

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Thursday, August 21, 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. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK (Minister of Finance) (St. John's) introduced Bill No. 22, The Financial Administration Act (Recommended by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor); and Bill No. 23, The Provincial Auditor's Act (Recommended by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor).

HON. AL. MACKLING (Attorney-General) (St. James) introduced Bill No. 2, The Statute Law Revision and Statute Law Amendment Act (1969); and Bill No. 7, An Act to amend The Real Property Act.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Selkirk) introduced Bill No. 11, an Act to Adjust Certain Benefits arising out of the Operation of the Group Life Insurance Plan for Public Servants. (Recommended by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor).

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order and I am seeking clarification of this order rather than objecting to it. I notice that the Attorney-General had the Member for Crescentwood second one of his bills, and I just wonder if it is in order or in the rules of this House for a backbencher to second bills of this nature.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): May I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if my honourable friend had an objection, the time to have raised the objection was at the time of the introduction of that bill. I don't think that he is correct. However, the time of objection is at the time of the occurrence of the objection and I certainly will take into consideration the matter raised by my honourable friend.

MR. SPEAKER: At this point, before we proceed, I wish to explain the presence of strangers in the Legislative Chamber this afternoon. Yesterday a request came to me from the C. B. C. seeking permission to locate television cameras and sound-recording equipment within the Legislative Chamber for the purpose of filming all or a portion or portions of the question period before Orders of the Day this afternoon. I was also informed by the C. B. C. that all, or a portion or portions of the film so obtained may be incorporated into a documentary public service film which the Corporation intends to telecast at a later date. The representative of the C. B. C. also indicated to me that he had the tentative approval of the three parties recognized in this House. I am cognizant of Rule 16 of our Legislative Assembly which reads as follows: "Strangers may be admitted to the Galleries and to such other parts of the Legislative Chamber as are set apart for that purpose by the Speaker." The rule grants the Speaker the right to admit strangers and to set apart areas of the Chamber for this purpose. However, in view of the fact that the strangers wished to do more than be passive observers and auditors, and hence this may concern the honourable members, I therefore met with the Honourable the House Leader and the Whips of the three parties, at which meeting their approval of the strangers' request was conveyed to me on the following conditions:

1. That the presence and activities of the strangers in no way disrupt the orderly conduct of business of this House and that same do not adversely affect the decorum of this House.
2. That the filming be allowed during the question period only, before Orders of the Day.
3. That the filming be for the express purpose of production of a documentary public service film for telecast at a later date, and that no part of it be used for commercial purposes, for news reporting, or for that matter for any purpose other than that first indicated.
4. That the granting of this request not be construed as an open invitation or basis for admission to the C. B. C. or to anyone at any future time.
5. That the C. B. C. do grant the Speaker the right and opportunity to preview in proper context that portion or portions of the film that may be taken herein and used, and that it meet with his approval. To this the C. B. C. agreed. I therefore rule that the C. B. C. be admitted today only for the purpose and on the conditions aforementioned.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

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

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I wanted to direct a question to the

(MR. CRAIK cont'd.) Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I wondered if he could advise the House if any progress has been made with regard to the definition of the boundary in the Hudson's Bay between Manitoba and Ontario; and secondly, whether any further progress has been made on the acquisition of oil rights for the Province of Manitoba in the Hudson's Bay; and if I might add a third, Mr. Speaker, could he undertake to supply the House at some time with information regarding the number of oil exploration holes being drilled at the present time or that will be in 1969?

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Brandon East): Yes, I will take this as notice, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable the House Leader. In view of the fact that the Minister of Health and Social Services is on record as favouring a single form of municipal government for Greater Winnipeg, and in view of the fact that the Attorney-General is quoted in the latest issue of the St. James-Assiniboia News as stating that he is opposed to such a move because he "believes it would be detrimental to the growth of the Province of Manitoba as a whole," would the House Leader please explain whether the government is at loggerheads with itself on this issue, or does it have an official position?

MR. PAULLEY: May I suggest to my honourable friend the House Leader of the Liberal Party, Mr. Speaker, that this will eventually become a matter of policy for this government on receipt of the information from the respective commissions that have been set up to consider all aspects of municipal government in the Province of Manitoba, and until that time it would be presumption on my part to indicate whether there are any differences of opinion between representatives of different areas in the Metro area.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker - to the Attorney-General. Would the Minister explain to the House why he feels such a move would be detrimental to Manitoba as a whole?

MR. PAULLEY: I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that is not a question properly for Orders of the Day.

MR. SPEAKER: Has the honourable member a second supplementary question?

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I don't heed the advice of the House Leader. I am asking a question of the Attorney-General: Would he explain that statement that he has made as to why it would be detrimental to Manitoba as a whole?

MR. MACKLING: I think the honourable member has heard what the House Leader has had to say. It is a matter of policy which will be debated in this forum in due course and I'll be happy to participate in that debate at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. I assume that he is aware of the fact that there is a Japanese Trade Mission currently in Saskatchewan to, among other things, discuss the possibilities of entering into a barter arrangement with the Province of Saskatchewan in an effort to move some of their surplus grain. The specific items of barter mentioned are hydro-electric generators. We in this province are always in the business of constructing hydro-electric projects. Has he made any effort to contact this trade mission that is currently in Saskatchewan?

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): I might say, Mr. Speaker, that the subject matter has been researched. We have discussed matters with Manitoba Hydro and Telephone and found out that the Japanese have been bidding on these projects, and whether or not there is room to negotiate will be determined in due course.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Labour. Has the Minister of Labour any report to the House in respect to the review of the minimum wage, and can he advise the House whether the board has met yet, and will the government increase the minimum wage at this session?

MR. PAULLEY: I am pleased to hear the comments of my honourable friend the Member for Assiniboia. The Minister of Labour has been in constant contact with the newly appointed chairman of the Minimum Wage Board. He is in the process of calling the board together as quickly as possible to consider the matter of minimum wages. I may say, Mr.

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) Speaker, that it was necessary to make a change in the personnel of the board, due to one of the representatives of the Employer Group becoming married and moving to the City of Brandon. However, a replacement has been made. In reply to the last question, whether or not there will be an increase immediately in the minimum wage of Manitoba, I await the report, as indicated previously of the Minimum Wage Board, at this session.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I wasn't quite clear. Has the board met yet, or it hasn't met, at this stage?

MR. PAULLEY: The answer to that, Mr. Speaker, is no. As I indicate, the chairman is making every effort to have the board meet as quickly as possible. I anticipate that that meeting will take place within a fortnight.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. LEONARD H. CLAYDON (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Honourable House Leader. The other day the First Minister indicated that, although he agreed in principle with the Private Members' Resolutions, he indicated that it was not the government's intention to proceed or pass those resolutions at this session. Would the Honourable House Leader indicate whether this is in fact the government's position?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I suggest to the Honourable Member for Wolseley that he is taking out of context what the Honourable the Premier of Manitoba said. He did not say that the resolutions would not be proceeded with. It would be a presumption on our part to prevent debate and we have no desire to prevent debate. The manner of the answer of my leader was to the effect that legislation dealing with the resolutions would not be forthcoming at this session unless in some extenuating circumstances the same was deemed necessary and advisable.

MR. CLAYDON: Will the Honourable House Leader indicate that if these resolutions are accepted and passed by this House, that the legislation will come forward at the next session.

MR. PAULLEY: May I suggest to my honourable friend that he be just a little more patient than he has been in the past, and this will be revealed in due course.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, who I see is back. Can the Minister advise the House of the total cost to date of the Boundaries Commission, and also can the Minister confirm or deny reports that it may be another three years before the report is ready?

MR. PAWLEY: I believe this is a proper question for record. I would appreciate it if you would put it in the form of an Order for Return and I'll supply an answer to you as soon as possible.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. BUD SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Labour. Is the Minister aware that under an agreement reached this summer between Local 500 of the Canadian Union of Public Employees and the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg, Manitoba University students employed by Metro are required to pay compulsory union fees each month and yet they are limited by the union to pay scales lower than those accorded non-student labour?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I say to my honourable friend I am aware of this particular situation. It has been drawn to my attention. I have not had an opportunity of looking into the wage agreement between Metro and CUPE but I do suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is a matter between the organization and its membership and, as far as I am concerned, this government has no intention of interfering in negotiated agreements between employees and employers, provided there is no violation of provincial law.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the Honourable Minister of Labour not investigate this agreement to check on the legality of the conditions imposed upon these student labourers?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I suggest -- as I indicated, the Honourable Minister of Labour is aware of the situation. I question whether I have the right to legally interfere with the agreement between Metro and CUPE or any other agreement, unless there is a violation of some provincial law, in which case I would be prepared to take the necessary steps.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) Finance. Does the government intend to introduce its own tax reform program in Manitoba as the Province of Ontario has already begun?

MR. CHERNIACK: I'm sorry - did you say, does the government propose to introduce its own tax reforms?

MR. MOLGAT: Tax reform program as the Province of Ontario has announced.

MR. CHERNIACK: I think that that's a matter that should await development for the honourable member and we'll see just what he finds in due course.

MR. MOLGAT: A supplementary question, if I may, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister of Finance in a position to announce the position of the government regarding the Capital Gains Tax?

MR. CHERNIACK: When we're in a position to do so, we certainly will.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Youth and Education. Have you given any consideration to policy in regard to aid to parochial schools?

HON. SAUL A MILLER (Minister of Youth and Education) (Seven Oaks): Not at this date, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY McKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, on Monday I believe it was, I asked a question of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, if he could give me some information on the proposed Pleasant Valley Dam project. Is the Minister in a position to answer my question today?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'm very sorry I'm not in this position but we're working on it and we will provide the information as soon as possible.

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

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address this question to the Honourable Minister of Youth and Education. I wonder if he's in a position today to give the information I requested a few days ago in regard to the cost to the Province of the maintaining of university education tuition fees, university student tuition fees at this past year's level, if they were to be kept at that level next year. What would this cost the province?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I regret to inform the questioner that I was unable to give him the information up until now. I've been informed this morning that the estimated cost to the province would be in excess of three quarters of a million dollars.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the Minister of Health and Social Services. In the light of the Federal Government's announced cut-back in grants for hospital construction, is it the intention of this government to pass on to the local taxpayer the increased costs of hospital construction?

HON. SIDNEY GREEN (Minister of Health and Social Services) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I might say that the government has formed no intention in that connection.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, on August 19th I made a request to the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Services to table a document. As you know, Mr. Speaker, according to our rules, when someone quotes or reads from a document he is required to table the same if requested, and I find that only part of the document was tabled. Would he be kind enough to table the remainder?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I think that the honourable member should stand corrected. I read very closely what I said in Hansard, and the document which I read from when I specifically mentioned that in my comment was indeed tabled with the Clerk.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: A question to the Honourable Minister, Mr. Speaker. Is there a part of the document that he did not table?

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the Honourable Minister answered the question.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the document which I read from was tabled. I was holding in my hand a series of documents. The part of the series, I perhaps may put it more correctly, which I referred to was indeed tabled.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry to cause you any difficulty at this time, but to me a document is not just one piece of paper; it's a complete set, and I would ask the

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd.) Minister to table the complete document.

MR. SPEAKER: May I bring to the attention of the honourable member, as I heard the reply given the question was answered. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. Was your name affixed to any petition pledging government to certain matters before or during the election campaign?

MR. PAULLEY: May I say to my honourable friend, I affix my signature to many documents. If my name was affixed to any document as Minister of Labour prior to the election of June 25 it was presumptuous and I have not affixed my name as Minister of Labour to any document pertaining to the question of education.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable House Leader. I know that the present Minister of Health and Social Services is responsible for health and welfare which previously was two departments, as well as the new Medicare Services Plan and housing. I wonder if there's any plans to, at the present time to sort of change and lighten the work load of the present Minister?

MR. PAULLEY: May I suggest to my honourable friend that he read the Speech from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor delivered on opening day in which reference was made to possible reorganization of responsibilities of members of the Executive Council in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel. -- (Interjection) -- Could the honourable member present a subsequent question?

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, is it the intention of the government to create a Department of Urban Affairs?

MR. PAULLEY: May I suggest to my honourable friend that this is a matter of policy which will be revealed in due course.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Youth and Education. Could he at this time yet advise the House as to whether or not the cutting of the spending estimates of the Federal Government is going to affect in any way the cost of the school construction program in Manitoba?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, a letter was sent to Ottawa requesting information on this. No reply has yet been received.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Transportation. Could he inform the House what the situation is on the bridge across the Assiniboine River on Provincial Road No. 305, commonly known as the Hood Bridge? If he doesn't have this information at his fingertips would he undertake to supply the House with the information?

HON. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Minister of Transportation) (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I believe this is the highway running south of Portage la Prairie. I believe it's under construction or will be shortly under construction.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer a question asked by the Member for Gladstone. He wanted to know if we were black-topping or hard-surfacing certain highways. May I suggest to him that he has his highways crossed up and I'd hope he'd check it out. It seems that the highways that he refers to are many miles apart.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, from the point of clarification to the Minister, there are several roads of keen importance to the residents in the area south of Portage, 305 and namely 240. The question that I specifically directed to him was the bridge construction that was scheduled in this year's estimates on 305, the crossing of the Assiniboine River.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, what he really wants to know is have we scrapped the project. The answer is no.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney-General. Enquires in the province of Ontario have revealed that several provincial and municipal bodies have engaged in wire tapping. Is there any such activity in Manitoba by agencies either of the Provincial Government or under the control of the Provincial Government.

MR. MACKLING: There certainly is not, to my knowledge.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, a subsequent question. In view of the government's expressed intention to deal with matters of civil rights, does the Minister intend to conduct an enquiry into such practices in Manitoba?

MR. MACKLING: There have been no practices of this nature drawn to my attention, no complaints received. I know that there's widespread concern about this nationally and we will certainly take an interest in it.

MR. MOLGAT: A supplementary question. But the government does not intend to enquire whether or not it is going on in Manitoba?

MR. MACKLING: We have no source of information that it is going on in Manitoba and therefore no enquiry is warranted.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Transportation. Can he tell the House whether steps are being taken by the government now to reconvene at the earliest possible date the Air Canada Policy Committee?

MR. BOROWSKI: No, Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge no steps are being taken. And, Mr. Speaker, while I'm on my feet I'd like to speak on a point of privilege and draw to the attention of the House a couple of inaccuracies appearing in the local paper in the last two days, the first one having to do with the salary of the Leader of the Opposition. It listed the salary as \$19,000. The fact is he receives the same salary as Cabinet Ministers. The second one was more serious. It listed four candidates who were elected in the February 20th by-election and it listed me as a Conservative candidate. Mr. Speaker, I object to that and I would prefer to be called a horse thief rather than a Conservative.

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

MR. EARL MCKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Would the Minister of Agriculture be prepared to call a legislative committee on Agriculture immediately to deal with the serious problems which the farmers of Manitoba are facing?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, there are many things that are being currently considered by myself and my department and the cabinet, which will be revealed in due course as far as it relates to agriculture.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, if I may, it's my pleasure to announce to the House that financial assistance will be provided for potato growers who suffered more than 30 percent crop losses in last year's production. An amount of \$40.00 per acre up to \$1,400.00 per grower to cover cost of feed and fertilizer will be paid. This applies to contract growers and growers registered under the Manitoba Vegetable Marketing Commission and the applications will be available at the Marketing Commission as of August 25th.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: I congratulate the Minister of Agriculture for his announcement. I know that many of the potato growers will welcome that announcement. One question. Is the Minister of Agriculture a potato grower?

MR. USKIW: I don't have to answer that question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PAULLEY: Just in case there's any misunderstanding, possibly I can assist my colleague - and I don't think he needs assistance. He was a potato grower and he is disqualified, as being a member of Cabinet, from receiving any amounts of monies as a result of the announcement that he just made, and may I allay any fears that my honourable friend may have in this regard.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture in the light of the statement that he has just made in regard to assistance to the potato growers. I congratulate the government on this step. I would like to ask him now if all other farmers in the province of Manitoba who suffered crop loss last year will now be free to apply for assistance to the same extent as is being paid to the potato growers.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that the rationale behind this move is the fact that this is one major commodity that was not covered under the former government's crop insurance program, so that I don't see any room for any further adjustments in this respect.

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

MR. JACK HARDY (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the Minister of Youth and Education. Is it the intention of the government to undertake a study with the possible introduction of legislation to control the special levy costs to the local levels of government?

MR. MILLER: When and if the government makes a decision in this regard the member will hear about it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable the Minister of Youth and Education. It appears that the Saskatchewan Government are accepting on behalf of their university, grain in lieu of fees from rural students. Will his department and his government consider the same course of action for this coming year?

MR. MILLER: We'll consider anything. We have not received any such request. Of course, it's the university who would have to be involved in this because the fees are not paid to the government nor to the Department of Education.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: A supplemental question, Mr. Speaker. Do I understand it from the Minister that if any requests are received along this line that they will be favourably received?

MR. MILLER: Well, they would be received. I can't speak for how the universities would feel about this.

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

MR. HARDY: Mr. Speaker, in the absence, I believe, of the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation, may I direct this question to the Minister of Labour. Is it the intention of this government to undertake a feasibility study in the hope of utilizing the Red River Floodway as a recreational area?

MR. PAULLEY: It is the intention of this government, Mr. Speaker, to conduct feasibility studies in many areas for the benefit of the people of Manitoba, and this could conceivably be one of the areas that we will undertake to consider.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Minister of Transportation would disclose his salary to the House.

MR. PAULLEY: I believe that that would appear in the records of the House and if he looks in the estimates he'll find it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Has the Minister determined whether the recently announced cutbacks in federal assistance will affect the City of Winnipeg's urban renewal program in Area No. 2, and as well whether they'll affect the City of St. James-Assiniboia program in Brooklands? And the second part of my question: what steps is the province taking in this connection?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, this should rightfully be referred to the Honourable Minister of Health and Welfare. It falls within his department so refer it to him.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, this matter was raised earlier in the House by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. At that time I indicated that indeed the federal withdrawal of their participation in urban renewal programs would affect Manitoba, that the chairman of our Housing Corporation was getting in touch with the affected municipal people and advising them of our intentions in this regard, and we are presently making plans to make representations on the question to the government in Ottawa hoping that they can possibly be urged to reverse their policy, and a policy which apparently was endorsed by the type of constitutional theories that were advanced by the Leader of the Opposition in this House.

MR. PATRICK: Up to date there has been no representation made to Ottawa as yet, has there?

MR. GREEN: There have been calls to Ottawa but I can't refer to them as representations.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Provincial Treasurer, who is just rising, so possibly he can answer my question at the same time as the statement he was about to make. Is it the intention of the government to issue a Manitoba Savings Bond this year?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, that's under consideration. There is no indication yet that this will be done but it is being considered, and while I'm on my feet and in reference to Manitoba Savings Bonds I'd like to reply to yesterday's question from the Honourable Member for St. Vital, who requested information as to the dollar value of Manitoba Savings Bonds redeemed during the month of July 1969. I am informed that the answer to that question is \$984,200.00.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to direct a question please to the Minister of Transportation. There have been notices in the paper lately, or speculation as to the financial situation of TransAir. A few days ago I noticed where they had been given a franchise to Toronto. I am sure that many people in northern Manitoba would want some assurance that the services in the north . . .

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

MR. BEARD: Will the north be affected by any further enlargement of TransAir?

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, this is a question that concerns me, not only as Minister of Transportation, but as an individual who lives up there. I've been getting representations in the last few days from the north. Many people are concerned that our service is bad. It's over-priced and people feel that if the airline does get the Toronto franchise it will hurt our service even further. There's been no position taken by the government but it's being looked at very closely.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Subsequent to the Minister's disclosure the other day that he is considering the establishment of a government price control board to compel business to justify increases in the prices of goods and services, can he advise this House whether he has anything further to report, and also can the Minister advise whether this board would have control over rent, and also if this board would have control over interest rates?

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs) (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to be able to answer all these questions now, but if you will allow me a few days I'll be able to give you more explanations on this Bill when it is actually introduced for second reading.

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

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. It's reported that farm equipment is being repossessed while the farmer who had the equipment held considerable amount of grain in his bin. Does the Minister propose any legislation or policy statement that might provide some form of relief for those farmers who are having their equipment repossessed.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . the Bill, which will be dealt with shortly, and the member will have every opportunity to discuss it then.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, just to give one more explanation on the question from the Honourable Member of La Verendrye. You have the Bill on your table now so when you have time, maybe this afternoon or this evening, further questions will be answered. The later one is actually introduced for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, a question directed to the Minister of Youth and Education. The final Boundaries Commission Report with respect to the educational boundaries in the Interlake has been available now for some time and there are some minor boundary adjustments that have been contemplated in that report. Is it the intention of the Department of Education to implement any of these prior to the school term of September - this September?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, no, not prior to this school term which is just a couple of weeks away. The report is in the hands of the government. I think it was filed last spring. We inherited it and, frankly, we want to look at it and look at it very closely before we take any action.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Labour. I'd like to ask the Honourable Minister of Labour if this TV program this afternoon will be in technicolor, and if so, could he assure the House that all parties will be represented in their proper colours?

MR. PAULLEY: I don't think really this requires an answer from me as Minister of Labour, but I think the true colours of my friend opposite were revealed on June 25th.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: My question, Mr. Speaker, is for the Honourable the House Leader. Could he inform the House whether his government has settled on a nominee for the position of Ombudsman? Also, could he inform the House whether the appointment will be made after the legislation is passed if it's still at this Session.

MR. PAULLEY: May I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this would be a proper question to ask the Honourable the First Minister. There is a bill to be considered establishing the office of Ombudsman. Because we have an efficient government, the bill establishing the said office is on our table and the Honourable the First Minister will be prepared, I'm sure, to answer that question on his return to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the House Leader. The Throne Speech had a sentence in it indicating that we would be asked to approve legislation designed to make the voting age consistent with the age of legal responsibility in other aspects of life. Is the House Leader in a position to advise the House what age has been settled upon?

MR. PAULLEY: May I suggest to my honourable friend the Member for Ste. Rose, as he well knows this will be revealed in due course.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is it the intention of the government to change other legal requirements of age - for example, to be members of this Legislature? Is it the intention to make that change as well, and the intention to make the changes with regards to drinking laws in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. PAULLEY: I suggest the answer I just gave to the first question of my honourable friend applies to his subsequent questions as well.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Services. Would he be agreeable if I was to offer to table the remainder of the controversial document which has been discussed in the House earlier today and other days?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member can act in such way as the rules permit him to act. He can't ask for my approval because he knows just what I think.

MR. MOLGAT: All that is required in the House is that some member ask for the tabling. I request the tabling.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to address a question to the Honourable Minister of Transport. Has the Minister discussed with the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg their transportation studies of 1968 for the Greater Winnipeg area?

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, the answer is no.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Will the Minister be doing this in the near future?

MR. BOROWSKI: At the earliest opportunity, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Youth and Education. Is it the policy of your government to see to it that the fees for university students remain as they were last year?

MR. MILLER: If you're asking for a policy statement I can't give you an answer.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Transportation to that asked by my colleague. Is it conceivable that the Minister who has announced new priorities in highway construction, namely northern roads, that he would have done so without consulting or talking to the needs, the transportation needs in the metro area?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order may I suggest to my honourable friend that the Honourable Member for Emerson asked a question pertaining to education, and now my honourable friend from Lakeside rises and asks a question of the Honourable Minister for Transportation dealing with highway construction. Now what is the relationship? There's certainly no supplemental question.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I am the Honourable Member from Sturgeon Creek and I asked about the transportation study of 1968 from Greater Winnipeg.

MR. PAULLEY: May I suggest then, Mr. Speaker, in all deference, it is my understanding the Honourable Member for Emerson interceded between the original question and this one. -- (Interjection) -- Yes he did.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I'm quite happy to withdraw my question and ask my colleague to ask that supplementary question of the Minister of Transportation.

MR. PAULLEY: It's too late.

MR. ENNS: Did he make a major decision with respect to the priorities of highway construction without consulting the half million people and their governments of the transportation requirements they're obviously going to need in the next two years.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, the member knows very well that the budget had been spent by his government for the next fiscal year and there is nothing I can do to change it. You know this very well. And the second part of that question is that we consult with Metro, but I don't believe it's Metro's responsibility to decide where we build highways in the north. I don't believe you consulted when you were Minister of Highways.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I'd like to address a question to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Has he or any members of his government held talks or discussions with any of the mining companies, in particular International Nickel, regarding the renegotiating of an upward revision of royalties or taxes paid to the province?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, no such discussions have taken place.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - ADDRESS FOR PAPERS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable the Member from River Heights, I wonder if we can have this matter stand.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the question period now having terminated, can we get these lights here off.

MR. SPEAKER: I would certainly appreciate it. Address for Papers. The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. ENNS: In the absence of the Honourable Member for River Heights, and I'm not quite sure whether or not I'm in order, but if I may I'll ask for it. Can we read the address then? I'm seeking advice, Mr. Speaker. -- (Interjection) -- We'll ask for it to stand in that case.

MR. SPEAKER: (Agreed) Second readings.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, there's another Address for Papers.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, I called for both.

MR. ENNS: We'll ask for both of them to stand, Mr. Speaker, if that's agreeable to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: No, the first Address for Papers that I called was for the first and then it was for the second.

GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 25.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the sponsor of this resolution the Honourable the First Minister, may I have the indulgence of the House to have this stand?

MR. SPEAKER: (Agreed.) Bill No. 18.

MR. CHERNIACK presented Bill No. 18, an Act to amend The Motive Fuel Tax Act, for second reading.

MR. CHERNIACK: May I indicate, Mr. Speaker, that if accepted this will be the type of Bill that would be dealt with in Committee of the Whole.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I explained to honourable members that this Bill is in identical form as Bill No. 60 which was presented by the previous government at the previous Session of the Legislature and which was aborted by the abrupt calling of the election. The intent of the Bill was to recognize that there was a different BTU content - I think would be the word - between propane and other motive fuels, and it was felt that there was an unfair imposition of taxation for propane because of the lesser effectiveness of propane. As a result, the import of this Bill, the principle involved, is to reduce the tax from 20 cents to 17 cents a

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) gallon on propane gas.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River, that debate on this matter be adjourned.

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

MR. CHERNIACK presented Bill No. 19, an Act to amend The Gasoline Tax Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, this Bill, like the last one and like many others that will be appearing at this Session, is in identical form with the Bill which had been presented by the former government (Bill 59) in the previous Session, which Bill was not dealt with in its entirety because of the abrupt conclusion of the Session. It is in the exact form as that which was presented as I say at the last Session, and deals with the exemption from taxation of international aircraft making technical stops for refueling purposes only and not for traffic purposes.

I might indicate that I've been given to understand that the previous government had made a commitment to certain international airlines that this would be done, and as a result, this firm to whom the commitment had been made did make the decision to stop at the Winnipeg International Airport for refueling. In order to honour that commitment we are proposing this Bill so that in the event that we have any review of our taxation policy and any change, the firm which acted on the undertaking of the previous government will be given ample notice of any intention of that change, and for that reason I propose the Bill at this time.

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

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Roblin, that debate on this matter be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by the honourable member . . .

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, before we pass the motion, if the honourable member has no objections I would be prepared to speak at this time very briefly on the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: (Agreed.) The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'm very interested in what the Provincial Treasurer had to say in this regard, that this had been a commitment made by the previous government. I do not believe that the House had been advised of any such commitment having been made and I would like to know some details from the Ministers to exactly to whom this commitment was made; when the commitment was made; and how much is involved financially insofar as the Province of Manitoba is concerned. Basically, I think that the approach may have some sense from a business standpoint in Manitoba. I assume that the province will derive no benefit at all now from the sale of gasoline to this one particular carrier. Does this apply to other carriers as well; and was a commitment made to others? Now if there is no benefit at all from a provincial standpoint, could the Minister indicate then exactly what the benefit will be to the sellers of the fuel? I presume that this is the advantage to obtain some sales in the Province of Manitoba. Are there any other taxes collected? I know that there is a charge at the airport but this is a federal one. Does the province itself stand to gain anything from this decision or is it one that is purely to increase the amount of traffic?

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

MR. PAULLEY presented Bill No. 14, an Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act, for second reading, and that it be referred to the Committee on Industrial Relations.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may, by way of introduction to second reading of this Bill, indicate that hereto was another Bill that had been prepared for introduction prior to the dissolving of the House last May. The Bill which is now before the House is basically the same but there have been one or two changes, mainly dealing with the question of administration.

The basic purpose of the Bill deals with two aspects, one which would increase the dollar amounts of major benefits to injured workmen and their dependents, and those aimed at improving the administrative aspects of Workmen's Compensation in Manitoba. These are therefore important changes which will improve compensation from both the viewpoint of the employees and the employers. The amendments will increase certain pensions to widows of

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) those who have been unfortunately fatally injured in employment in respect of the widows from \$100.00 to \$120.00. This increased pension will apply to persons affected by past accidents and to those affected by accidents in the future. At the present time there are approximately 500 such persons who are receiving this pension.

I might say for the information of members of the House that the anticipated cost of this change will amount to some one million one - \$170,000 for past cases and approximately \$66,000 in respect of future cases. With this change, we in Manitoba, insofar as compensation to widows, will still be behind British Columbia and Ontario but ahead of the other provinces in the Dominion.

The Bill also will provide increased amounts of pensions for dependent children and extend the principle of a graduated benefit according to age. At the present, for children under 16 years of age, pensions are paid amounting to \$35.00 monthly if one parent is living, and \$45.00 if no parent is living, and those over 16 and attending school may be paid at present up to a maximum of \$50.00 monthly. These, Mr. Speaker, will be changed as follows: Pensions for children of less than 10 years will be increased from \$35.00 to \$45.00 in respect of where there is a surviving parent, and \$55.00 where there is no surviving parent. Pensions for children between 10 and 16 years of age will increase from \$35.00 to \$50.00, or \$60.00 if they are orphan children. Pensions for children over 16 at school will be increased from the present maximum of \$50.00 to \$60.00 or \$70.00 maximum, again depending on whether or not the child concerned has one or more surviving parent.

There will also be an increase in the amount of money payable to a widow on the decease of her husband or vice versa, as the case may be, from the figure of \$300.00 to \$500.00, and this of course, as members I am sure will understand, will increase the financial help at a critical time to about 30 or 40 persons each year whose breadwinner unfortunately is killed in industry and will cost approximately \$6,000 to \$8,000 annually. By this change Manitoba becomes on a par with Ontario and Quebec and again ahead of the other provinces of the Dominion of Canada.

Another part of the bill increases the minimum compensation for temporarily total disabled workers from \$25.00 to \$35.00 weekly. This change again puts Manitoba generally on a par with other provinces, behind only Ontario and Saskatchewan, whose amounts are \$40.00 and \$36.00 respectively, and ahead of New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland.

There are other changes within the bill, Mr. Speaker, dealing with administrative changes. There is a provision at the present time in the bill of the payment of interest at 3 percent. Well I only wish we could get loans amortized at 3 percent but the change is made in the bill to make it more realistic so that the amortization will be at the amounts having to be paid at the present time. I might say incidentally, too, that the minimum income on the basis of compensation for volunteer firemen will be increased from \$25.00 to \$35.00 a week.

There is also a change administratively, Mr. Speaker, within the bill which will empower the Board to make agreements with compensation authorities in other Canadian jurisdictions to facilitate the handling of claims between the provinces and to avoid the possibility of double assessments being made against employers in different administrations.

A few other minor changes are contained within the Bill, Mr. Speaker, that I would be glad to explain in answer to questions. It would be my intention to have the chairman of the Compensation Board and the officials of the Board present at the Industrial Relations Committee when this matter goes to second reading, as I am sure it will. I am sure that members of the House generally will accept the principles involved in this bill, and I want to announce at this time, if I may, dealing with the whole question of Workmen's Compensation, that it is the intention of the government to have a reassessment made without undue delay of all aspects of compensation in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, many will recall that the last time that there was a review of the compensation of active Manitoba was about ten years ago when Mr. Justice Turgeon had a thorough investigation into all aspects of Workmen's Compensation. It is true that piecemeal approaches have been made in the interim - some benefits have been increased; but basically the Act remains the same as it was ten years ago, but there has been a material change in working conditions and the operation of industry. Particularly, Mr. Speaker, have there been changes in the field of safety in industry, and we have, as a result of an agreement between the federal authorities and the Province of Manitoba, undertaken through our

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) Compensation Board certain aspects of safety inspection and safety control so far as our Compensation Board here in Manitoba being responsible for investigations respecting safety in federal fields as well as our own. I might say that the cost of this will be borne by and large, or totally, by the federal authority, and I think this augurs well for the citizens and the workers of the Province of Manitoba.

I want to assure the members of the House that any investigation that will take place will take place in concert with employers, with labour representatives and others concerned, but I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that members will agree with me of change over the last ten years that it is time for a reassessment. There is one area particularly that is of grave concern at the present time to recipients of pensions for Workmen's Compensation, and these are those that are on partial disability pensions, which were set in many cases when wages were considerably lower than they are at the present time. This whole area has to be reviewed in the light of cost of living today and wage rates of today. It seems, to many, intolerable that some people, for instance, Mr. Speaker, who may have lost an eye ten or twelve years ago, under the terms now prevailing receive only a pension of \$30.00 or \$40.00 per month. While I am not proposing at this particular time adjustments in those pensions, I recommend to the House the changes that are now before you. As I indicated at the offset of my remarks, changes generally were those forwarded by the previous administration with slight changes.

It is my hope, my hope, Mr. Speaker, that this bill will be given the consent of the House without undue delay so that the increased benefits will be able to be paid to those concerned commencing on October 1st of this year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just before the question is put, I would like to make a comment or two on the proposed legislation. I would like to say that, speaking for myself, Sir, and for members in this party on this side of the House, we endorse most enthusiastically the humane and charitable aspects of the legislation, the humane and humanitarian aspects of the legislation, and also the mechanical improvements proposed under those sections of the legislation dealing with administration of the Act and with the function of officials of the Workmen's Compensation Board, with the principle involved, where the cost to the public treasury, the public purse, is kept in mind; where streamlined methods of procedure and executive decision are improved and expanded upon. In particular we are in favour, Sir, of the humane aspects of the legislation, as I have said, and I would like to put my enthusiastic endorsement of those aspects of the legislation on the record at this time.

No one on this side of the House has any quarrel with the improvements proposed, either for dependents who are covered by the legislation as it is currently drafted, or for the purport of the legislation as outlined by the Honourable Minister. The question is, Mr. Speaker: is the legislation humane enough? And I think this is the aspect of the proposal and of the debate to which members of this Chamber must address themselves. I have had correspondence and communication with, as I am sure the Honourable Minister has, and no doubt most if not all members of this Chamber, many people who depend for their livelihood and the livelihoods of members of their families to a very large extent on the pension payments which are made available to them under the Workmen's Compensation legislation. The Minister has indeed pointed out that there are vast areas in terms of social justice that are neither covered by the existing legislation or covered by that which has been introduced by him and his government at this stage in this session, but I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it would be in the interest of the quality of life in Manitoba, which is a concept to which all parties in this House subscribe and with which all of us are concerned, I submit it would be in the interests of that life, Sir, if we did with all haste and as soon as practical, consider these areas of omission and oversight in the field of compensation, in the field of workmen's benefits and payments, because there are a good many people who are dependent to a considerable degree, as I have said, on such pensions and who are finding it extremely difficult to cope with the rigors of raising small families at this time.

I think in particular of those people who are on widows' pensions, which have seen some upward revision in recent years but which have not come into the category which benefitted from retroactive legislation. I was in communication not long ago with a widow who had three small children to raise, three small boys, and who has done an eminent job of raising them, who has been widowed since 1939, who has been receiving a pension under the Act for all those years, and lo those many years, Mr. Speaker, but has never benefitted from any

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.) upward revision of the pension granted to persons like her in that particular category.

I stand to be corrected by the Minister if I am in error in this assessment of the legislation, but it's my understanding, Sir, that in the area of widows' pensions, the various measures revising the pension upward have not been retroactive to any great degree, and in fact they may never -- I haven't studied the legislation fully as yet, I haven't had time to do so, but it's legislation in which I am interested and I hope to study at the Minister's feet in this particular field, and it's my understanding, Sir, that that legislation has never provided for improvement in a retroactive way. As a consequence, you have persons in Manitoba, like the widow to whom I refer, who since 1939 has had to cope with the rigors and the struggles and the expense of raising a family of small children, albeit they are in a position now, at an age now where they can help her somewhat but who nonetheless has had those three decades of providing for their livelihood and hers on a pension which, though barely reasonable and gratuitous and helpful at the time, certainly now under the economic changes that have occurred and under the pressures of the astronomical rises in the cost of living in the last three decades, a pension now that is next to worthless in terms of coping with her living costs.

So I would at this juncture, in consideration of the legislation, Sir, simply like to make a case for those Manitobans in that category. I concede that the Minister referred to them, at least obliquely, in his presentation when he said there were vast areas which are still not touched by the proposed new legislation and which require attention and action, and I would like to make my own specific reference to those areas and to the particular category which I have mentioned in the last few minutes, and endorse the Minister's sentiments that there is a vast field there, Sir, which requires attention soon - not late but soon. The time is long since past when people in that category deserved considerably more help than they are getting. So while we subscribe to the humanitarian aspects of the legislation and to the democratic and charitable philosophy implicit in the legislation, to the fairness of the legislation and to the mechanical improvements proposed in the administration of the Act and the efficient functioning of the board and all its parts, we submit at this juncture, Sir, that the legislation does not go anywhere near far enough, and that although in many of its aspects it is in relative terms humane, it is not sufficiently humane and we invite the Minister to act as expeditiously as possible in improving the legislation to make life more palatable, more comfortable and indeed more fair for Manitobans of the type to which I have referred in my remarks up to this point, Sir. With that I would reiterate that I subscribe in full, as I am sure all members of my party do, to the principle of the legislation, to the aim and purport of it, but we will be at the Minister's door in the weeks and months ahead urging him to move much further in this field than the present legislation suggests he is prepared to do at this time. Thank you, Sir.

MR. PAULLEY: I thank my honourable friend and I'm not trying to close the debate but I would like to ask my honourable friend for clarification of his reference to retroactive features of the bill. Is your question, does this bill and the increases of the bill apply to widows who have been made widows in the past, the increases, or do you mean by retroactive payment to give back the difference between their pensions previously and those contemplated by the bill?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, no. I don't think it would be practical to . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Then may I assure my honourable friend that widows previous to the enactment of this will receive the benefits contained within the bill.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, with that assurance I'm satisfied with the legislation up to this point. I don't think it would be practical to try to pick up, try to fill in the gap that has existed in terms of payments for persons who've been on these pensions for the last 20 years. I think that would be totally impractical from the point of view of the public treasury and I don't think anybody in that category would expect that to be reasonable, Sir. But what I'm referring to is the person, the widow or the dependent child, for example, who for the past any number of years - it could be up to 16 in the case of a child, it could be up to 30 or 40 in the case of a widow - who has been on a fixed pension that was set under the terms of the legislation at that time and pegged to the cost of living of that day and has never received the upward revision that would make it of any value to them in the 1960's, and all I'm asking is that where that widow, for example, was receiving a pension of \$40.00 a month in 1944 - to take a hypothetical case, and it is a hypothetical case; I'm not citing from specific correspondence - that she now, even though she's only got \$40.00 all these years, she's not asking and

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) I'm not asking that you make up the difference, but give her the \$120.00 now. Don't leave her at the \$40.00.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I rise to thank the Honourable Minister for explanation of the bill and also to advise the House that I do concur in many of the things and endorse the bill in principle. You may recall that during the last Session during the labour estimates I was one of the ones that recommended that the widows' allowances be increased from \$100.00 to \$125.00. That means that at that time I was much more liberal than the present New Democratic Government is, because their increase is only up from \$100.00 to \$120.00.

As well, I certainly appreciate the increases to the dependents and the children. It may not be very much but if you take an overall assessment it is 20 percent. So I say this is encouraging and it's in the right direction, but as was mentioned, it still is far behind Ontario and British Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat disappointed and maybe critical of the Minister and the government because I know the bill has some other features to the one that we had introduced before but I would have liked to see the government as well have increased the ceiling for the Workmen's Compensation which the compensation is based on. At the present time it's \$6,600 and I'm sure the Minister could have just as easily at this time increased the ceiling to \$7,000, because you have to appreciate, Mr. Speaker, you don't get the full benefit of your salary. When you are on compensation you're only entitled to 75 percent of your total salary. So when a worker is receiving \$600.00, and when he's totally disabled, he's not receiving \$600.00 as such but he's receiving \$450.00.

When we look at widows' compensation and allowances or pension, when a worker is injured he's receiving - or that household is receiving 75 percent of his salary. If his salary is, let's assume \$600.00, now that household is receiving \$450.00 which is considerably more money than if this worker is killed and the widow is only left with \$100.00 pension on the present time, and with this bill which will be \$120.00. So I would agree with the Minister that it's probably time that we review all the compensation and pensions in respect to widows and children. But I certainly do appreciate the amendment and I think it's in the right direction.

The second point that I wish to make, a thing that the Minister should have also considered at this time as well, updating the pensions of all the workers because, as was mentioned by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, there has been a great increase in the cost of living and many of the people that are on pensions that were established 10 or 15 years ago certainly cannot live on that pension today because of the cost of living. So that's the other most important area that I would like to see the Minister consider.

My third point, Mr. Speaker, is that probably of all the legislation that we have in respect to labour in this province, I find that I get more complaints in respect to Workmen's Compensation than any other, and many of these are probably appeals against the decisions of the Board and so on. And I would like to say, or just make a recommendation to the Honourable Minister to see what he thinks of it, I think if he would appoint or would have the Attorney-General appoint an independent advisor for workers in case they do have complaints against decisions of the board and they wish to appeal, it would be, I think, to their advantage to go to somebody and have assistance within the Department of Labour. If it's an independent advisor he could be of help in making their appeal to the board, because at the present time they have to seek legal advice and this is costly, and in many instances people are, the workers are just not prepared to do that. So I think this would be most advisable and I think it would be as well in the right direction and I believe there is some sort of legislation in that respect in the Province of Ontario.

So these are the few points I wish to make. I also appreciated the remarks of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry. I hope he was speaking for the Conservative Party and not himself individually because it certainly is a different tune than we've been hearing here for quite a few years. Because I know the former Minister of Labour used to tell us that conditions are great and the wages are high and increasing quite considerably every year. But this is not so because I feel that we had a long way to catch up, and I hope that the Honourable Member for Fort Garry will continue to speak in that vein for the Conservative Party. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak, possibly I could just say

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) a few words in closing the debate. I don't want to preclude anybody from taking part in this debate. It is of great interest.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member from Charleswood wish to speak?

MR. MOUG: Right, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Vital, that we adjourn the debate.

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

MR. MACKLING presented Bill No. 3, an Act to amend The Regulations Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, for your edification most of you are aware of the fact that the laws of the Province of Manitoba are printed and the annual statutes are provided to the public annually. If you have had the occasion you will find that the last time that the statutes of Manitoba were revised and consolidated was in 1954. Since that time, there has been a continual build-up of the annual statutes to this date. Presently this government has under continuous consideration the revision of the statutes, which was commenced under the previous government. Included is the concern for consolidation and revision of the regulations pertaining to the statutes. The bill that is introduced before you this afternoon is exactly the same, word for word, as the bill that was introduced by the previous administration and aborted at the last Session of the Legislature. This Act, an Act to amend The Regulations Act, essentially provides for the regulations what is now in being and in the work in respect to the statutes of the province of Manitoba.

For any of you who, not being a lawyer, has considered the effect of a statute you'll find that if you're concerned about the effect of a particular statute you must go back through each one of the annuals to ensure that you have interpreted the statute in its amended form, and if you think that the statutes of the province of Manitoba at the present time present to many a delightful maze, the regulations are much more so. What this Act will do is will permit the revision and consolidation of the regulations in keeping with the same procedure which is now well in the way in respect of the statutes. And I might say that this Act will permit the Standing Committee to deal with the revision of the regulations, perhaps hopefully, immediately that this same Standing Committee completes consideration of the revisions of the revised statutes. It is hoped that that Committee will be appointed during the course of this Session, will sit if possible during this Session, and complete the revision of the statutes. It's hoped that the revision of the regulations will proceed immediately thereafter, and they will be revised from time to time during the course of the amendments to the regulations.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Birtle-Russell, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. MACKLING presented Bill No. 4, The Intoxicated Persons Detention Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, this Act, as presented to this House as Bill No. 4, is in the exact language of Bill 21, a bill which was introduced into this House by the previous administration. It provides in essence for the release of persons who are found to be intoxicated into the custody of an adult person who will be responsible for them or the release of those persons who are found to be intoxicated after detention in public custody until such time as they have reached a stage of sobriety where they can remove themselves without any reasonable degree of speculation as to the certainty of their actions thereafter. By this, in essence, Mr. Speaker, the over-indulgence of alcoholic beverage would no longer be a criminal offence. The over-indulgence of alcohol is considered by many to be a very improper act and it is deemed that those who have over-indulged ought to be removed from where they are until they are in a reasonable state of sobriety. This Act would permit that.

I might say that this Act which is considered to be enlightened legislation, is presently - this form of legislation is presently in being in the province of British Columbia, and also in the province of Saskatchewan. It was introduced in those provinces in a gradual manner and it is intended that this legislation would be introduced in this province in the same manner. It provides for the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council designating an area or areas from time to time for the implementation of this Act. In short, it will be introduced in a pragmatic way to determine the worth and validity of the legislation. As it appears in the other provinces the legislation has worked exceedingly well.

(MR. MACKLING cont'd)

In the past year for example 30,000 days were spent in jail by persons who were found to be intoxicated. There will be a considerable saving, not only to the government and society but it will mean that the stigma of a criminal offence will be removed from those who are unfortunate enough to be persuaded from time to time by their friends to take just another drink.

It's hoped that in due course there will be a further extension of public concern in respect to the detoxification of alcoholics, but this step would naturally follow as a corollary to the initial implementation of this act on a very pragmatic basis.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the principle of the act is abundantly clear. I will be happy to answer questions on an informal basis if there are questions that the honourable members wish to put. Otherwise, I think the principle of the bill is clearly before you.

MR. SPEAKER put the question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to oppose the bill; on the contrary I support the general principle of the bill because it seemed to me for some years that making it compulsory for someone who is taken by the police as a result of having had too much to drink and making it an offence does not achieve the results that we really want. It has turned out to be a very costly operation I think without any great results.

I am concerned, however, at the approach of the Minister - which I must admit I think was the same approach of the previous government - that this will only be applied to certain parts of the province at the discretion of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. Would it not be more advisable to make it available to those jurisdictions who want to make use of it? In other words, if a municipality wishes to make use of the Act simply make it voluntary; apply the Act to the whole of the province and let those who want to make use of it make use of it, those who don't don't need to. I recognize that there's a particular problem in northern Manitoba for example where there may not be facilities available when someone is taken into custody, and the result is great inconvenience to the individual concerned as well as substantial cost to the province. But rather than approach it simply on the government making a decision that such an area will qualify, leave it on a voluntary basis and let those who want to make use of this provision do so.

Now I wonder if the Minister has made any checks here with the various police forces as to their reaction to this type of approach. I understand that there are some areas where the police are very concerned that this may end up by being a very difficult problem for them to handle and that if there is not the deterrent of a charge that they might end up by becoming a hostel for drunks, and that they neither have the facilities nor the manpower to handle the situation. I don't know if this is a sound objection but I believe that the people who have been involved in it, the police forces, would be in a position to give some good advice as to the possible problems that would arise. Again, if it were available to those who want it on a voluntary basis this might solve the problem for those areas where it might be considered to be of major importance. I suspect that here in the City of Winnipeg, for example, the police force might want to handle it, or the municipality might want to handle it in a different way, and rather than the province making the decision, why not simply let the City of Winnipeg make the decision if they want to make use of this Act or not.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, in rising at this time, I would like to say that I also am in agreement with the general principles of this Bill. I also find myself in much agreement with what the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose has stated, but I think that there's one field that I am very concerned about today and this is the field of intoxication, not by alcohol but by drugs as well. I think that we find that there's a far greater rate of increase of drug intoxication today than there is in alcohol, and the Minister in his statement referred only to alcoholic beverages. Now I have seen in my life many cases of intoxication. In some cases it's quite obvious that it's alcoholic intoxication. I have not had too much experience with drug intoxication. Some doctors tell me that the symptoms are rather similar in some ways and yet in others they are different, but it does concern me that there is this whole field of drug intoxication still being left without being considered.

Now this problem was mentioned when this Bill came up last spring. There was concern expressed about it then and nothing has been done since that time to make any change to cover that particular subject. When there was such a concern expressed at that time I think that perhaps it would be in the interests of all people that this matter be taken into consideration,

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd) and I would urge that very serious consideration be taken in the committee stage to this problem of drug addiction.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the question of designated areas disturbs me. I very much like the suggestion of the Member for Ste. Rose when he suggests that it be at the request of the various municipal bodies rather than the designation of the Lieutenant-Governor. I think it's quite important that as much freedom be left in the field of local administration as possible, and especially in the field of criminal detention. I think the problem is far better known at the local level than it is at the central level.

With these few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to contribute my share to this debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MCKENZIE: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Swan River, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 16. The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW presented Bill No. 16, an Act respecting the Keystone Centre, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the Bill is exactly the same as it was when it was presented to the House during the last session at the last Legislature. It simply provides -- perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I should go back somewhat to illustrate the history of the events in Brandon with respect to this matter.

In 1907 there was established a Winter Fair and Livestock Association in Brandon for the purpose of owning property and facilities to encourage livestock breeding, shows and exhibitions. In 1946 the name was changed to the Brandon Winter Fair and Livestock Association. In 1947 this was transferred to the City of Brandon. Brandon then became responsible to assure that facilities would be provided for that particular purpose. At this point the City of Brandon want to be relieved of those responsibilities, as perhaps most of you are aware and indeed the former government is aware, that there is a move under way to establish new facilities in Brandon known as the Keystone Centre, and that all Brandon wants to do is to be relieved of its role and to be allowed the privilege of selling or disposing of property and setting aside the funds from this sale of property towards the new Keystone Centre; and also, that this new centre be held by one corporation to provide facilities for the Winter Fair and the Provincial Exhibition of Manitoba.

That's pretty well the gist of it, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure that honourable members opposite are fully aware of it. There are no changes from the previous Bill and I don't see any problems.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to make a few short comments on the Bill that's presented by the Honourable Minister, and first I'd like to thank him for presenting this Bill again to the House for consideration. It is a commitment that I personally as Minister of Agriculture during my first term of office made to the people of Brandon that this legislation would go forward, and I again want to thank the Honourable Minister for re-entering this Bill into the House.

For many years, Mr. Speaker, the two organizations out of Brandon have discussed the possibility of amalgamating into one official centre, and with the disposal of the old building which I believe will shortly be condemned, taking the money from that source, and with additional monies from other sources that I want to just mention briefly, to construct a new service and recreational centre in Brandon to serve not only the City of Brandon but agricultural areas of the whole western part of the province.

I recall, Mr. Speaker, that at the time that we discussed this Bill going into the House that I did give assurance to the people of Brandon and to the organizations involved out there that once the proper legislation had gone through and they were in a position to move forward, that there would be financial support coming from the provincial government and that we would be discussing assistance from the federal government. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I did meet with that group in Brandon at one time with the Minister of Agriculture from Ottawa, the Honourable Mr. Olson. At that time -- I think that I should for the information of the House say that Mr. Olson did indicate at that time that it would be given top priority insofar as the Federal Government was concerned and so far as financial assistance was concerned, I made no commitment

(MR. WATT cont'd.) insofar as the amount that the Government of Manitoba might contribute until I had some reasonable assurance of the monies that might be forthcoming from the Federal Government, and I believe that they have a responsibility in this area.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I was very interested to note from people out in the southwest part of the province that a commitment had been made by the then opposition party, the NDP, insofar as financial assistance was concerned, and I believe to the extent of probably not less than a million and a half dollars. I was quite happy to learn that the NDP Party would be in a position, if they formed the government, to expend at least that much money towards the centre at Brandon, and I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that we can depend on the government of the day to live up to the commitments that they made out at Brandon and the people in the southwest area will be very happy to note this additional monies that will be forthcoming from the provincial government. Thank you very much.

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

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, I rise in complete support of the Bill and congratulate the Minister of Agriculture for bringing it forward so promptly, and also support completely the remarks of the Honourable Member from Arthur. What these two gentlemen have said in effect and in brief is that Brandon has a wonderful showcase for agriculture in Manitoba in the summer and winter fair and they wish to assist Brandon to improve this showcase by making a new facility available, one which is urgently needed. This is the first step in this improvement of the facilities and we heartily support this and approve of their efforts. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. EVANS: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I don't believe there's any use in me taking up too much time in repeating some of the very excellent and I would say accurate remarks that have been made in the House by members on the other side and also by the Minister of Agriculture respecting the very worthwhile nature of the Bill that we are now considering today. I don't think it's a matter for any controversy. In a sense it's a very technical Bill arising out of the fact that the Province of Manitoba I believe undertook to aid Brandon back in 1947 by taking over the debt of the Brandon Arena, and this Bill before us allows the City of Brandon to go ahead and to sell that arena.

As has also been explained, the funds will be set aside and will be put to a very worthwhile purpose; namely, a new home for the Manitoba Winter Fair, sometimes known as the Keystone Centre, as well as providing other facilities which will aid the cause of agriculture in southwestern Manitoba, and I'm sure all members of the House who value agriculture at all, and particularly members of the House from southwestern Manitoba, will realize the value of this particular Centre. I might also add, however, that I understand that the sale of the Brandon Arena as it's usually called will enable the city to provide space for a new shopping centre, a new shopping complex to go ahead, and this too will create many more jobs in the area and I am sure that all members of the House will give their full support to this Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I just wish basically to only ask a question of the Minister, and still I have to agree with the previous speaker that certainly there's no question of this being a controversial Bill, especially since Brandon over the years has been a showcase as mentioned by the member. I'm just wondering, is this going to create some problems as far as your shopping nights are concerned? As far as that part is concerned, I'm sure the City of Brandon, the people of Brandon will be able to look after that part. I was wondering, Mr. Speaker, if the amount mentioned by the member for Arthur - I think he mentioned a million and a half - is this the figure involved as far as the provincial government is concerned?

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker,

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

MR. USKIW: I'm not sure that I could accept all the remarks that were made by the members of the Opposition, in particular as it relates to a financial commitment in the sum of a million and a half dollars. My understanding of the commitment of this government is that there was representation made to members of this government during the campaign asking for a commitment, and that our position is that if there was a commitment from the previous

August 21, 1969

(MR. USKIW cont'd.) administration that we would honour that commitment, although the figure in itself was not pinned down. Secondly, we are still waiting to hear from the Federal Government as to what their commitment may be. We have not been able to get any confirmation from Ottawa as to the extent of their financial support. So with that in mind, I hope this clears the question.

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

. Continued on next page.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 17. The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW presented Bill No. 17, an Act to amend The Natural Products Marketing Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, this again is another one of those bills that was left on the Order Paper on that very important day when the House was dissolved. There aren't many changes, in fact there is only one change in the Bill which I think all of you will concur in, and I will deal with that as I go along in the explanation of the Bill.

The first item, if I may, 1(e) changes --it's repealed and substituted. Products packed and stored on producer's premises is not regulated product under the Act.

Section 3 is repealed. Purpose of the Act defined by provisions contained therein, so therefore there is no need for that particular section.

Section 17 (b) is also repealed, covered under Section 18.

Section 18 provides for a flexibility to set prices within range of minimum and maximum prices. As we had things under the old Bill, under the old Act, it was impossible to allow any Board or Commission to have some flexibility in pricing on a day-to-day basis, and this will make that particular thing possible within the scope of the minimum and maximum prices as approved by the Marketing Board. Section 18 (2) is a new clause. It gives the Manitoba Marketing Board authority to revoke an order of a commission or a board, providing of course in their opinion it's in the public interest.

Section 26 (b) is repealed for the same reason as Section 17 (d) under the marketing board concept. This applies to Marketing Commission but it's the same type of change.

Section 27 (1) is repealed and substituted. It's the same changes as in Section 17 and 18 but relating to Marketing Commissions as opposed to Marketing Boards re pricing flexibility. Section 27 (2) is the same as 18 (2) applying to commissions.

Section 32 (a) strikes out the words "producer thereof". The significance of that change of course is that it provides that this Act may apply insofar as the enforcement is concerned upon any one, mainly the wholesalers or what have you. It doesn't only apply to producers in other words. Section 32 (b) allows for Boards or Commissions to set aside reserves under the previous Act. Under the Act as it is, there is no provision set aside for reserves and we find that Boards and Commissions from time to time, because of changes and fluctuations in the volume of production going through their facilities, they find themselves in an awkward financial position and this will simply allow them to set aside a certain reserve to provide for the ups and downs in the business. The only change made in that particular section from the previous Bill is the words added: "as may be approved by the Manitoba Marketing Board". It was my opinion that any reserves that would be set aside by any Board or Commission should have the approval of the Manitoba Marketing Board, so that we have a great deal more responsibility in the setting aside of reserves.

Section 34 clause (b) subsection (2) permits an inspector to order a driver of a vehicle having regulated product to unload or detain at a specified place. In other words, it goes beyond the Act as it is in that under the Act as it is there is only provision for inspection but not the detention. Clause (e) broadens the powers of the inspection by allowing seizure of product. This is found to be necessary as a means to deter violations of any of the Board regulations. Section 34 subsection (3) raises the fine from \$10.00 to \$100.00 for anyone obstructing the inspector or giving false information.

Sections 35 (a) and 35 (b) are added sections. Seizure - this again applies to the question of seizure of product. Again it's a matter of placing additional deterrent under the Act. The opinion of apparently the previous administration, and I would concur, that it probably will be more effective than a dollar fine.

Section 37 is repealed and substituted. It strengthens the basis for prosecution as it will be assumed that product being moved by producer, and feed is a product of that producer unless proven otherwise. In other words, there has to some form of identification to the product in transit or otherwise.

Section 41 (a) is a new section. It's an extension of power from the Federal Government. In other words, a waiver of federal jurisdiction in favour of the provinces. This has been done in the past but we have never had it in the provincial Act.

The commencement of the Act is when it receives Royal Assent, subject to clause (b) of Section 7 and Section 11 being retroactive to April 16th, 1964, and the explanation of that is that there were measures taken by various Boards and Commissions that probably were contrary

(MR. USKIW cont'd.) to the previous Act and this would make them valid.

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

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I just want to say again a few words on this particular Bill. Again I want to thank the Honourable the Minister for re-introducing this Bill into the House, with a slight change in it, in fact a change I really had intended to amend myself had it gone forward or if I had been putting the Bill through. I think the Minister has explained basically the reasons for the changes in the National Products Marketing Act, and I just want to point out, Mr. Speaker, where I as Minister, before I left my office had made a commitment, particularly to the Vegetable Marketing Commission, that such legislation would go through and again I thank the Minister for presenting this legislation to the House.

I think the immediate problem and the reason for the changes, Mr. Speaker, of course lie particularly at the moment with the Manitoba Vegetable Marketing Commission where we were in some trouble insofar as the marketing of potatoes were concerned. This legislation will provide I think for the marketing of potatoes through that Vegetable Marketing Commission and I believe will be in the best interest of most of the potato growers in the Province of Manitoba. But I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I think that this legislation must also be accompanied by a commitment by the government of the day that there should be promotion of liaison between producers and the processors and the distributors in this province. I don't think that the legislation is intended here or should be used strictly as an enforcement upon the producers and put the producers in a position where they can tie up processing and the marketing of our products in the Province of Manitoba. And I think this is quite possible, Mr. Speaker, that there can be better liaison and a better understanding created between the whole agricultural community in this province.

I want to point out a particular example last spring, Mr. Speaker, when I as Minister of Agriculture found the potato growers with a very severe problem insofar as the marketing of low grade potatoes were concerned, and at that time I asked the representation from the producers and from the distributors and the wholesalers right down the line to meet in my office, and I again want to thank the response to that request and the results actually that did take place insofar as moving large quantities of potatoes that seemed at that time to be not marketable. I think it's just an example, Mr. Speaker, of what can be done to close what I believe is the division between our agricultural producers and the processing and distributing people of this province. I think our answers to our farm and agricultural problems lie in better understanding and promotion of better liaison between all segments of the agricultural community of this province.

With these few remarks again I thank the Minister for bringing this Bill before the legislature. Thank you.

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

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I rise just for a few comments. I had some occasion to be involved with the orderly marketing of vegetables in this province some few short years ago. I underline and understand the minister's need, as was the former minister's need, to put more teeth into the Act and this of course is what is being done here, to enable the enforcement of the provisions of the marketing legislation to be in fact carried out more effectively. I wish the Minister all the luck in this sometimes controversial area. I did think that when I saw the notice on the Order Paper that amendments would be brought forward to the Natural Products Marketing Act that I was of course aware of the amendments that we had proposed, but I thought that you as a new government would have taken the occasion to read back some of your comments and speeches during my particular time with this matter and re-introduce some of the controls that I relaxed on five or six vegetables for instance. It would seem to me, and I think you would agree with me, that is the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, that it was deemed to be a mistake at that time to place the six root crop vegetables on a voluntary list, that is take them off the compulsory list of marketing, and I had just in the back of my mind that perhaps you would have taken advantage at this time to reimpose them insofar as it was your suggestion that a grievous mistake was being made. However, the principles involved, the tightening up particularly of that section that expands the responsibility, that is that it does lie solely on the producer, is a good one and we certainly support on this side.

I make one final comment. I am not quite aware of the need for the section dealing with reserves. To my knowledge, the build-up of reserves was quite possible under the old legislation, and I indicate to him the very successful reserve that was built up in the Hog Marketing Commission which indeed enabled them to finance to a large extent the very

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) wonderful facilities that they now own. If I am not mistaken the Hog Marketing Commission built up a reserve of some 70 or 80 thousand dollars in a few short years of their operation. So I just point out to him that is it was possible under the old legislation to build up that reserve, obviously there is some question as to the need for that. I think it was a matter of individual choice by the commission or marketing board as to whether or not they chose to refund the reserve as dividends to growers in each growing year or whether they in fact carried it out. At any rate, the Minister may wish to explain that further in his closing of the debate. It seems to me that in the Hog Marketing Commission this was available. At any rate, Mr. Speaker, I wish the Minister and the government well in the orderly marketing of vegetables in this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for La Verendrye.

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

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

MR. TOUPIN presented Bill No. 13, an Act to amend The Public Utilities Board Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I must say that this Bill was presented at the last session. I am led to believe that it is exactly the same as the Bill that was presented. Section 1 - The Public Utility Board and Municipal Board both date from 1959 when the Municipal and the Public Utility Board was split into two. As originally enacted in 1959, Section 4 of the Public Utility Board Act and Section 4 of the Municipal Board Act both read as follows: "The Board shall be composed of not less than 3 nor more than 5 members." In 1965, Section 4 of the Municipal Board Act was amended so as to remove this upper limit, and the object of the proposed amendment is to make a corresponding change in the Public Utility Board Act. The present members of the Public Utility Board are also the members of the Security Commission and it is contemplated that the amended section may be used to appoint a sixth member of the Board to take on the "hear and report" basis under Section 31 of the Act. Some of the routine applications regarding water rate applications from country points, and thus ease the demands on the time of existing members who are serving in two capacities.

Regarding Section 2, if a sixth member is appointed he would as the Act now stands be entitled to attend all sittings of the Board. This is not intended and the proposed subsection (15)(6) gives the chairman the power to allocate the work and specify which hearing and applications the various members shall undertake. Sections 3, 4 and 5 - the Board now has power, where it considers expedient in the public interest, to prohibit a company which operates a public utility from paying any dividends or otherwise distributing any of its assets to its shareholders, but although it thus has this power over total prohibition it has no power of partial prohibition by restricting dividends or other distributions. I say that such a power is desirable. For instance, the Board may allow a public utility to charge rates which enable it to build up a reserve for future expenses. If the Board does this, it should be able to insure that the reserve is not subsequently dissipated by being paid out in dividends. At present it is doubtful what sanctions could be invoked against either the company or its directors if a reserve were so dissipated. Again Sections 3 and 4 give the board this power of partial prohibition and Section 5 makes a consequential amendment entailed by Sections 3 and 4.

Regarding Section 6, this adds two new subsections, (2)(e) and (2)(f) to Section 82, making the directors of a company liable for a dividend or distribution of assets which contravenes either a total or partial prohibition. At present the only sanction behind prohibition is a fine of not more than \$500 under Section 104 which might not deter any company which was minded to disobey. These two subsections make the directors liable to replace the money and are modelled on the subsection (3) and (4) of Section 73 of the Companies Act, which relates to the liability of directors for paying a dividend out of capital. When there is only a partial prohibition in force, the breach might be solely in paying too big a dividend, so the proviso at the end of the subsection (2)(e) deals with such a case, as it would be unjust to require the directors to repay the whole dividends.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, we have no objection to the Bill. It does seem rather odd coming from that side of the House that we are going to start increasing the membership from 5 to 6. Of course quite a bit of time has elapsed since last May, and the way the Minister explained the situation possibly there is a need for this. However, I think we have been

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd.) warned often enough that let's keep these boards as small as possible.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Fort Garry.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 10. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I wish this matter to stand for today.

MR. SPEAKER: May the Honourable Minister have leave? (Agreed.) The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

MR. BOROWSKI presented Bill No. 15, The Transit Grants Act, for second reading, and that it be referred to Law Amendments Committee.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, did I hear someone wanting me to explain the Bill? In keeping with the express wishes of the First Minister to keep the Session as short as possible, I'm not going to waste a great deal of time because this is an old Bill. In fact, Mr. Speaker, had the previous administration not been guilty of abdicating their responsibility it wouldn't be necessary for me to stand up here and present this Bill. However -- (Interjection) -- well I really should thank them, because as a matter of fact I would be on the other side and not here had they not done this.

The Bill quite simply stated allows the government to increase a grant to (a) private; (b) public; and (c) jointly-owned transit system. I believe there's three transit systems in Manitoba - Winnipeg, Brandon and Flin Flon. I believe this is correct. What it amounts to is 5 percent tax subsidy based on gross operating revenue which amounts to \$513,000 for this year. The previous grant was \$264,800.00. Or to put it another way, it increases the grant from 3 percent to 5 percent.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. CLAYDON: Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House are in agreement with the general principles of this Bill. However, when the Bill reaches the committee stage we may wish to recommend some changes, because since the Bill was first introduced, in April I believe it was, conditions have changed, particularly with regard to the Metro Transit System in Winnipeg, and the Bill at the present time is identical word for word with the Bill that was introduced at that time. The proposed changes in the grant formula will mean that the grant for 1970 will increase from approximately \$300,000 to approximately \$500,000 and the intention of the previous administration was not to tamper with the rebate of the diesel fuel tax but to make a grant equal to or exceed the amount of the tax.

MR. CHERNIAK: You didn't pass the Act.

MR. CLAYDON: . . . you knew it. And the tax was paid a few days ago to the Metro Corporation based on the old formula. Apparently it is not based on this new formula. So for these reasons we may wish in the committee stage to see that this situation is taken care of in this year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I must say that when I listened to the Speech from the Throne, and on re-reading the specific comments in this regard which says "My Ministers inform me that legislation will be submitted for your approval to authorize an increase in subsidies payable to urban transit systems", that I anticipated my honourable friends were in fact going to increase the subsidies. What is really happening is that they are doing exactly what the previous government had in mind because the Bill is identical. -- (Interjection) -- Well yes, I admit it's an increase but it sounded in your Throne Speech as a great new program. It's a rehashed Tory program, that's what it boils down to. Now I'll have to admit that the Tory one was a long time in coming because the Bill was given to us on the 18th of April, it was deposited on our desks, and then we never heard a thing about it again.

MR. PAULLEY: You're hearing now.

MR. MOLGAT: Even though the Session ended well towards the end of May, well over a month went by, but it seems to me really that my honourable friends were taking a little bit advantage of the public of Manitoba when they were putting in as a great item in their Throne Speech an increase in transit subsidies when it is merely presenting to the House a Bill that was presented here once before, albeit not acted upon.

MR. PAULLEY: We'll accept that.

MR. MOLGAT: I had expected from my honourable friends that they were really serious about this section and that they were going to do something more than the Tories had been proposing.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

MR. BOROWSKI presented Bill No. 24, the Proceeds of Contracts Disbursement Act, 1969, for second reading, and that it be referred to Law Amendments Committee.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MEMBERS: Explain.

MR. BOROWSKI: It looks, Mr. Speaker, like they're going to make me work for my wages. This is another old Bill which should have been dealt with and this one here is really quite simple. I don't think there's any controversy right now. This is to take care of a situation where a contract has been completed and there is no question concerning the amount of money owing by the province or the contractor, he having discharged his obligations under the contract and the monies held back under the provisions of the law. We are aware and are made aware that conflicting claims in respect of money and procedure that was devised on previous occasions was in accordance with the principle which is set out in the Bill, that the money is paid to the trustee together with all information we have concerning the requests that have come in in respect of the amount of money, and there is then the procedure laid out whereby the trustees will proceed to pay out the money, taking into account the claims that are made, and of course this establishes the necessary procedure which must be followed in event of there being any dispute with regard to it. This gives notice to all persons who may have an interest in the money concerned. It serves the useful purpose so far as we're concerned as it gets the money out of our books and transfers the responsibility of adjudicating what may be conflicting claims with the trustee and with the assistance of the court when necessary. The rest of the information is in the Bill. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I can quite understand the extreme reluctance with which the Minister of Transportation presents these bills and his hesitation in getting up and explaining them. Having told us earlier today that he would rather be called a horse thief than a Conservative, I can understand his feelings at the moment when he's presenting two bills in a row which are Tory bills. Now I can just see how that would disturb my honourable friend with his background for independence in this House on previous occasions to find himself in that most unenviable position. I just want to say that I sympathize with him thoroughly, Mr. Speaker. He has my complete understanding. I regret that I must call upon him to explain them to the House. I recognize how painful it is for him to do so but it's one of these things that you know the victor after all has some obligations.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . not with the Bill.

MR. MOLGAT: The Bill itself, well I was in agreement with it when it had a temporary. . .

MR. PAULLEY: Well that's the main thing.

MR. MOLGAT: . . . presentation to the House here once before and I'm still in agreement with it.

MR. PAULLEY: That's why we brought it forward. We knew you'd agree with it.

MR. MOLGAT: I see. Well that's excellent. I might ask the Minister whether he has many more Tory bills to present to the House, and if he'd let me know which ones then I may be content by simply reading them, the past editions rather than insisting that he give us a further explanation and torturing him in this way.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, just briefly in reply to my honourable friend the Member for Ste. Rose, while this Bill was introduced by the Tories at the last Session it does indeed have some humanitarian aspects which sometimes is not that of Toryism, and as the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose indicated, he's not going to oppose it because of the humanitarian aspects, even though it was introduced back in the spring by the Tories, and I'm sure that he would agree that it was proper for my colleague the Member for Thompson and the Minister of Transportation to introduce it. I'm sure that my colleague from Churchill, the Minister of Transportation in this particular instance, would not worry too much about being a horse thief.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. CLAYDON: Mr. Speaker, we would have no objection to this Bill. It is identical except for the name of the William Construction Company having been added to it for two

(MR. CLAYDON cont'd.) projects. It's more a matter of routine than anything else and we would therefore have no objection to it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, would the Honourable Minister of Transportation permit a question?

MR. SPEAKER: the honourable member's question. The Honourable Minister will have an opportunity to close debate.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I'll reshape my position at this point. I won't ask a question but I would like to convey to the Honourable Minister of Transportation that I'm concerned at this point whether his attitude this afternoon reflects on his Party a wholesale discrimination towards the whole section of our community which is made up of horse thieves.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Youth and Education.

MR. MILLER presented Bill No. 20, an Act to amend The Public Schools Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is going to make it possible for Indians to vote for and to sit on school boards in areas of Manitoba, those areas of Manitoba where an Indian reservation is included in the school division. Now this is achieved by altering the qualification from resident ratepayer, which still exists or is required in rural Manitoba, changing it from resident ratepayer to resident elector. Also, there is the matter of the machinery for setting this up. It would be through a board of reference, who on dealing with the petition from a council of an Indian band would then decide whether a ward should be created or whether this should become part of an existing ward so that they could fit into the division in the new boundaries of the division and could qualify to either stand for election and sit if elected.

This also provides authority for a school board to pay expenses of school trustees elect to attend meetings and seminars - and I'm told that the Manitoba Association of School Trustees had already planned a seminar for newly elected trustees for late this fall, I believe it's November or early December, I'm not sure which - in order to acquaint trustees who are coming in for the first time, acquaint them with their jobs, the problems they may have to face, and generally to make known to them the work that they are going to have to deal with as trustees, and as the work of trustees becomes more and more complex I think this is certainly a step in the right direction.

So those basically are the amendments in this Act, or the changes in this Act. They're quite clear. If there are any questions perhaps I would hear from members on this.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 20 looks quite familiar and we've looked at it before as one of the bills that was before the House before, although I don't think this one was distributed before. Our Party has spent a good deal of time looking at this and is in favour of this Bill and was prepared to make the move at an earlier date, and I don't anticipate that there are any changes in the Bill from that time.

I'm sure the Honourable Member for Inkster would also like to make his contribution to this, although I think he'll find his position as well as mine well documented in last spring's Hansard. This pretty well gives our position. I think I said at the time that I thought it was an altruistic move to do this. I think it's a very necessary one. I think that it's not going to be without some local difficulties in the interim period in which it becomes accepted by the various local communities. However, it's a right move and I certainly would support this completely as far as the representation of the treaty Indians on school boards are concerned.

As far as the second part is concerned with the school board covering their incidental costs for seminars and so on, I think we've for some time now been aware of the necessity for school boards to involve themselves in more seminars pertaining to the responsibilities which they undertake when they become a school board member, and this will not be in any way an expensive item but it's one that is very necessary. So our endorsement is here for Bill No. 20.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I also have to concur with my colleague from Riel. I think that this is a move that the Indian people will welcome. I for one have an Indian Band in

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd.) my constituency who in the past several years have had their children going to school in the Pelly Trail School Division. They have had no representation on that board and the fact that now they will be able to I'm sure is a most welcome step.

There is one other point though that concerns me. The question we're dealing with now is the Public Schools Act but there's also the question of the Municipal Act - this embraces a wider field - and this is the eligibility of a resident elector rather than a ratepayer, and if we are going to give this privilege to a resident elector in a school matter, I would be quite concerned about the stand that the government is going to take. Are they going to broaden this field to the municipal field as well, because this is a question that many people are quite concerned about. I raise this now not as a criticism of this Bill whatsoever, but there is a question which covers a larger field than this Bill itself encompasses.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Health and Social Services.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to rise on an occasion when there is such general agreement in the House. That's very encouraging. I am sure there will be the other as well, which is certainly what will make for good government, and I would never certainly be one who would want to find agreement on everything as my honourable friend well knows.

Mr. Speaker, I merely rise at this time because the original principle resolution on which this Bill is based was put forth in my name at the legislative session last year, and at that time I was very very pleased indeed to find that it met with the approval of all members of the House and I was even pleased to have thought that it would be passed by the then administration, which indicates the feeling that I had for the Bill. I was happy to know that it would be passed by that administration. Mr. Speaker, needless to say I'm happier still to know that it's ultimately going to be passed by this administration.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I rise in complete support of the Bill and to approve giving what is an obvious right to me to the Indian people to sit on school boards. I want to point out though, Mr. Speaker, that to be effective the Minister is going to have to do some major revisions of the school district boundaries in the Province of Manitoba, because it's all well and fine to put this on the statute books, but at the moment a very large part of our Indian population is in the Frontier School Division and that division is not in a true sense a school division. It is really government administration; it is not a self-administered school division. And this does not apply only to the very far north - and I know the problems of the north, the distances involved and the difficulties - but the facts are the Frontier School Division stretches very far south, including areas that could very well be included in other school divisions, and at the moment the students from those Indian reservations are in a sense segregated by being sent to the Frontier School.

Many years ago in this House I urged the then Minister of Education to push towards a much greater integration of our school system with the Federal Government; get the Indian students, where they were prepared to do so, attending the regular schools in their vicinity. It seems to me that one of the problems in Manitoba has been that even in the southern areas the reserves really have been segregated and that in many cases the white community next door to an Indian reservation had its school and the Indian reservation had a separate school, and that we would have gone on much further in understanding between both groups had the students been in school together.

And so I urge the Minister, I encourage him, I compliment him for the Bill, but I urge him as well to have a very close review of the boundaries of the school divisions insofar as the Indian reservations are concerned, to consult with the Indian people and to see where arrangements can be made to integrate the school system and not proceed with segregation.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable the Minister of Youth and Education.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the member for Ste. Rose for his comments. I can assure him that the matter he brought to my attention will be looked into. This government will attempt through consultation, through meeting with the people concerned, to try to hurry the day when we can eliminate the type of segregation that existed in Manitoba all these years, and not just Manitoba but generally in Canada, and I can assure him that we will act on this as quickly as we can. We need of course the support and the co-operation of the Federal Government. Hopefully, we will be in touch with them, they will co-operate, and in the final analysis if the people involved, that is the Indians living on the reserves, wish to

(MR. MILLER cont'd.) come into the school systems of Manitoba they certainly will not find this government dragging its feet but will help them in this direction.

Generally I want to thank members for their remarks on the Bill and I hope therefore that when it goes before Law Amendments it will be passed in short order.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 26. The Honourable the Minister of Youth and Education.

MR. MILLER presented Bill No. 26, an Act to amend the Teachers Pensions Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple and short Bill; it is simply to correct inequity which has developed through no-one's fault. It's primarily designed to take care of people who by reclassification suddenly find that they're not covered by the Teachers Retirement Fund - the TRAF. These refer to the Chairman of the Public Schools Finance Board, the University Grants Commission and teachers who have been taken out from the department and are now working for the Department of Health and Social Services although they are still teachers. I'm thinking of the case of teachers who are at the Home for Boys and the Portage Home. They were teachers; they are still contributing to the Pension Fund; but because of the wording of the Act they are prevented from participating, and if something should happen tomorrow and somebody died tomorrow there'd be a difficulty in making payment. So this is simply a corrective measure to bring the Teachers Pension Act in line with the situation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: Mr. Speaker, I can assure the Minister that there will be no difficulty in getting this Bill passed, that we'll be supporting it. However, I feel personally that there are two added features that I would like to see embedded in this Bill and I'm sorry to see that they haven't been considered. I look at this Bill from a school administrator's point of view, or a school trustee's point of view, and one of the considerations that we find very important is the fact that the retirement of teachers, as far as the retirement plan is concerned, is now 65. Teachers are permitted to retire at the age of 60 but not without significant loss in their pension. I would suggest that it would be very palatable to many people if the teachers were permitted to retire at the age of 60 and without loss of their pension. You can well understand the situation where teachers have been on staff for a number of years and are wishing themselves to retire, and because of the rapidly changing curriculum and school situations it's often desirable to have younger people or newly trained people involved in education, but the school board, the school administrator and the teachers are all unwilling to make this change because it means the loss of that certain portion of that retirement fund for that teacher, and I beg the Minister to consider this point.

Now there's only one other factor that I'd like to mention and that is with reference to the portability of teachers' pensions. I didn't rise in discussion of the previous Bill but I was very anxious to see it passed. However, this presents a difficult kind of situation. The previous Bill will encourage the integration of Indian children into our provincial schools, a thing that I supported for many years. It will enable the band members to have a say in the administration of the school, which is again a very desirable thing, but I can very easily visualize a situation where the Indian children and the band administrator become part of the provincial school system and yet the teacher in transferring from that job to the provincial job does not retain the same pension plan; in fact she is eligible to lose some amount of pension money. Likewise, as we are well aware, teachers travel more and more from province to province. This year I would suggest that we have more teachers coming in from the United States, although I'm not requesting the portability go that far, than we've ever had. However, we have many more teachers from Saskatchewan this year than we've had in the past for obvious reasons. Therefore, in this regard, Mr. Minister, I would strongly suggest that these points be taken into consideration. I think they're very valid.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Youth and Education.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the member for Emerson for the remarks he made. It reminds me of a speech I made in this House about a year and half ago, and at that time it fell on deaf ears, but I can assure the member from Emerson that the very items he brings up will be getting close attention from this department and I trust that when legislation is introduced he will have enough influence on his colleagues so that they will take another position than they took in the past.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Osborne for an Address to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor in answer to his Speech at the opening of the session, and the proposed motion of the Honourable the Leader of the Official Opposition in amendment thereto, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Rhineland in further amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell has the floor.

A MEMBER: Was it a point of order?

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I wonder on a point of order if I could suggest to the government House Leader whether because of the lateness of the hour and in the interests of the continuity of the member for Birtle-Russell's speech if we could adjourn at this point.

MR. PAULLEY: On the point, Mr. Speaker, I think maybe he could get started, he has 15 minutes.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. No doubt I also am concerned about getting the business of this House through as expeditiously as possible. I was going to address a remark to the government House Leader but I see he's left, so I will carry on and direct my first remarks to the Speaker of the House, and I would like to offer my congratulations to you, Mr. Speaker, along with those of others who have spoken before me, and congratulate you on your elevation to the high office of ruler of this House. I'm sure that your task will not be an easy one. Those who have preceded you have set a standard of excellence which is exceedingly high. I am sure however that your qualifications are such that with diligence and sincerity you also can achieve those marks of excellence hitherto established, and I for one look forward to many hours of excellent debate in this House under the guidance of your counselling. The role of Speaker is a lonely one, filled with many anxious moments. You will no doubt have many important decisions to make with little time for reflection and an implied obligation to offer, by example, a code of conduct exemplary to one and all. I'm sure you will succeed and I assure you of my own personal accord.

I would also like to pay tribute at this time to those on the government side of the House who are new to this body. They have earned the right to be here by the democratic process and I feel certain that their views and their thinking will play an important part in the deliberations and the programs forwarded in this session and also in the future sessions of this Assembly. At the same time I would like to pay tribute to those on the opposite side of the House who have taken the obligation of Cabinet Ministers, and I know that the heavy time burden on their shoulders will be something that they in time alone will duly appreciate as being a problem that senior members on this side of the House had previously held.

At the same time, I would also like to congratulate the new members on this side of the House, and likewise I feel that their views will also be considered by all members here and their contribution will be also of major importance. With almost half of the members in this body new since the last session of the Legislature, it would not be at all surprising to find many new views and many new policies developed by all parties concerned.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having dispensed with all the niceties that make this such a fine place to be, I want to get on with one of the more important problems which face this society of ours and this province of ours. It is of the greatest concern to the people in my constituency of Birtle-Russell, and it is the problem of the agricultural situation and the marketing problems that face us today.

The Honourable Minister of Agriculture has made presentations to this House and to the Federal Government with regard to the two price system. Now we know what has happened in the past week after such presentations have been made to the Federal Government. Right today a price has been set on the basis of the two price system which will now give the farmer approximately \$155.00 less for every 1,000 bushels of wheat which he delivers to the elevator. That is \$155.00 per thousand less than what he received last year, and we all know that last year he received barely enough to carry on under the rising costs that face us today.

However, I understand that the government will be bringing in a Human Rights Commission and maybe this will take care of all the problems. At the present time the grain handlers on the West Coast are on strike and I understand that their present wage demands

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd.) are for \$51.00 per day for an 8 hour day working on the dock loading western grain. Now I realize that the dock workers recognize the plight of the farmer, and by mutual consent have agreed to load any shipment of grain during the strike period, but nevertheless if you can justify this figure of \$51.00 per day to the farmers of my area then I will retract, but I can see farmers taking great exception to the amount of money paid towards the man who pushes a broom or wields a shovel in the movement of grain. Fifty-one dollars per day for an 8 hour day seems rather excessive when the farmer is going to actually get 20 cents per bushel less for every bushel of wheat exported from this country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I understand first by the newspapers and then by a statement in this House that the First Minister will be going to the West Coast the first of next week. I am sure that he is quite familiar with the labour movement and he has the working man's support, and I would ask him if he can justify to the farmer this exorbitant amount for an 8 hour day's work. If in the light of farm prices he feels that this amount is excessive, I would urge the First Minister to use the influence that he has with the labour movement to reduce their demands in accordance with the request of the Prime Minister of our country to hold the line in the spiral that is ever-tightening and forcing free enterprise out of the competitive circle of world competition. One of the last bastions of free enterprise as we know it is the individual farmer who operates perhaps a half section or more of land and tries his best without government assistance to carry on and make a meagre living in this society of ours.

To most farmers in this province a 5 bushel quota was the best that they were able to deliver to the Canadian Wheat Board in the past crop year. Indeed some farmers were not even able to deliver a full 5 bushel quota, but they have been given assurance by the Canadian Wheat Board if they were not on a 5 bushel quota they would be able to deliver one bushel more per specified acre above the existing quota that was in existence at the time of the close of the crop year. Now if they are on a 3 bushel quota this means that they would only be able to deliver one extra bushel, that is up to 4 bushels, which should still leave them one bushel short of the average 5 bushel quota established for Western Canada. On the basis of No. 2 wheat, and we all know that there was very little No. 2 wheat last year in Western Canada, and based on an 18 to 20 cent freight differential to the Lakehead, this still leaves the farmer roughly only \$1.50 per bushel for every bushel delivered. On the basis of a 5 bushel delivery quota this gives the farmer only \$7.50 per specified acre.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Perhaps the honourable member can conclude his speech after the dinner hour. It is now 5.30 o'clock and I leave the Chair to return again at 8:00 o'clock tonight.