, and whether that residence is sitting on a subdivided piece of property in a city or that residence is sitting on an acreage on a farm, they are basically serving the same function; they are a shelter for a family, whether a city family or a farm family. And if we can do that, I think we can go a long way to at least meeting some of the problems, because then we can start thinking in terms of equity between one and the other. And the same would apply to the farm itself, because in a sense it's a business and farmers like to think of themselves as businessmen, and so they are running a business on certain lands and it can be compared to the running of a business anywhere, but we have to take into account the possible return on the investment on a farm area, how lucrative is it in view of the capital investment made by the farmer in comparison to his city cousin, and try to find a relationship between the farm as a business and any other commercial enterprise in an urban area.

And certainly one of the key things - and I know that the Member for Brandon doesn't like this - but one of the key things in controlling what finally happens is to try to control the use to which land is put. And this is why some of us on this side of the House in this Party are so very serious when we discuss planning, and why planning is a tool which is recognized by the Assessment Department and which can be used by the Assessment Department to make sure that the equity is maintained and that land uses won't run away. I mean by this that if you have a stable and comprehensive pattern of land use control, in other words if this land is set aside as agricultural and there can be no question but that the farm portion of it is going to remain farm - and again I've assumed that we will accept my proposition that a residence is in another category, that if the residence is in a farm or city it's the same thing - but the farm portion is going to be set aside for farming by the town planning authorities and it's zoned for that and it's not available for anything but that, then when the assessor looks at it he has to take into account, and he cannot arbitrarily suggest, yes it is true it's a farm but maybe it will be something else, because until the land use is changed it cannot be anything else. And to the extent that we in the Legislature accept town planning, accept land use control and will stick by them and will support the land use as established, then we will be helping the assessors in equitably placing an assessment on land, and make it possible for a farmer to know that so long as he is abiding by that and it's being used for that purpose and that he cannot use it for any other purpose, that the land values are not going to rise.

So I think it's wrong to simply say, well the assessor is doing something wrong, he is taking into account the sale of land half a mile up the road. He is quite right because he has no assurance that the land use is not going to change a month from now, and unless the town planning scheme fixes it and fixes it for a definite period so that there can be no alteration in the land use, the assessor is really in a bind. He has no way of equitably assessing the value on any piece of property because he doesn't know from month to month what he encounters, and so it's absolutely essential that we establish patterns of land use and that we stick to them,

(MR. MILLER cont'd) . . . because this sort of land use would preclude the urban or industrial development that might take place and which might affect the sale of land. It would help to ensure that the value of farm land relates fairly closely to the existing use and it would in a sense freeze it at that basis.

And I'm suggesting this too, that if we don't do that - and municipalities tend very often to look at the immediate possibilities of, let's say an industrial plant moving in, they're taking a very short and narrow look at it, they're looking at today and not thinking of the implications beyond it - I'm suggesting that a municipality that does not employ a very rigorously maintained land use control system is inviting instability into its whole tax structure and is inviting a tax hardship on all the other people in their area. One of the best examples is a bill that's before the House now, where if a certain industry is going to be built it will inevitably, and must, affect the assessment of land adjacent to that building because the assessor is quite right when he says: I have no idea whether six months from now the neighbouring land is going to be a farm or it's going to be converted into a site for a warehouse or for trucking. And so he has every right to say: It might happen, it has happened in the area, land sales have gone up from "X" dollars per acre to "X-plus plus" per acre, and therefore I have to accept these as sales that have occurred in the area and it's got to be reflected in my assessment in order to have equity and to be equitable. And so, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that land controls are part of the package that we have to look at and part of the things we have to consider when we're thinking in terms of assessment or a change in assessment.

There is another technique that's used in other jurisdictions, that there should be a differential or a split tax rate, a differential in the taxing on land, taking into account the uses to which the land is put. Now that's not something that we have here. It is in other jurisdictions and it's worth looking into. It's a very complex one, but basically what it does is simply state that the taxes will reflect the services which are being made available to certain areas within a municipality, and so some attempt is made to tax more fairly, based on the services which are being rendered on that land.

Now if we don't do those things and if we simply say we are going to permit lands to be sold for other than farm uses - and in and around Greater Winnipeg or any growth centre natural growth will continue - and a farmer who today owns land and is farming it is free tomorrow to sell the land to a developer for a housing development and subdivide it for a couple of hundred homes or to a commercial development or to an industrial developer, if a farmer has that right to do that and he has the right to gain on the return - or make money on the sale of the land, then I feel that farmer has really no complaint if land assessments rise in his area and land assessments reflect the true value, market value, of lands in that area. Because he can't have his cake and eat it too. He can't say: This is a farm; it shall be assessed as a farm; I want to pay taxes as if it's a farm; no other consideration should be taken, only the productivity as a farm, but I want to have the right to sell it the day after tomorrow for any other purpose I choose and I may, if I am able to, get three and four times the assessed value of what it is today. So I say it is an untenable position these people are placing themselves in. They are trying to keep a ceiling, a lid on the value of their lands as far as assessment is concerned, but they're trying to capitalize on any demand for land which develops on the outskirts of an urban area.

Now I don't sympathize with the one who is doing this and simply trying to make a fast buck on it; I do sympathize with the man who legitimately wants to remain on that piece of property and farm it. I proposed some time ago - some of you may recall - in committee when we met with representatives from the outer zone around Metropolitan Winnipeg, the reeves from those areas, who pointed out the situation of strictly market gardeners in and around Winnipeg who were gradually being put in the position where they could not continue as market gardeners economically, and I proposed at that time that they be allowed, the municipalities be allowed to defer the taxes on these lands. In other words, that those who legitimately want to farm will continue to farm and a deferment be permitted, and that that deferment be permitted to stay until such a time as the land was actually sold, and at that time the increased value of the land, after it's sold, they would have to pick up the amount of deferral.

The Michener Commission in their recommendation, after hearing various farm groups on the subject, pretty well said the same thing. They suggested that where an increase in taxes of farmers whose lands were affected by urban growth was increasing in value so as to

(MR. MILLER cont'd) make farm use of them uneconomic, that deferral of payment of taxes be permitted. And I think it's a very fair proposal. I think it meets the demands and the requirements of those legitimate farmers who say: We are farmers; we want to remain as farmers; we have no interest in doing anything but that; we've been on this land for a generation or two and we hope to continue on; we don't want to be pushed off because the assessment values are forcing us through taxation to sell out. It's a legitimate position and I would suggest that by deferring of taxes they can do it. -- (Interjection) -- The Member for Rhineland says, "How do you explain deferrals?" The deferral is that you let the assessment rise, let it rise to reflect the true sale market value of the land around it, that the actual tax would be paid -- the amount that is paid now is to be turned over, but the rise in taxes due to the increase in assessment be set aside as a deferral, kept on the books of the municipality, and in five or ten years from now that farmer sold at the inflated value, then the owner, the farmer has to return back to the municipality the money that he saved by deferral that he would otherwise have had to pay annually to the municipality.

There is various ways of doing it. Another way of doing it is on a capital gains tax on land sales, where if you're prepared to sit on your land and wait for the so-called bonanza, that if it comes you pay a capital gains on the sale of your land. So that there is various methods, and they're being used in other jurisdictions whereby the legitimate farmer, the legitimate land holder in and around a growth centre can be protected and can be defended from being pushed off his land when he wants to continue farming.

But I don't think it's going to be answered by a simple resolution which simply says that the basis of agricultural assessment be productivity rather than market value of land, because I think that only looks at one aspect of the problem of assessment in Manitoba. It ignores the urban problem completely. My immediate reaction when I saw this was to say, well how do you measure productivity? Does that mean that a retail store in Winnipeg that is on Portage Avenue and is not doing well financially - and there are some we see up and down Portage Avenue, many of them are closing down - on that basis can that man say that the productivity of this particular piece of land isn't very good because they've been losing money on this particular enterprise or in this store and therefore the assessment on this piece of land should be -- or on this building should be less because the productivity has proven to be pretty bad. Would that be the measurement? Because if you start with productivity on lands then you're going to have to end up with productivity in the city, and once you really are getting into the productivity aspect of it, what you're really doing is trying to use municipal taxation and assessment as a measurement of ability to pay, and Mr. Speaker, this has never been -- never never has it been a measure of ability to pay. It has simply been a very rough yardstick really of a value which was evolved over the years and a measure whereby some method of taxation could be applied on an individual, usually related to services to his property, but as time went on, as we know, as we become an urbanized community, as municipalities have been entering into financing of areas of service which have not directly related to property, the problem has become aggravated and is going to continue to be aggravated unless we can come to grips and come to terms with the real problem.

So I sympathize with the motives of the mover of this, I recognize he's speaking on behalf of many people who find themselves in a bind because of what has happened with assessment in Manitoba, particularly since assessments or equalized assessment is the base on which sharing of services, or costs of services between the province and the municipalities have become involved, and it of course affects the entire question of the amount of money which a province will participate in, or the amount of money that the province puts in to a shared cost service. And so certainly the assessment on any given area affects not only that particular land holder but also the municipality as a whole.

I'm hoping, frankly, that before this particular resolution is resolved we will explore this even further, that there will be perhaps some more concrete proposals put forward. I know that I didn't come up with any direct solutions. I think I've pointed the way that there may be solutions found if this government really wants to get at it and get to the nub of it. But I do want to caution members of this Legislature that they cannot deal with this resolution in isolation, but rather this becomes part of an over-all problem facing all of Manitoba, whether they reside in a city or they reside in the country, and in view of that I think that we should study this matter more closely than we have and I'm hoping that other speakers perhaps can come up with some suggestions that I could support. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the House prepared to let this matter stand in the name of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead? (Agreed.)

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Hamiota. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is clear to everybody that no taxes, not a single tax, can be classified in the "popular" category, but nevertheless we must, we must -- (Interjection) -- I don't know because I never had to pay that tax. My Honourable Leader I think would take objection to what I said. He mentioned one of the taxes. Maybe he would like to mention it out loud. -- (Interjection) -- You ask him. I was nearly kicked out of here once; I'm not going to get kicked out today. Well, Mr. Speaker, I . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Maybe the honourable gentleman would like to pause for a while.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well I certainly don't want to give the impression that this is not an important resolution, Mr. Speaker. I'm glad to see everybody is so happy today, maybe they'll look at this resolution that I consider to be a very important one. As I was saying, we don't expect taxes to be popular, but nevertheless we realize that the government must have funds, must have money, and that we must raise taxes. Then I imagine that a government that will impose taxes should take certain things into consideration such as the ability-to-pay; they might want to take people in the low income into consideration when they impose taxes. They should certainly try to have every tax levied to be a fair tax and also no doubt that they will look at the facility to collect such taxes. But I feel that the first question asked by a government or group -- level of government that wants to impose a tax should be -- is this tax fair?

Mr. Speaker, I maintain and the members of our Party feel that this is the most unfair tax possible. It is a tax that discriminates. I know we might be told well this tax applies the same on everybody. It reminds me of this quotation of Anatole France Mr. Speaker, "that the law in its majestic equality forbids the rich as well as the poor to sleep under bridges, to beg in the streets and to steal bread." It makes about as much sense. I say that this tax discriminates. I say that it is not a fair tax, because if we would impose a sales tax on clothing of children, if we would say well all right we will look at the age of the child, we will look at the wealth of the family -- this is possible, this could be taken into consideration -- the number of dependents in that family, how many are students and so on. But this is not what we say at all. We say that there's a tax according to size. Well, Mr. Speaker, it would indicate -- would be that my children would be quite a size compared to the children of the Honourable Member from Selkirk, and is it fair that a rich man like my honourable friend from Selkirk, because he's just a little guy and his children are small, that he shouldn't pay any taxes on the shoes and the clothes of his children, where I might very well pay more for my children because it takes a little more cloth and a little more leather? -- (Interjection) -- Well that's it, that adds to the unfairness of it all Mr. Speaker. -- (Interjection) -- That's all in your mind, Tom. If they start taxing the mind, it's going to be pretty difficult Mr. Speaker. But I suggest -- if they can let me finish my speech -- I'm having a hard time today and I'm trying to be serious because I consider this to be serious, Mr. Speaker. It's not just a question as I say, of criticizing the government -- it's easy to criticize and I admit this. I say this to the Provincial Treasurer, we could make a case on every tax. It's easy because we're on the safe side -- and I don't want to do this today. I realize that we need money, that we must have taxes. And I realize that sometimes you might have a point, to say, well, you can't have all the taxes based on ability to pay and soak the rich all the time; they'll go into another province. Well, those are good points, and I'm not suggesting that we don't need the money. The only thing that I say, that this is an unfair tax and the government is stating they have one reason for collecting this tax this way, they have only one reason; they say it is the easiest way of collecting it; it would be quite difficult to say according to age. And, Sir, we felt that all right, this was a point that shouldn't be considered when you're discriminating against people, but nevertheless if you read the end of this motion here, and I will quote: "Therefore Be It Resolved that the five percent provincial sales tax be eliminated on all clothing and footwear for children eligible for federal government family allowance." Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that this is very valid. We're giving the government -- the government is always asking for suggestions, for responsible suggestions; I think that nobody can say that this is not a responsible suggestion, a responsible resolution. We're not suggesting that you shouldn't have any taxes; we're not suggesting -- we have in the past suggested that the clothing of children should not be taxed, but if you insist, if you need the money that bad, all right, but at least don't discriminate. Don't discriminate. And I defy any members from this side of the House, the Government side of the House, Mr. Speaker, to stand up and say this does not discriminate. This is a fair tax.

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) Because I'm sure that they agree that it is not fair. You're adding a load on a family that might have too heavy a burden to start with.

I feel Mr. Speaker, and I sincerely recommend that the government vote in favour, accept this resolution. I'm sure that - as I say, we finally found a way to get around this. It won't be that difficult to collect. This is what the Provincial Treasurer said at the time when we mentioned this, it won't be that difficult to collect and we will stop this form of discrimination, this very unfair tax on the children of Manitoba. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to say a few words on this resolution. They're going to be very few because I don't think it makes very much difference what we say here and how we vote; we're going to be out-voted. -- (Interjection) -- No, I'm not going to give a speech. I think it would be wasting our time. I think the best thing we can do and the people of Manitoba can do when the next provincial election rolls around is to throw them out of office. This would be the most sensible way to handle this matter.

I notice in this resolution reference is made to size. I appreciate the problem that the government may have, that they always say well there's many grown people that have certain sizes. I'm not sure if this is the best way, I don't know. I think we should look at all the provinces that have a sales tax and see which one has the most workable method, the mechanics of collecting this tax so that there wouldn't be certain people beating the Provincial Treasury for certain money. I don't really know which is the best way. I think the mover of this resolution should have brought in something - I don't want to say this so it would appear that I'm criticizing him, but I really think that he should have brought in something more specific than simply saying, "sizes". I have, for example, three daughters and I'm being penalized because they're healthy. They're over these sizes, and the two oldest ones, one is 13 and one is 15, and we've been paying sales tax on everything that they use simply because they're over that size. So there's, you know, if you want to call, discrimination. I appreciate what you're trying to say, but I don't really think the size is going to solve it. -- (Interjection) -- Per family. . . . I see, I'm sorry. Well this is fine. I misunderstood. I got the impression that you want it based on size, and right at this time I know people are being -- I'll use the word discrimination. Certainly we're paying tax and I don't think it's fair because they're going to school the same as other children. One other thing that should have been brought in - and again it's futile to talk about it - there's toothpaste, there's soaps, there's laundry detergents, there's many other things that are just as essential, just as vital to a family and to children and this should be considered. And I hope the government will consider this themselves. They can do this without a resolution. They can turn around and say well, we've looked at this thing and we really think that it's unfair to put tax on these items that I just mentioned and maybe they can turn around and take it off themselves, without a resolution. And again I say, I'm not going to waste time on this thing because I know it's not going to do any good, they're just going to get up and vote against it. Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Hamiota. I take it he'll be closing the debate.

MR. DAWSON: Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, in view of the honourable member wanting to close debate, I think I should say a few words. I was rather interested to hear the remarks of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface in that he's very strongly against the aspect of discrimination, and when I take a look at Resolution 20 I have difficulty in reconciling the views of members in his own party, because there they're asking for a special tax credit for residents of northern Manitoba. I'm going to speak on that resolution at a later date and bring some of those matters into perspective the way I see it. However, I intend to support the resolution that is before us at the present time on the sales tax. Not that this province can't make use of the money - I'm sure they do. We know that. In fact when the tax was first instituted, we thought that there should be sufficient slack that would last several years but -- (interjection) -- There was? No, I don't think there was because we've had certain other matters take place since then. This was tabbed as an education tax when it originally came out and the people of my area certainly haven't seen any assistance of that 50 million revenue that the government got. I felt at the time, when they renamed the tax to Revenue Tax that it was a misnomer; that it was brought in for the purpose of at that time assisting the education department of this province, because they were going to spend much more money and have consequently. We

(MR. FROESE cont'd) have the report of the Public School Finance Board and that report shows that even from the year '67 to '68 the tremendous increases in expenditures that took place. They show here the figures of the grants that were given - and mind you, the grants reflect increase in expenditure. There is only one expenditure, namely the matter of buses, where you had a decrease of 11 percent; all the others had increases of 20 percent or more, and in the case of transportation the increases of expenditure amounted to 135 percent; so that you see the tremendous increases in expenditures in the education field. And this is why we had the tax brought up at that time. But I feel if a tax is being brought in that it should apply equally to all the people of this province.

When the Member for St. Boniface mentions that this tax is also discriminating because of what he mentioned, certain minors who should be exempt are not exempt; there are also other discriminations as I point out, the way the money is being used, that we have a very large discrepancy in that respect as well. I feel that the money should have been applied so that all the taxpayers and all the children of this province would have benefitted by the implementation of this tax.

So, Mr. Speaker, I intend to support the resolution and certainly will have further things to mention on another resolution also on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Hamiota. Order please. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Honourable Member for Hamiota will be closing the debate, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Labour, that the debate be adjourned. -- (Interjection) -- Have I spoken on this debate?

MR. DAWSON: You've already spoken on this.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. That can be checked out in just a moment.

MR. EVANS: I apologize, Mr. Speaker. I didn't realize I had spoken in this debate. -- (Interjection) -- . . . most kind of you but . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. EVANS: You reminded us this morning of the . . . rules and I expect to . . .

MR. DAWSON: Mr. Speaker I would offer the Honourable Minister of Finance another opportunity but I think that he did speak on this. I was very very sorry to hear him admit, when he spoke, that one of the statements he made was that he hated to admit the law must fill the administrative scheme; and he says, but we must be practical.

Now I think this is very typical of that government. They're afraid to tamper seriously with an administrative apparatus, and that's about what it amounts to. The government find themselves being in the position of being responsible to the administration rather than being responsible to the people. This is exactly what he said at that time and that's why I remember it so clearly. He said that "we find ourselves in the position of being responsible to the administrative machine first and the people second", and I was so disappointed in that statement, but it's typical of the government. I guess they're always responsible to the administrative bureau, or the bureaucrats, and not to the people.

He also said that it was impossible to supervise the article of sales and the use they would be put to. And I agree with him it would be difficult to supervise the article of sales and the use they would be put to; but he also said or he inferred that the people of Manitoba were dishonest. He said that the suggestion that I had made here in this resolution by using an identification card for people that were eligible for federal family allowance would be abused. But isn't the system being abused right now? What about a married woman who's small and can wear the particular size that is eligible for the exemption; isn't she cheating? Is the Minister putting her in jail for abusing the law? It works two ways. -- (interjection) -- Well, my point is that the law is being abused in that case, so if he says it's going to be abused from the other way, it certainly is. I realize that she's fortunate, she's able to get into a size 12, she can get away with the tax; but doesn't it work the other way too? What if you had a son that's only 11 years old and is big enough to wear oversize, it works the same way too. And who's being abused there? So it works two ways.

So basing it on sizes, as the Member for Churchill said -- who thought we were basing it on sizes and now he agrees that the proper way to do it is by either some form of identification on an age basis or eliminate the tax completely. Now we realize that we have to be practical, the government says they need some money, but we feel that by taking it out of children and parents who are already overtaxed as it is, it's the wrong way of doing it. I think

(MR. DAWSON cont'd) the points that I've brought out certainly rebut the Minister's argument. He's telling us in plain English that he's in the grip of the machine; the machine being his own department. As I pointed out before, the first people he should be responsible to are the people of Manitoba and not the administrative machine that operates his department.

I want to point out too, to the Honourable Minister of Finance, that it was last fall that my Leader wrote to him asking him to consider the removal of the tax on children's clothing and other particular things that are a necessity in everyday living, such as soap and wax and things like this, and he replied and said it would be looked into, but there's never been anything said about it since until the day he stood up and said that he was in the grip of a machine.

I can't agree with the Member for Rhineland when he says that the tax should apply for everyone. We're trying to give tax concessions in the north, but we're talking about two different things here. I believe the northern area is a different argument all over again. This sales tax on children's clothes is an argument for all of Manitoba.

I want to conclude Mr. Speaker, by saying that the Minister on that particular day, told us that the government would be opposed to this particular resolution because he was in the grip of a machine.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

A STANDING VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Borowski, Campbell, Cherniack, Dawson, Doern, Dow, Fox, Froese, Green, Guttormson, Hanuschak, Harris, Hillhouse, Kawchuk, Miller, Molgat, Patrick, Paultley, Petursson, Shoemaker, Tanchak and Uskiw.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Bjornson, Carroll, Clayton, Cowan, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Graham, Hamilton, Johnson, Jorgenson, Klym, Lissaman, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, Mclean, Masniuk, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Witney and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 23; nays 26.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the resolution lost.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, it appears that my buddy the Attorney-General is still in Rome. I wonder if the House Leader can find out when he's coming back. I thought it was a five day affair. They're sure working hard on him.

MR. EVANS: . . . relieve my honourable friend of whatever strain that's imposed on him in this way.

MR. DESJARDINS: He might see the light if they keep him there too long.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Hamiota. The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, according to TED it is inevitable that the farm population in Manitoba is going to decline further than it has in the past. And the reason given by TED for this decline are new concepts in agriculture, improved transportation and changes in service industry technology. But TED goes on to say at page 431 that Manitobans have a choice, and that choice is between controlling a clearly defined set of forces and building up rural areas around the natural resources in which they abound, or surrendering to those forces and allowing those areas to decay.

According to TED . . . -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I remind the honourable gentleman that the Honourable Member for Selkirk has the floor, and I can hardly hear him. If there are to be any discussions I wonder if they might not be held in the hall.

MR. HILLHOUSE: According to TED it is inevitable, according to the best available information, that regardless of what course of action is chosen, Manitoba's farm population will continue to shrink, and the smaller rural areas will continue to disappear. TED estimates that by 1980 it is conceivable that the number of farms in Manitoba will shrink from roughly 37,000 at present, to 20,000, and that there would be fewer than 40 agricultural centres in Manitoba's rural region, compared to more than 60 at present.

Quoting from page 431 of TED, it says: "This does not mean that large scale migration must occur from rural Manitoba to Metropolitan Winnipeg or other urban centres. Nor does this mean that the people of rural Manitoba and the federal and provincial governments must

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd) simply accept continuing decline in rural regions of Manitoba. In fact, immense opportunities exist for development throughout rural Manitoba if appropriate policies designed to control change more effectively are followed by all concerned". It goes on to say further: "While the future of many farms and many small hamlets is bleak, there is no reason to assume that the future of the people currently living in these places is equally dismal. Unlike mining, which depletes resources and can leave a region without an economic base for the future, agriculture is a permanent foundation for economic activity. Manitoba's gross farm income could in fact double to \$800 million by 1980, while the net income per farm could more than triple to \$10,000.00. If the multitude of small service centres throughout rural Manitoba were to concentrate into several major ones, these would be an important stimulus to further control. The combined opportunities presented by agriculture and service centre development, would lead to higher relative income levels, lower poverty levels, better housing, new investment, better transportation services, more secure land and business capital and the provision of a wider more readily available and better range of goods and services. In short, Manitoba has an opportunity to develop in its rural regions a community which can compete effectively with the metropolitan regions of modern Canada".

The report goes on to say: "That this potential will not be realized unless the people concerned take deliberate and co-ordinated action to control the forces of change, and that fragmented policies will not suffice. The magnitude of these social and economic problems in solution will require heavy financial and technical support, even if we are to control these forces of change, and it is estimated that at least 60 percent of the necessary capital investment will have to be borne by Canada, and the balance by Manitoba." In my opinion there will have to be a shift of policy in the use of funds by the Manitoba Development Fund and that more emphasis be placed on community and co-operative schemes of development.

On page 432 of the TED Report it points out the difficulties with which we would be confronted, and so as to emphasize these difficulties I will quote the language therein used: First: "Regional development and planning throughout rural Manitoba will not be easy. The process requires an unprecedented involvement on the part of governments, regional groups, businesses and individuals. The essential problems must still be faced even on a regional level, namely, the movement of people away from farms and small service centres and into larger centres. It is important that people be prepared to consider the type of farm and the type of service centre which will be best in tune with the future. This is essential if everyone in rural Manitoba is to have access to the knowledge required for intelligent planning. Finally, for both humanitarian and economic reasons assistance should be provided to those individuals, businesses and communities making the adjustment.

TED goes on to state further, and I quote: "The recommendations presented here do not contain a detailed plan or specific target for growth in each rural region; rather they offer a blueprint for building the local regional, provincial and federal framework that is necessary to the formulation of a sound plan for development. An initial two or three years of intensive research, discussion and planning is recommended for each region, involving a cost to each region of between 150,000 and 200,000 dollars, to be underwritten entirely by the federal and provincial governments. It is also recommended that the role of the existing regional development corporations be greatly expanded."

In addition, the TED Report sets out in fairly specific details recommendations for regional development, and since this resolution is in essence and substance requiring the government to give greater financial support to the establishment of industry in rural Manitoba, and thus stop or at least retard the population shift from rural to urban centres, I hope that the government in its wisdom will unanimously support this resolution.

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

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable . . .

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, if the Minister doesn't object, I would like to make a comment.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I recognize the Minister. May I hear what he has to say.

MR. SPIVAK: I was going to move the adjournment of the debate, but if the honourable member wishes to speak, I'll sit down.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Thank you Mr. Speaker, and thank you, Mr. Minister.

The resolution proposed by the Honourable Member for Hamiota is quite interesting

(MR. DOERN cont'd) because I think that it's the kind of resolution, and it deals with the kinds of problems in Manitoba, that either we solve and go forward, or else we tackle in the wrong way and break the province in economic terms. There's no doubt that there has been a tendency and a trend in recent years that I think can only accelerate in the movement of people from the rural areas into the urban areas. This has a disastrous effect, in particular, not only on the farm population, but on terms of the small towns and villages of our province. In the past - well the early part of the 1960s - '61 to '66 - our farm population was down 11,000. The members resolution suggests that it's mainly the lack of industry that is responsible for this trend and I think that there's a lot of truth in that, although I don't think that's the entire answer.

As the TED Report pointed out, all regions have the problem of losing population, there's out-migration not only in rural Manitoba into the urban areas of Manitoba, but we know that we have that problem out of province - that people leave. We also know that we lose people out of the country and so on. So the question is how do you attract people in, or how do you retain people. I think there is also a very serious problem connected with this, and that is the question of, you have to look at this from the point of view of new conditions and new changes rather than from the point of view of simply maintaining the status quo; because it will not work in that manner.

I also think it's rather interesting that the Member for Hamiota proposed this particular resolution which seemed to anticipate the TED Report. This is either a question of perhaps clairvoyance, or perhaps it's better put as a question of connection. Someone on the Commission may have suggested it to my honourable friend, but nevertheless, it certainly anticipated what was to be said later.

One of the key points, if you speak to people throughout the Province of Manitoba, is that they have a complaint which is similar to the complaint of our government in connection with Ottawa - namely, that the people in the rural areas of the province often feel they're not properly consulted. That the directives come out from the big boys in Winnipeg, the experts and the planners, and the public administrators and the members of the Cabinet and the government, and they tell them what to do; and they tell them how to act; and they tell them even what their problems are. The people complain frequently that they don't feel that they are consulted and they don't feel that they are participating in, in this instance, the regional development of their area. So if it's correct for the provincial government to complain or accuse the federal government of not being properly consulted, it is equally true and equally valid for the people in Manitoba outside of the metro area to complain that the provincial government doesn't always consult them, and doesn't give them a sense of participation.

Up to now, we know that these regional development corporations were established under COMEF. The question is how many of them are really functioning? I think COMEF recommended six regional development corporations - five plus the one in the Interlake region which I guess is directed by the ARDA people. But out of the five that were proposed, only two in fact that I can determine - and the Minister can correct me on this later - only two are really functioning. The other three are perhaps growing but still infant. -- (Interjection) --

I'll have to leave that to you to determine for yourselves and the shortcut would be to have the Minister explain that. This is dealt with in the TED Commission Report. Also, up to now many of the attempts to develop the province regionally have been done on the basis of crisis or ad hoc arrangements rather than planning and it's really in planning for the future that this is the area that we have to get into. As I said, the present setup of the five regions, or five plus one, with only a few functioning, we realize that we're just really beginning to get into the regional development corporations. We have the skeleton, so to speak, and it's now time to put some flesh on it.

The Member for Selkirk pointed out that there would have to be increased expenditures and I think this is undoubtedly true. It is proposed in the TED Report, and I think this makes good sense, that in order to establish plans in each of the regions there'll have to be a significant amount of money spent on doing research and developing plans, because there is no detailed series of plans in these regions at present. There's a sort of a general overall plan or view but when you look at each particular region, they're all different; they all have different problems and they will have to be handled differently. COMEF in fact I think failed in not looking at the regions as separate entities but tended to take an overall viewpoint.

(MR. DOERN cont'd) Undoubtedly there would have to be, in addition to an expenditure of 150,000 or 200,000 dollars for research and planning, there would have to be a permanent staff which would cost a certain amount of money, a key man, a manager or full-time chairman, executive secretary, whatever he would be called, who would have to have some professional supporting staff which would cost I guess somewhere in the region of 30, 40, 50 thousand dollars a year depending on how many men and what calibre was expected, and the money for this would have to come primarily from the province and also from the Federal Government. But it would probably be useful as well to have some money come from the region itself. Part of the problem is participation, then there should also be economic participation as well. But the major costs of underwriting the initial stages should be done by the senior government and then they should continue to participate, but also the regions themselves. You would need boards of directors and regular meetings and so on and so on.

One of the recommendations that was made by the TED Report which ties in with this particular area, which I think is one of the most useful suggestions, is the suggestion that we have a Standing Committee of the Legislature. This would give an opportunity to the people of rural Manitoba and to the directors of the Regional Development Corporation and people from Industry and Commerce and the Manitoba Development Fund and the Minister himself and the opposition parties, all an opportunity to think about and work on the economic development and the economic future of this province, because that's the key to Manitoba and that's the key to our future, and the present system, like I think the system in so many of the other departments, is simply not adequate. It's not good enough for the Minister to tell us secondhand about the cards and letters and phone calls that he gets.

Similarly, we're talking about South Indian Lake, we're hearing about reports. We have to take the interpretation of the Minister, we have to take the summary of the Minister, we have to take the emphasis from the Minister. We would like to hear ourselves the representations that are made. In particular, we would like to be involved in the very planning as well. It was suggested in TED, and I think this is a useful thing -- kind of reminds me of the, what is it? -- the Address to the Nation or something that the President makes -- a State of the Union Message done once or twice a year in the United States -- the suggestion made that the Minister should report if not more than annually at least annually, give the Standing Committee which would contain representatives of the Legislature, give a clear annual report on government policy. If we knew what the government's goals were, and I don't think we really know now, if we had a clear statement then we could assess and evaluate whether the government was carrying out these goals or to what extent they were achieving them.

I'm going to save some comments that I have on the government's successes in meeting the COMEF goals for the Minister's Department. I think that the TED Report showed that the government failed to meet a very significant percentage of the goals that were set by the COMEF Report and if we're not careful we will again have a new report five or ten years from now that will be called something else -- perhaps the SID Report would be appropriate -- and the result would be that we then again will say well we should do something now. We should plan ahead, we should set up committees and so on, I think the time for action is now. It's not good enough for the government to act on some of these proposals in the fall or at the next session. I think the Minister should enlighten us as to -- and the Premier should enlighten us as to what steps the government is taking immediately to get some of the TED Report off the ground, because I think, Mr. Speaker, that we have developed some inertia; we have a general consensus from the business community, from labour community, from the government, from the opposition and so on, there is a broad consensus that the TED Report is a blueprint in fact for the development of this province, and I in general concur with that, so I say let's do something about it. And if we wait then I fear for the consequences of the report and I fear for the development of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I'll just end by making some general comments which are tied in with what I've just said that there is no doubt that one of the things we must do as well -- and this is what the government's task is -- is to give economic development the highest priority. I hope that the government shares the enthusiasm of the Minister because I have no doubt that the Minister gives high priority to the economic development of the province and that he himself probably buys the TED Report hook, line and sinker. But I wonder whether the government does. -- (Interjection) -- He wrote it. I don't know if he wrote it but he may have worked on some of it at any rate. I think that we have to have the commitment of the government that economic

(MR. DOERN cont'd) development has the highest priority. We'll only know this if the government starts to take action now on some of the recommendations and if the government starts laying out some clear policy decisions. I submit they have not done this; that they can talk all they wish but until we have a clear idea of what their targets are then I think we will not be able to measure their performance.

So I would say that although improvements could be made on this resolution that I support it in general. I think one of my colleagues may be able to improve on it further by amendment and maybe make the resolution more effective still. So I look forward to hearing the Minister and I hope that when he speaks the next day that he's going to do more than simply refute or rebut the comments of opposition members. I hope that maybe he'll give us that clear policy statement and maybe make some enthusiastic and exciting announcement so we can move this province forward.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister

MR. SPIVAK: I intend to adjourn the debate, Mr. Speaker, but if someone wants to speak I'll . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister intends to adjourn the debate. Do I understand that -- in due course?

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, but if someone wants to speak I'll . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I also wish to thank the Honourable Minister for allowing me to put in a few words at this time. This particular resolution and subject matter of development corporations has been of interest to me for some time and I've seen a certain number of them develop. We have a local development corporation in our area with membership drawn from the various municipalities and downs in the south central part of Manitoba, and it seems to me that there is a certain amount of difficulty in these associations in bringing about development.

We know that our own legislation here in Manitoba provides for a levy at the municipal level, I think it's one mill that they can levy for the support of development which can be used by these corporations and that the various municipalities and towns are contributing to the support of these corporations that they can function. It seems to me, however, that the rural municipalities, even though they might contribute and they do contribute, that they stand to gain very little; that it's more the towns and villages that stand to gain. Because if there is development most likely if industries are to come in they will require water, sewage and so on and that these facilities are not available generally by the rural municipalities, so that they have to locate somewhere in the vicinity of a town or village where these facilities are available. Therefore it stands to reason that they will locate near these towns and also on the property of these towns and villages.

Then it is my belief and I think the success of these corporations can largely be ascribed to the matter of the ADA grants. If it were not for the federal ADA grants at the present time I can't think we would have had the development that we presently have had in rural Manitoba and that has been pushed by the development associations. I think the ADA grants is one of the principal factors in development of rural Manitoba and the manufacturing concerns. And these grants are very substantial. We know that they can amount to as much as a 33 percent outright grant with a maximum I think of \$5 million. So that any new industries coming up are getting very considerable amount of capital into their corporation in this way. And on the strength of that grant they can go out and borrow or secure additional funds so that the owner has to put up very little in the way of capital on his own. This is what is the, I think, the driving force behind the whole setup in that we do secure industries in these areas. As pointed out on previous occasions, this federal legislation has brought about and confers these grants only in areas that are designated and some time ago the southern part of the south central area of Manitoba was not in such a designated area; it was only the last few years that this area became designated. I think the Provincial Department of Industry and Commerce played a part in this, at least assisted in this matter, and I think they are to be congratulated in doing this because this certainly has been one of the principal items and a big factor in assisting industries to locate.

One further matter. I feel that the industries that have come in in these centres are, to my way of thinking, more or less luxury items and this is where I feel that some of this prosperity might be very artificial, because should we have recessions or hard times some of

(MR. FROESE cont'd) these items that are being manufactured might not have a market and that they could be in serious trouble as a result. I would like to see the manufacturing of some more different kinds of articles that are needed in daily life and that the farmer or any other industry might require so that we can count on the industry to remain and also to remain in business. This is why I wondered, supposing the Federal Government withdrew its policy as far as the ADA grants, what would happen? Will the industrial program that we presently have under the Department of Industry and Commerce in this connection, will it last? Will we be able to continue?

When I take a look at the federal estimates for the coming year I find on Page 340 there is two items here listed. One is payments in respect to projects and programs under The Agricultural and Rural Development Act where they anticipate spending \$25 million this year where they spent \$18 million in the previous year. Then there is the further item, incentives to industry for the development of employment opportunities in designated areas in Canada for which they have budgeted \$49 million this year, and which figure stood at \$33,600,000 last year or a year ago. This is a considerable increase and I just wonder how much of that increase really applies to Manitoba. I would certainly like to hear from the Minister as to what programs are in effect, how many are on the drawing board and how many does the Minister expect to be processed this year that are presently being applied for. I think he has this information and I certainly would appreciate hearing from them. I certainly wish the various development corporations the best of luck and hope they carry on and are successful. No doubt if the provincial government can give further assistance, and in some areas I think they should, that this resolution is quite in order. But as I have pointed out, my main concern is whether the grants under the ADA program will continue and maybe the Minister could indicate to us what the prospects are in this area and then see what the prospects are in general for this program in Manitoba for the coming year.

I have always had difficulty in reconciling myself to the principle of using tax money for the purpose of development. I feel that we are treading on ground here that I personally do not like too well. I think it has the flavour of a little Socialism and therefore I've never felt too strongly on the matter of these corporations and the way they are being operated. I feel that this should be left to private enterprise, in my opinion, and that we should have people who are interested to organize them on those basis. Other than that, I will support the resolution.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, the 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 Gladstone. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I rise merely to waive my right to speak on this question but I notice that the Honourable Member for Gladstone is not here and I know that he wanted to close debate, so I could let it stand or someone else could adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: I suggest that the honourable gentleman could probably allow it to stand in his name, if that's satisfactory to the House.

MR. GREEN: That's agreeable to me.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate of the Honourable Member for Inkster. The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to have the matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Seven Oaks,

WHEREAS farmers cannot absorb substantial losses because of high financial inputs per acre of production; and,

WHEREAS losses due to hail damage may greatly reduce farm income; and,

WHEREAS under the present Crop Insurance program farmers could suffer severe losses due to hail damage and still remain ineligible for compensation; and,

WHEREAS it is inefficient to maintain two Crop Insurance Agencies;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of amending present Crop Insurance legislation to provide:

- (a) Extend Crop Insurance program to include crops not now covered, vegetables, potatoes, etc. ;
- (b) Provide hail insurance on an individual field basis; and,

(MR. USKIW cont'd)

THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the hail section provide coverage comparable to present private insurers on an optional basis.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, this is an item that has been discussed in this House a number of times. I don't know whether any other members of other parties have raised the same point, although I can remind the House that we have in the last three years, hoping Mr. Speaker that the members opposite would see the light and eventually come around to supporting such a proposal.

There's nothing radical about this kind of a proposal. It's mainly suggesting that we tidy up the Crop Insurance program and by doing so provide the farmers of this province an opportunity to buy the complete crop insurance program that they require in the most efficient manner. When I say in the most efficient manner I want to refer to part of my resolution which states that there are two crop insurance agencies -- Mr. Speaker, I want to correct that. That is in error. There are more than two crop insurance agencies. We have the provincial government involved on the one hand and then we have many insurance companies involved in the provision of hail insurance coverage on the other hand. So you have a great number of insurers in the field of crop insurance in Manitoba. I don't know just what that number may be but it wouldn't surprise me if there aren't something like 50 or 60 or 100 different insurance companies involved in total.

This is an inefficiency, Mr. Speaker, because we must recognize that where you have duplication of services that those people that are receiving the services must pay for that duplication or for the inefficiency. This is a time, Mr. Speaker, when we ought to be careful to the extent that we recognize that the agricultural economy is such that it cannot afford any inefficiencies -- and I know there are many; this isn't the only area. But if it is possible for the legislators in this province to increase the efficiency of the producers, to cut down their costs, then I think they ought to proceed to do so. This is something the government has been dragging their feet on for a number of years. There's no doubt in my mind, Mr. Speaker, that they may have lobbies and opposition to this kind of proposal -- and I don't blame the people that may have voiced opposition to this kind of a proposal in that they have something at stake, they may lose a bit of the business that they now have and I can't fault them for that Mr. Speaker. If I was in the insurance business I probably would do the same thing. But Mr. Speaker -- (interjection) -- my Leader says perhaps I wouldn't.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the farm community must take an interest in this particular area; the government which is responsible for legislation in this area has to take a positive position knowing that there is a need to cut down the costs. This is an effective way without costing the government any money, Mr. Speaker -- without costing them any money, they could effectively reduce the cost of crop insurance for the farmers of Manitoba. If there was ever a year in which we ought to look at ways and means of reducing costs, Mr. Speaker, this is the year. All the honourable members on the government side have indicated throughout this entire session that the farmers are indeed in very dire circumstances financially and here is an opportunity where we can do just a little bit to alleviate those circumstances and help the farmers along inasmuch as possible with this kind of a proposal.

I have discussed this with many other people. I've discussed this with crop insurance people and it has been indicated that this is feasible; in fact, desirable, and it's only a question of government policy as to whether it's attainable. This is why I rise on, I believe it's the third occasion since I was elected to this House, to make this proposal, that I think we ought to give it the kind of consideration that it deserves regardless of the fact that my honourable friend from Souris-Lansdowne will probably say, as he has said in the past, that if the farmers want to buy some hail insurance that they can buy it from him, Mr. Speaker. Regardless of that fact, I think we ought to be prepared to give this matter the consideration that it deserves. -- (Interjection) -- My honourable friend from St. Boniface says that that situation has changed, and hopefully it is, Mr. Speaker, and we'll have the unanimous support of the House on this proposal.

I want to say that I am pleased that the government has moved, in part, in adopting proposals which I have in this resolution, namely, adding other crops to the program and I'm referring to potatoes which are now included in the . . .

1966

May 6, 1969

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if the honourable gentleman would care to carry on his speech when it next appears on the Order Paper. It is now 5:30. I'm leaving the Chair to return again at 8:00 this evening.