

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Friday, April 24, 1970

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

HON. PETER BURTNIAK (Minister of Tourism and Recreation) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, if I may have leave of the House I'd like to make a short statement.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Minister have leave? (Agreed.)

STATEMENT

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Speaker, a new schedule of increased fees for park entrance and camper permits will be in effect in Manitoba with the opening of the 1970 camping season which will start on May 15th. The increases are necessary to meet the increased costs of development, maintaining the quality of service and to bring the park fee schedule closer in line with the national average.

The new park entry fees are as follows, and I will give you some comparisons with other provinces such as Saskatchewan and Ontario. Vehicles other than buses - we charged 50 cents in the past - will be increased up to \$1.00 per day, from \$3.00 to \$5.00 for the season. For comparison, Saskatchewan charges \$1.00 per day or \$4.00 per season; Ontario charges \$1.00 per day or \$10.00 for the season. Chartered buses will be \$5.00 per day.

The park entrance fees are assessed at the following areas: Birds Hill, Grand Beach, The Whiteshell Provincial Parks, and at the provincial recreational areas at Rivers, Patricia Beach, Grand Valley, St. Malo, St. Ambroise, Moose Lake and Norquay Beach. The camper permit fees are now as follows: Camping only \$1.50 per day - increased from 50 cents - it will be \$9.00 per week or \$50.00 per season. Saskatchewan fees are \$1.00 per day and \$80.00 per season; Ontario has a \$2.50 a day charge only. Camping with electrical services, per day, \$2.00, per week \$12.00 and for the season \$75.00. Saskatchewan rates are \$2.00 per day, \$150.00 per season; Ontario rates are \$3.00 per day. Camping with full services will be increased by 50 cents from \$2.00 to \$2.50 per day, \$15.00 per week and \$125.00 for the season. Seasonal camping privileges are allowed only in certain specified areas of the province; there are approximately 40 places.

Schedule of rentals and service fees for residential summer resort lots is now under review as well.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the statement made by the Minister of Tourism and Recreation, I don't think that it really comes as any surprise that the fees should be increased in the Department of Tourism and Recreation. We have had fee increases in the Land Titles Office and in other things, and I would perhaps suggest to the Minister of Finance that for these additional revenues if they put the entire schedule of fee increases in all at once then maybe we wouldn't have to have these statements every day that there's a little fee increase here, there's a little fee increase the next day, and I think that the people of Manitoba would appreciate it if they knew all at once just how much this government is going to cost them.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the Minister's announcement. It seems to me this is another switch in NDP policy. I can recall when they sat on this side castigating the government for instituting fees in provincial parks, and now they are increasing the fees that they objected to at the time. It seems to me that the Throne Speech made quite a point of no increase in taxation. Well, a fee going from \$3.00 to \$5.00, from 2.00 to 2.50 and so on is quite a substantial increase, and to be called a slight adjustment or whatever terms are used when increases are announced, I think is a way of increasing taxation without having too much notice paid to it by the public, but I'm sure that the public will notice this increase of taxation.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Morris. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I was going to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Tourism and Recreation if it's . . .

MR. PAULLEY: I don't think that would be in order. I would suggest that my honourable friend may defer his question until Orders of the Day on Monday.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Morris. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, I'd like the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand. If anyone else wishes to speak, I would have no objection.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to say a few words on this Order for Return. I don't like to impute motives to anyone, but it is always difficult when you're dealing with the type of opposition we have in this House. The type of questions they're asking are an insult, not just to the House but to the civil servants, that they're trying to dig into their background. It seems that the civil servant since we have taken office has no rights of any kind, he's fair game for the opposition to come into the House and ask all kinds of questions. We've had questions as a matter of fact asking even about a person's nationality, his colour and a few other things. It seems that if this government doesn't want to be criticized, we shouldn't hire Jews or Negroes because two of the people that have been questioned, one was a Negro and one was a Jew. I suppose the next thing they're going to bring in here is religion. --(Interjection)--Well, it's the truth. You're asking questions here about Deputy Ministers and you know the answers before you ask them. It's like asking how many Ministers is there in the government. You know the answers but you're deliberately bringing out into the open to try and embarrass the government, and that's fine, but what are you going to do to the civil servant that you're so concerned about? You know very well which Deputy Minister didn't get the increment. Of course you do, otherwise you wouldn't have brought in this resolution, this Order for Return.

MR. ENNS: Could you tell us now which one didn't? You tell us now which one didn't and we'll withdraw the Order.

MR. BOROWSKI: I don't owe you anything. When we talk about open government, Mr. Speaker, we meant open government to the people, not to the jerks on that side of the House.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Honourable Minister has used language in this House -I'm a very patient man - but he has used language in this House over the last two or three weeks that I think is entirely unbecoming of him on the position he holds, and now I think something should be done that he withdraw that remark when he refers to us as jerks. We're here representing the people and we're not going to go down to that level, and I would appreciate your assistance in this regard.

MR. PAULLEY: My honourable friend the former Speaker rose on a point of order. I can see no point of order. If my honourable friend has a point of privilege, he may be justified in raising a matter of privilege but not a point of order at this time. Now I don't know, frankly, whether the use of the word "jerks" is unparliamentary or not. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if an objection is raised by my honourable friend the Member for Swan River as to the word in itself that you may take that under advisement and instruct us, because there so many words that from time to time are used in this House, such as old roosters and old chickens and old ducks and lovely ducks, that sometimes one wonders what is within parliamentary usage or not. So I would suggest first of all it's not a point of order; secondly it could conceivably by a point of privilege and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that maybe you could take it under advisement.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, on the remarks of my honourable friend the Minister of Labour, I am fully familiar with the names that are listed in Beauschêne, but if the Honourable Minister of Transport is going to be given the privilege of using the terms that he's using, we're quite capable of doing it, but I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that we're not going to let this House go down in the gutter and he has no right to allow it to get down there either. He should be showing leadership as a Minister to the Crown, not doing the things that he is doing. He doesn't have to say these things; he knows he doesn't have to say these things. He's gaining nothing by it and I think the sooner he stops the better it'll be for us all.

MR. SHERMAN: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker --(Interjection)--Yes, on a point of privilege, Sir, I don't have any quarrel with the Minister's use of terminology, the terminology that he employed a moment ago. If the Minister wishes to call us on this side of the House "jerks" that's his prerogative, but I reject and repudiate and renounce out of the hand the racist slurs that he directed towards the party, to which I belong, one moment ago. The Minister of Transport knows better than to do that kind of thing, to try that kind of hypocritical

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) . . . approach to politics in this Chamber. He knows that there is no feeling, no endorsement on this side of the House for any kind of attitude that would embrace any kind of racism and that kind of remark should be withdrawn, Sir. He can call us jerks if he likes, but not racists. The only thing we object to in this House is the kind of attitude that the Minister of Transport shows, not the kind of attitude that Jews and Negroes and Anglo Saxons and the Ukrainians show but the kind of attitude that the Minister of Transport in his ignorance of the parliamentary system shows, and he should withdraw those racist slurs.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . Mr. Speaker, that you should be in control of the House, and I'm glad to see the division opposite. One member stands on a point of order on the use of the word "jerks", another honourable member of the same party says it's quite in order. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that they leave to your direction the conduct of this House.

MR. SPEAKER: In recollection of the unparliamentary expressions as listed in Beauchesne, I do not recall the word complained of as one being unparliamentary. I can well appreciate that many words . . . (slight recording failure) . . . I'm not quite certain whether it's worth the exertion of the time and effort to determine whether the term complained of is unparliamentary or not. I would rather urge on honourable members of the House in participating in debate to use such vocabulary as they and all of us would be quite certain that they're on safe ground within the limits allowed and permitted to be used and refrain from using terms that, if they're not unparliamentary, I do feel they certainly may border on being unparliamentary.

MR. BOROWSKI: Can I continue, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, the Minister of Transport may not continue. I don't want him to withdraw the reference and the description of me as a jerk, I want him to withdraw the implication that my colleagues and I are racists and I want him to withdraw that remark now, Mr. Speaker.

SOME MEMBERS: Now, now, now!

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Fort Garry was saying that there are certain rules to be followed in Parliament. If the example we've seen on the other side is parliamentary then I hope that I never get that way, because I have been very quiet and very careful in what I say in this House. As a matter of fact,

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. Is the Honourable Minister of Transport at this point going to withdraw his reference to the implications raised regarding racism in this House against us or is he not? That's the only question because it's one or the other.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the member read Hansard tomorrow . . .

MR. SHERMAN: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. What good is it reading Hansard tomorrow when the Minister of Transport stands up in this Chamber and tries to change the record in Hansard? What good is it reading Hansard? We want a withdrawal of his racist slurs against this Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may . . .

MR. SPEAKER: At the moment I am of the impression that the Honourable Minister is in the process of explaining the comments made, complained of, and hopefully that they result, or at the end will meet with the approval of the members of the House.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, the House has been in session almost a month and a half and I think the members will agree that I have been very restrained in that time. I seldom speak and seldom answer questions, and I have stated right off the start that if you behave we'll behave on this side. Now there's been two instances in this House. The first one was Hoffman, and his name was dragged in here --(Interjection)-- Kaufman, I'm sorry. You know, and why are they doing it? We've hired many people since we're in office, but the two they pick on, one is a Jew - maybe it's a coincidence; the other one is a Negro --(Interjection)-- Just a minute . . .

MR. SHERMAN: It's absolute nonsense.

MR. BOROWSKI: Let me finish.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege.

MR. BOROWSKI: Will somebody throw him a bale of hay and send him back to the barn to graze.

MR. SHERMAN: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I'm the one who raised the

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) . . . question about the racist inferences and implications in the Minister's remarks and now he's brought up the name of Mr. J. Kaufman, and nobody on this side of the House cares whether Mr. Kaufman's name is Kaufman, Robinson or Lennon - nobody cares. The point was that we felt that there some political hackery, some political preference shown in that appointment and it had nothing to do with his nationality. The Minister of Transport seems to be very concerned about nationality, Mr. Speaker. I for my part couldn't care less whether the Minister of Transport and I derived from the same kind of racial stock or those totally diametrically opposite as long as we're good Canadians and good Manitobans. It's the Minister of Transport who continually raises this question of nationality, a point that we don't care about in our party. He has accused us, who have as our provincial president in this province a Jew and who have as a member for Hamilton West in the House of Commons a Negro in our party - which is more than can be said for the New Democratic Party incidentally - he has accused us of racism and I want a withdrawal, Mr. Speaker, of that slur.

SOME MEMBERS: Now, now, now!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I regret that I was not aware of the racial origin of the Deputy Minister in our government, but now having heard that reference was made to individuals to who, as I read the Order for Return, are in no way related to it, perhaps the Honourable Minister could retract the statement that he has made and limit his remarks related to the debate to the Order for Return before us.

MR. BOROWSKI: I don't know what interpretation you got from my statement. The opposition obviously gives one interpretation, and I suppose a guilty conscience causes a person to get a certain . . .

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

MR. WATT: Is the honourable member going to retract the statement or is he not?

MR. JORGENSON: The Honourable Minister is not . . .

MR. MACKLING: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Morris has a point of order.

MR. JORGENSON: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The Minister is not in the process of carrying out an admonition that you gave to him. He is not in the process of withdrawing a remark that he made and that the House has asked him to withdraw, and you, Sir, have asked him to withdraw, and I would suggest, Sir, that the Minister confine his remarks to withdrawing that statement before he proceeds further along the course that he's following now. We demand and we should get a withdrawal of that racist statement immediately, and he can proceed on as long as he likes after he has withdrawn that remark.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I hate to see such expressions in this Assembly. And I suggest --(Interjection)-- You see, Mr. Speaker, the uproar from the other side is symbolic of what I attempted to say, that I hate to see such an exhibition in this House which is supposed to be the seat of democracy in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SHERMAN: Would the Minister permit a question?

MR. PAULLEY: After I'm finished.

MR. SHERMAN: Will you permit me a question after you've finished?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I believe that the Honourable Member for Fort Garry heard the Honourable Minister indicate that he would permit a question after he is finished. The Honourable Minister.

MR. PAULLEY: All I am endeavouring to do . . .

MR. WATT: On a point of order, are we debating your ruling? Are we debating your ruling?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister is speaking on a point of order.

MR. PAULLEY: What I am endeavouring to do as the acting House Leader at this particular moment, Mr. Speaker, is to appeal to the members of this House to conduct themselves in a proper parliamentary manner. --(Interjection)-- You see, Mr. Speaker -- I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friends opposite would only realize that when we first came into this House for the first session we elected you, Sir, as the Chairman of this Assembly, and we gave you the right of the conduct, or the control of the conduct of this House in accordance with aged long democratic procedures, and now a single member apparently can not stand up on a point of privilege or a point of order without interjection from the likes of my friend the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Would the government House Leader permit a question?

MR. PAULLEY: I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that with my honourable friend's experience and yours . . .

MR. JORGENSEN: Is the member on a point of order?

MR. PAULLEY: I am.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well then, what is your point of order?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker will decide that and not the Member for Morris. What I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, to you is what has happened here this afternoon is that my honourable friends never raised a point of privilege in respect of the remarks of the Minister of Transportation in respect to any illusion to the national ancestry of individuals until such time as . . .

MR. SHERMAN: Read Hansard.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I now rise on a point or order. Is the Minister of Labour speaking on a point of order on your ruling? Mr. Speaker, I ask you to make a ruling . . .

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder if my honourable friend would sit down . . .

MR. WATT: I am not sitting down. I say to the Honourable Minister of Labour that . . . the Speaker makes a ruling. Are you speaking on the Speaker's ruling? Are you debating the Speaker's ruling?

MR. PAULLEY: What ruling?

MR. WATT: Would the Speaker please repeat the ruling.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm making an appeal . . .

MR. WATT: Again on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I say that the Minister of Labour is debating your ruling. Would you make a ruling on it?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker . . . --(Interjection)--

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to sit down until you make a ruling, Sir, unless you order . . . (Interjection)--

MR. PAULLEY: Will you sit down until I'm finished.

MR. WATT: I will not. On a point of order, I ask the Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please, Order.

MR. PAULLEY: Then I'll sit down. At least I'll give you the courtesy of me sitting down while you . . . --(Interjection)--

MR. WATT: Are you speaking on the ruling that the Speaker has made?

MR. SPEAKER: I had made what I felt was a gentlemanly request to members of the House; and my hope is that honourable members would adhere to the rules of the House in conducting themselves in participating in debate. That is my only wish and I'm sure that that is the only wish of the members of the House. And I still do hope that the Honourable Minister of Transportation could bring his remarks within the framework of the rules governing debate of this House. Be it the terminology used, be it any references which have been made to anything which could have been misinterpreted by members in such a manner as may be considered be a breach of privilege and continue with the debate, if he chooses to do so. If that is the intention of the Honourable Minister and if he wishes to comply with that, I would hope that the Honourable Minister would make that apparent as rapidly as possible and proceed with the debate.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, do you think the Opposition will give me an opportunity to --(Interjection)-- Well you know you can sit there and

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. BOROWSKI: . . . squawk on your fanny all you like. I have something to say, and if he won't let me say it, you know I'll just sit down and sit there.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, on a matter of privilege. I think the gentleman is using vocabulary that is most unbecoming and there are more women than myself in this House . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, Order please. I had given the Honourable Minister an opportunity to do many things and certainly a matter of 15 or 20 seconds, surely we can go beyond a matter of 20 seconds and allowing the Minister to explain himself away and bring himself back within the rules.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order then. Might I refer you to our own rule book 14 (1) that when the authority of the Chair is not being followed or abused by the House persistently and willfully obstructing the business thereof, if the offence has been committed

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . by the member in the House, the Speaker shall forthwith put the question on motion being made by the Leader of the House that the Member be suspended from the service of the House and no amendment, adjournment or debate shall be allowed. Now it's a question of how often you have given him the opportunity to adhere to the ruling of the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Well it is my sincere belief that we have gentlemen in the House. The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

MR. BOROWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. When I got up to speak I said I don't want to impute motives to anybody and then I went on bringing certain things up. And I mentioned them bringing in the names of a couple of people into this House - one was a Jew and one was a Negro. But I prefaced my remark by saying "I don't want to impute any motives to anyone." And I wish they would remember that. It's unfortunate that we can't have instantaneous translation of Hansard, because if they read it they'd realize what I really said. And I brought up these things, not being racist, but apparently having a guilty conscience maybe they chose to interpret it as being racist and that was not my intention.

MR. SHERMAN: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transport who for six weeks now in this Chamber has subjected us to the most unparliamentary language and the most unparliamentary conduct and in ignorance of the parliamentary system, has now imputed further racist motives to this side of the House by saying that we have a guilty conscience on this point.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please, Order. I do not believe that we ought to concern ourselves with what had transpired at various times over the past six weeks. The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

MR. BOROWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not sure I should get up and say any more. It doesn't seem that I can get more than 30 seconds before the other side starts braying again. I made a statement, I prefaced it and I had no intentions of suggesting or saying what they are saying I have said -- and again I would invite them to wait until they read Hansard and they will realize that I haven't said what they are suggesting I said. Now, if you want to take it that way, I can't help how you interpret any statements that are made. And there's many ways a statement could be interpreted. I stated a fact, there's no question that nationalities were asked, there's no question about that . . .

MR. ENNS: They were not asked. They were not asked -- nobody asked him that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please, Order.

MR. SHERMAN: Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. My colleague from Emerson asked for the citizenship of the particular person. It is not nationality. It is not.

A MEMBER: No, it is not.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please. I hope that I would not have to adjourn the House at this point.

MR. SHERMAN: Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to clarify a point.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I believe that I did hear the Honourable Minister indicate when his remarks will be read in Hansard that he had prefaced them in a certain manner which do not imply the charges or the accusations that have been made here. I would now ask the Honourable Minister if he wishes to continue with his debate to limit his remarks to the Order for Return before us.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I consider the time in this House very precious, I'm not going to waste any more time trying to explain. It's obvious I'm not going to get an opportunity, so I'll simply sit down and wait till we read Hansard on Monday.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, again. The Minister has imputed that this side of the House, or this particular party here, harbours bad motives towards certain races of people. We refute this out of hand. We've interpreted it this way - we don't have to read Hansard, we have ears. Unless the Minister is prepared to withdraw that then I would stand and move that the House adjourn.

MR. DESJARDINS: On a point of privilege, if I may --(Interjection)--Am I entitled to speak on a point of privilege of this House, Mr. Speaker? On a point of privilege of this House I might say that because I hold as the most important priority the build up of the Manitoba Mosaic, I think it is rather sad that we should have a display like we've had this afternoon, and I would implore the Minister of Transport for the good of the people of Manitoba and also for the good of the members of this House to withdraw these remarks. I don't doubt his sincerity at all, I know that he hates discrimination too much, but this is

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) . . . something that we have to be - when we make certain accusations or when we might give the impression - I can't speak a certain way like I did yesterday when I was addressing my remarks to the Honourable Member for Lakeside. I think the same thing goes for all of us and I would implore the Minister for the good of the people of Manitoba, not only because I'm worried about the members of this House, I would implore him to withdraw these remarks and that we can go on with the affairs of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I just rise on a point of privilege for one moment. There's one thing that I would like to enter into this debate that hasn't been mentioned by anyone here this afternoon. I think that I have held the respect and esteem of all members in this Legislature, and when we hear comments made that my colleague from Fort Rouge had suggested that the Minister of Transportation had made accusations -- I don't mind when comments are made about we as members individually on this side of the House, but I feel as one who represents some 15 to 16 thousand people when you talk about racism and so on, it's not only being imputed on myself but on the people that I represent as well. And I want, Mr. Speaker, for the record this to be known. I think this is something that has a far greater significance than the imputing remarks made just by members sitting in this Legislature. Let's not forget, Mr. Speaker, we all represent a fair number of people in our respective constituencies. I just want this to be made for the record, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would beg the indulgence of the House to direct one remark through you to the Minister of Finance who is a public servant of this province whom I not only respect very much but whom I like very much, and I would just like to say to him that the references made to the question of citizenship in respect to a certain individual raised by my colleague from Emerson had nothing to do - at least if they did have anything to do then I disassociate myself from those remarks -- they had nothing to do with whether that person was a Jew or a Negro or a wasp like me. What they had to do with was whether he was a Canadian citizen and therefore entitled to have responsibility for the spending of Canadian public monies.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder - and I want to appeal once again to the House, whether now, we cannot leave matters as they are. The Minister of Transportation a few moments ago --(Interjection)-- will you give me the same opportunity as we gave to the Honourable Member for Fort Garry and the Honourable Member for Rock Lake. I didn't interject then. Can I have the same courtesy. I believe that I, too, have been a reasonably respected member of this Assembly for a while. And I'm just appealing Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transportation said in the preface to his remarks he said certain things --(Interjection)--you you don't know? Here again, my honourable friend, the Member for Riel, who I normally think is a reasonable sort of an individual, is not giving me the same privilege as I gave to him to make some remarks. I want to appeal to all members of the House on both sides as the Acting House Leader at this stage, to let us look into the record of Hansard on Monday, which will be a true record of what has been said. I want to appeal, Mr. Speaker, let's get on with the business for the balance of the afternoon.

My honourable friend the Member for Riel suggested maybe the House should adjourn because of this. I suggest there's no motion before us. I would suggest this would not be a proper procedure to follow. I suggest that let us cool our emotions and let us look into the records. You, Mr. Speaker, have endeavoured, and I appreciate the difficulty of your position at this particular time. I illustrated a little while ago that you were charged with the responsibility of the conduct of the House. I now ask the members of the House to respect that decision that we made at our inaugural meeting of this Legislature. Let's get on with the business of the House, let's cool down. There will be lots of opportunity, there will be lots of opportunities following the production in Hansard of having this matter raised if indeed it would be necessary.

So, Mr. Speaker, may I though you appeal to the members of the House to let us get along with the Order of procedure that we have before us today. It may be, Mr. Speaker, that what I'm endeavouring to do will fall on deaf ears. I don't know. But I do earnestly and sincerely make this appeal to my colleagues in this House to get on with the business of Manitoba.

MR. WATT: Would the Honourable Minister permit a question?

MR. PAULLEY: Yes.

MR. WATT: Are you asking this side of the House to simply forget about the ruling that the Speaker has made, that he has asked the Minister of Transportation for a withdrawal of the statement that he made. I ask you again, Mr. Speaker, to make your ruling, to again ask the

(MR. WATT cont'd) . . . Minister of Transportation to withdraw his statement.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may answer the question of my honourable friend. I do not recall Mr. Speaker asking for a withdrawal of the remarks but that the Honourable —(Interjection)—Here we go again. The Minister indicated, or the Speaker indicated a request for temperance of language. My request is that we take a close look at Hansard when it arrives in order that we can make a proper assessment. This is my only appeal at the present time, and I'm sure I can say to my honourable friend the former Minister of Agriculture, that if on reading Hansard I come to the same conclusion as apparently is in his mind, I'll make a request too of the Minister of Transportation, but I want the opportunity of reading the record so that we're all sure of what we're talking about.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, may I, for the umpteenth time, say to the Opposition, as I have already said, that I had not imputed or suggested that they were racists. I brought up two points, and if the record should show on Monday that I said that they were racists, then I will be very happy to apologize on Monday.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. PAULLEY: I believe the motion stands in the name of the Honourable Member for Kildonan, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, that an ORDER of the House do issue for a Return showing the following information with respect to persons detained under The Intoxicated Persons Act, who have not committed an offence:

1. The location of the places of detention.
2. The number of persons detained for each month, January, February, March and April, 1970, in each place.
3. The number of meals served in each case.
4. The number of persons who were kept overnight in each case.
5. The number of persons whose home address is outside the municipal boundaries of the place of detention in each case.
6. The estimated cost of providing custody, meals, and lodging in each case.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, this is an Order for Return which gives me some concern, gives government some concern, and I want to indicate the reason why, in my view, government cannot accept this Order.

For one thing, Mr. Speaker, it requests information, particularized information, that is not within the knowledge of the government. That is, this information has to be obtained by application to a great number of local authorities and requesting of them the particular information that's provided here. Now I haven't been long enough in this House to know to what extent precedent is binding on the House, but I'm under the impression that the government must consider very seriously accepting any Return which requests of the government information that is within the knowledge of the government; however, if an Order for Return asks for information which the government does not have and cannot reasonably obtain within a short time, that the Order for Return cannot be accepted.

Now, as I indicate, Mr. Speaker, it may be that my understanding of the relative acceptance of Orders for Return is incorrect, and I'll stand to be corrected on that because I'm not that long in experience in the House, but it seems to me it makes good sense that government ought not to bind itself to obtain information which in some instances would occasion a good deal of expense in the research of the necessary information. Now, there are the two items, then Mr. Speaker: (1) I'm concerned about the principle of accepting a Return that's in this form where it obliges government to research data which the government does not now possess or ordinarily possess. That is, there are no records in my department which would provide this information. If it did, I could merely accept the Return as it's presently worded because the Return asks the House "for a Return showing the following information" and I could suggest, well, we'll accept the Return and then later on say, well, we didn't have the information. But it's obvious that the honourable member wants the government to get the information and supply it to the House, and this means that we would have to spend considerable time and effort in solicitation on all of the various local governments involved in the length and

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) . . . breadth of this province that are affected by this Order, and I want to assure you that it will affect quite a large number of local government areas and municipal corporations, some of whom really haven't got the cataloguing of information; some of them I'm not certain to what extent they maintain particularized records of all the information that's here, so that it's a formidable problem that I see in making certain that we have the information in the exact particular required by the Order, so I think it may be impossible of performance - that is, that government, if they undertook to get this, could actually get it, because none of the municipalities would be bound to have recorded this information and therefore would be in a position necessarily to give it to us.

Now I don't want, however, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member to think that I don't believe that there is a reasonable information being requested. I think the request for information of the nature that the honourable member asks would be of benefit to the House, and therefore I'd be prepared without having accepted the Order for Return, for the arguments and for the reasons that I've indicated, to undertake to make enquiry of a number of municipal authorities for the information that's requested in this Return, and perhaps a sampling of information would suffice. That is, if we had this sort of information from a rural municipality and an urban municipality, and perhaps a remote municipality, we would get some picture of the whole area of concern. If my honourable friend wants a particular municipality, that could be named specifically in the Order and I think, even though the municipal authority wouldn't be bound to give us that information, I think that they would cooperate and give it to us.

So for these reasons, I can't see how government can accept the Order in its present terms. I'd be quite willing to undertake to get a sampling of the information from respective municipalities, and if my honourable friend wants to name a particular one I'll be glad to include that particular one in my enquiry, but, as I indicate, I don't think we can demand this information; we will endeavour to get it but it would be on a limited selective basis.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a question and I don't want it to be thought that I am closing debate. Is it not a fact that the various police forces in the province have to compile a report on convictions under the various Acts, and is not this information fairly readily available?

MR. MACKLING: I believe that is right, Mr. Speaker, but as the honourable member knows, this is not an offence. Unfortunately, the Order for Return says "That an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the following information" and so on, "under The Intoxicated Persons' Act, who have not committed an offence." Now these people have not committed an offence, as my honourable friend knows, and therefore there's no requirement to record this. Under The Intoxicated Persons Detention Act there's no charge laid, so there's no record necessarily kept at all, and we haven't instructed or counselled that any records need be kept because it's no longer an offence; it's no longer a misdemeanour of any kind. Well, it's a social mistake, if anything, to become intoxicated and the former offence of public intoxication is no more, so none of the municipal authorities have been requested to keep details of this sort of thing. Some of them may have - I don't know; but if we ask for this information in all likelihood a good many of them do not have it, and that's why I say it's impossible to accept it and therefore -- I say we can't, but I'm willing to do my best to give a sampling of information to the fullest extent we can get it; I mean on a selective basis.

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

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, that the debate be adjourned.

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

QUESTIONS OF THE MINISTRY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I wish to put the following questions to the Ministry as they were submitted in writing a week ago.

1. Is the Government of Manitoba now planning the establishment of a Crown Corporation to sell automobile insurance?

MR. PAULLEY: . . . Mr. Speaker. Possibly the Clerk could -- Would this not be considered as a written request and any reply would be put on Votes and Proceedings? I believe this is the proper procedure rather than oral reply.

April 24, 1970

MR. SPEAKER: I believe that the honourable member has the privilege to place his questions on record and I hope that the honourable member appreciates the manner in which he may receive a reply.

MR. PAULLEY: The reply, if I'm not mistaken, Mr. Speaker, the motion would be from my honourable friend and then the reply would be in Votes and Proceedings. Is that not correct?

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I think it would be fair to indicate that there is a second reading fast approaching in respect to this very item, and I think if the honourable member would wait until that second reading, answers to his questions would be presented therein.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, may I then read the second question into the record? Are facilities now being prepared to house the proposed Crown Corporation which will offer automobile insurance at a reduced premium under regulations which will require compulsory liability coverage in Manitoba?

PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debates. The proposed Resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Rhineland in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. HARDY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in connection with this resolution which I consider to be one of the most important that has been introduced to date in this Legislature. I say I rise with some reluctance after witnessing one of the, I think, one of the worst scenes that I have not had the pleasure, and I say distinctly it hasn't been a pleasure, when we are gathered here to conduct the business of this province and are subjected to some of the comments that have been made this afternoon, but I assure you, Sir, I appreciate your remarks in this particular respect.

In connection with this resolution, I say it's one of the most important that has been introduced, both by the government or by a private member, because it zeros in on an area of great concern, of great concern to the people of Manitoba who find themselves in this particular position, and I often wonder, has the Provincial Government divorced itself to that degree that they are not cognizant of the situation which in fact does exist in many many municipalities in the Province of Manitoba?

Now it has been suggested, and many of the comments that I am going to make are repetitious, but it has been suggested that as an election promise, it was an election promise, at this point in time it was one of the biggest con jobs that was ever perpetrated on the people of Manitoba. And I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I shall not, unless I am directed by you to do so, Sir, but I am suggesting and the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources indicated that in his electioneering he did indicate to his constituents and presumably those in the area wherein his comments and his words were received, he did indicate that there was going to be in fact a turn to income tax for this purpose. Now I have no suggestion, Sir, that this was not the case.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please. I would indeed find it difficult to accept the term "con job" as being parliamentary.

MR. HARDY: I withdraw that, Mr. Speaker. There are other terms that can be utilized but I think the point was there.

Now what I am suggesting was that, as far as the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources was concerned, in fact what he has stated I have every reason to believe. What I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, and I quote from a couple of the copies of information and election material that was distributed June 25th. Obviously on June 24th there was no problem, June 25th there was no problem, June 26th there was a problem. "Property tax: NDP Government will give you an exemption on the first \$2,000 assessment of residential property." From the electioneering material of the Honourable Member from St. Matthews.

This is a copy of the election material of the candidate in Wolseley: "Tax exempt the first \$2,000 on residential property. The average homeowner is now unfairly taxed and the lower your income, the heavier and more unfair the tax burden." And I think the daddy of them all is that that was introduced by the Attorney-General.

I have no quarrel with the statements that were made, Mr. Speaker. I have no quarrel with the statements that were made, but I'm only suggesting, and it has been indicated, that

(MR. HARDY cont'd) . . . there is a degree of priority here. I agree there is a degree of priority and I'm suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that this, presumably the first priority was the Medicare arrangement - I've no quarrel with that and I've stated that. I've no quarrel with it whatsoever. But I'm suggesting that the second priority is in fact some indication that these are in fact going to be, there're going to be introduced and I'm suggesting that they should be introduced this year, as the amendment contains. Now, the Minister of Municipal Affairs in his remarks, and I must admit that as far as I was concerned personally they were a rather wishy-washy snow job attempt with respect to this particular resolution.

I agree, I agree that there are varying degrees, varying degrees in which people find themselves, and perhaps it is not opportune to segregate one group and give special consideration to them, because we all know, we all know that there are other areas wherein young people who are raising a family, in fact because of their income level, find themselves in this very same position. There are others, elderly people that are living in suites, whether it be in a self-contained unit or whether it be just a suite in the home of some other individual; they find themselves in the same position. But I would suggest that it has been indicated here that they do not want to approach it in a patchwork attitude. But Mr. Speaker, I'm suggesting that this year - yes, whether you call it a patchwork job or whatever you call it, the name means nothing, but these people, these people require assistance. I can suggest to you, Sir, that there are at least three municipalities in the City of Winnipeg or in the Metropolitan area of Winnipeg that probably will be introducing Private Members' Bills to in fact do exactly what the government suggested that they would do on June 25th, because local municipalities realize they know what the position is, they know the degree of hardship that is being in fact fostered on these people. I think it was the Honourable Member from Sturgeon Creek who read into the record a letter from the Mayor of St. James-Assinibola - or, I'm sorry, from an individual in St. James-Assinibola - outlining the plight in fact in which they find themselves, and this is not an isolated case, I can assure you, Sir, it is not an isolated case. There are many, many cases similar to this and I am suggesting that this now, an interim measure has to be adopted in order to overcome the problem. It has been suggested on many, many occasions, and I have been one of them that has suggested this and indicated, as have other members, that the area, the increase in the mill rate in urban areas of Manitoba, and presumably this will be part of the financing structure of municipalities in rural areas, is in fact creating a tremendous hardship. It is creating a tremendous hardship, Sir, because they are caught in the old cost price squeeze. We hear it on many occasions as it affects different people, different groups, different forms of industry and different forms of vocations really, but this is one, this is one area where their hands are absolutely tied because there is nowhere to go. What do they do? They're faced, they're faced with an increase in taxation this year. They're faced with an increase of anywhere, depending naturally on the mill rate increase itself, 35, 40, 50 dollars annually. This is the position they find themselves in. Their income hasn't increased, but their expenditure has; so in order to meet the requirements for the municipal taxes, what do they do? They have to cut down on something else. How far can you cut back? Really, how far can you cut back?

So I'm suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that - and I think it was very aptly expressed by the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, and I don't want to get into the verbiage that was used at that time or the manner in which the terminology was used "to consider the advisability of" - I mean this is government to consider: the advisability of - but I'm suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that in fact when this was passed at the last session that they do consider the advisability of and a degree of priority be established, that in fact this become the second priority on the undertakings of government - The \$2,000 basic exemption, and this applies only to those that are receiving the old age security pension and old age supplement, it's extremely difficult. I know, not from my own personal experience but from the experience of others that they find themselves in this position where in fact they as I said before, and I don't want to be repetitious, where they find themselves in the position where they don't know where to turn, they don't know where to turn. The local levels of government are faced with this problem, we're faced with this problem because perhaps we realize and are closer to it than this legislature, where in fact some of the individual cases, many of the individual cases do come to that level - perhaps we are closer to it at the municipal level. But I would hope that it is not the intention of the government because of this position that they find themselves in insofar as this area is concerned on a 2,000 dollar exemption; that they will in fact give every consideration, not to the advisability of, but to give every consideration to in fact implementing this program, allowing the municipalities to grant this exemption. The mechanism is there, there is no need for a means

April 24, 1970.

(MR. HARDY cont'd) . . . test, and a means test to me is something that has reached that stage of degeneracy because of politicians; but it is a need test. This has been established and the mechanics of it would be very, very simple in order to implement this program. But I think also, Mr. Speaker, that you're very very much aware, Sir, that the responsibility at the municipal level, in order to implement this program, is one in which in fact they cannot afford. It has to be spread over a much greater broader tax base, the tax base that is used by the provincial government.

I think, Mr. Speaker, in essence these are some of the comments that I wanted to make and only bring to the attention again, this was a promise, this was a promise. I agree that there are degrees of priority which have to be established by the government, but I'm suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that this should be the second priority insofar as this government is concerned, to implement the content of this resolution where in fact it will allow municipal levels of government to grant this exemption, and in turn be reimbursed by the provincial government. It's a question of straight arithmetic. On the basis of \$2,000 exemption, by and large this would represent a refund of 100, 120 dollars annually, which in fact these people, the people that find themselves in this position, it is absolutely essential that some assistance be given to them.

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

MR. JOHANNSON: Would the honourable member submit to question? He mentioned the fact that a piece of election literature used by myself contained a commitment regarding reduction of property taxation. Did this commitment mention the fact that we would reduce property taxation the first year in office?

MR. HARDY: Mr. Speaker, no - I mean, this is the point exactly - no time was mentioned whatsoever, and it could be ten years from now as far as this is concerned. I think in fact anybody that would read this it would be indicated to them that in fact this was a commitment, this was a commitment that is going to be introduced and carried out immediately, immediately upon election. This is my point exactly, Sir, and this is why I'm asking this House to give consideration to the carrying and approval of this resolution, in fact that something can be done at this point.

MR. JOHANNSON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Logan, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I don't wish to speak on that this afternoon. I would let it stand. I think probably it's second time, so presumably this goes elsewhere. --(Interjection)-- somebody loses . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Does not my honourable friend lose his right on the second time to take part in the debate?

MR. SPEAKER: I've therefore called for the . . .

MR. CRAIK: Someone else may wish to take the adjournment.

MR. PAULLEY: Pardon?

MR. CRAIK: Someone else may wish to take the adjournment.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, but as long as my honourable friend knows that he loses his right . . .

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

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): No, I'm sorry.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Fort Garry, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. PAULLEY: Unfortunately the Honourable Minister's not here, Mr. Speaker, so he would lose his right to speak in this debate.

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

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say a few words on this resolution. I haven't checked it but it appears it's very similar to the resolution I introduced in the two short months I sat in the Opposition last spring or last winter. It's a good resolution, and I certainly agree with it. We're going to vote for it; but while saying this I would like to make it clear that we are working on a scheme which will do at least what this resolution suggests or possibly more, the mechanics of which have not been worked out. I just want to indicate when we say we're going to vote for it that the final result will probably be not what's in here but the effect on the people involved will probably be the same.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, just following on the remarks of the Minister of Transportation which I welcome very much in this respect, I want to indicate that I, too, was particularly concerned about this matter, particularly after some occasions that I've had to visit through the north country in the portfolio that I at one time had, the Department of Mines and Natural Resources. It's no secret to particularly the Minister of Transportation or other northern members that, particularly in the north, the already exorbitant costs of fuels, motor fuels for the use of fishing vessels or motor toboggans is plenty high enough and any relaxation that can be brought as a result of a reduction in tax is both necessary and most helpful.

I'm happy to hear that the Minister and the government is in fact going to make this resolution possibly a meaningful one for a vote in this House. Perhaps if we had that same kind of candidness on the part of other ministers we would feel a little bit more confident about moving resolutions and voting for resolutions. I have made the statement several times in the House following the position outlined by the Honourable the House Leader, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, that essentially the government of the day was taking a somewhat different approach to resolutions, to private member's resolutions insofar as that by and large they would probably be consistently voting in favour of considering the advisability of - consequently we have had two members' resolutions voted on on the last private members' day and I suspect that that will be the pattern of all other private member's resolutions where we kind of went through the ridiculous performance of all members of the House rising to vote un-animously on these resolutions. We did so feeling I think somewhat foolish but not at all assured that action was in fact forthcoming. I welcome, therefore, the statement of the Minister of Transportation that in this instance it would appear that action is forthcoming and we await the specifics, the details of the government measures in this respect. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. PATRICK: Ayes and nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Did I hear ayes and nays?

MR. PATRICK: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

MR. PAULLEY: Have you support?

MR. PATRICK: Sure. Sure.

MR. PAULLEY: Okay.

MR. SPEAKER: We're dealing with the resolution of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye. Resolution No. 12 on Page 4. Those in favour please rise.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Allard, Bilton, Borowski, Boyce, Burtniak, Cherniack, Craik, Desjardins, Doern, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Ferguson, Fox, Girard, Gonick, Gottfried, Graham, Hardy, Henderson, Jenkins, Johannson, Johnston (P. la P.) Johnston (Stur. Cr.), Jorgenson, McGregor, Mackling, Malinowski, Miller, Molgat, Moug, Patrick, Paulley, Pawley, Petursson, Schreyer, Shafransky, Sherman, Spivak, Toupin, Turnbull, Uskiw, Uruski, Watt and Mrs. Trueman.

NAYS: Nil.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 45; Nays; Nil.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose and the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance in amendment thereto, which I am holding. I approve the amendment proposed by the Honourable Minister of Finance to the motion of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. In my opinion, Citation 201 of Beauchesne 4th Edition, 1968 is applicable. It reads as follows:

The object of any amendment may be to effect such an alteration in a question as will

April 24, 1970

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd) . . . obtain the support of those who without such alteration must either vote against it or abstain from voting thereon or to present to the House an alternative proposition either wholly or partially opposed to the original question. This may be effected by moving to omit all the words of the question after the first word "that" and to substitute in their place other words of a different import. In that case the debate that follows is not restricted to the amendment but includes the motives of the amendments and of the motion, both matters being under consideration of the House as alternative propositions. Therefore, I rule the proposed amendment of the Honourable Minister of Finance in order. Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Swan River that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed Resolution of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye. The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the resolution under discussion asks the government to rescind certain increases that have been granted, one to a Crown corporation and the other to a private company. Then I believe it was the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources during the debate thought this was kind of a silly idea and he did everything he could to say what a poor idea it was. But I notice that members on that side sometimes have a habit of bringing in the reduction they made on the Medicare premiums as something that they have done that is good for the province. So I have no quarrel with that, but that is a form of rescinding an increase. It was a political move to be sure but it was based on the idea that there should be some ability to pay in taxation for that sort of a service to the people. So I don't see that the resolution does not have some merit.

I have a copy of a newspaper ad that was published after a recent national conference on price stability and the heading is "A call for action to curb price increases." The conference was attended by business leaders, utility leaders or managers, heads of all the governments, the ten provincial governments and the Federal Government, and at the end of the conference they hammered out a statement that they could all agree to and I would like to read to the House a part of the statement: "All business firms and other commercial establishments in Canada are called upon to reduce the number and size of price increases they would normally make in 1970 by insuring that such increases are clearly less than the amount needed to cover increases in costs. This basic principle and the way in which it should be interpreted in particular areas of business were developed and adopted by the National Conference on Price Stability on February 9-10 and were endorsed by the heads of government at the Federal Provincial Conference on February 16th and 17th. The closing statement of the National Conference on Price Stability and the relevant portion of the statement of conclusions of the Federal Provincial Conference of First Ministers are produced below." And there is about nine propositions that agreement was reached on.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the honourable member to file the document from which he is reading? Could you table the document from which you are reading?

MR. G. JOHNSTON: When I am through reading from it, I will be glad to table it.

MR. CHERNIACK: Sorry, sorry to interrupt.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I would like to now read recommendation (h) which is part of the closing statement of a National Conference on Price Stability and this is, well it speaks for itself. Recommendation (h). "Representatives of the Transportation Telecommunications and Utilities Industries endorse the commission's general criteria for price restraint. As a positive expression of co-operation the members agreed to provide the Commission with 30 days' notice of any intent to increase general rate schedules." So there was some agreement I submit, Mr. Speaker, and there was some measure of support given by this government obviously, because it's a statement that all governments concurred in. So when the Minister of Mines stands up, pooh-poohs a resolution and says that, you know, this is interfering in a Crown corporation and this is interfering in a private corporation that serves the public in Manitoba. I don't agree with him. I agree that government have a place in this.

The Member for Crescentwood went to great length to say well there's not much we in Canada can do about inflation, it all emanates from the United States because they're on a war footing. I agree with him that there is not a great deal we can do about some of the inflationary pressures that are exerted on the North American continent, but there are some things

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd) we can do. Taxation in Canada I believe at all levels adds up to about 33 percent of the Gross National Product, 33 percent is taken up in municipal, provincial and federal taxes, so that government spending itself has a great deal to do with the inflationary pressures on the dollar. So I think that the motion deserves consideration. It is asking for a rescinding of recent increases. This doesn't mean for all time. I think it has been mentioned before that when a move is being made in any particular field, timing is all important. I think the timing of an increase now at this time when everyone in position of authority is preaching restraint of one sort or another, then the restraint must be for all, not for the other fellow. So I think that the motion has merit and deserves support.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Do you want me to table it or do you want . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Lend it to me.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Give it to the Minister of Finance.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the House Leader of the Liberal Party quoted the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Resources as having called this resolution "silly", I believe. -- (Interjection) -- Pardon? Well if he only inferred that it was silly then I will add my comments that I think it is silly because we have to try to realize just what it is that is proposed by the resolution itself. But before I deal with that, might I indicate to the honourable member that his comments about this government's decision to reduce Medicare, which he called a political move, and of course one does not impute motives of this House as we well know.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: There's nothing wrong with it being political. It was promised in an election and it was delivered, it was a political move and I give them credit for it; there's nothing wrong with it.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, I'm glad to hear the honourable member rise to make sure that imputing a political motive is perfectly all right, because the fact is, there's a difference between a political motive and the carrying out of an election pledge, and certainly it was a move that results from the healthy aspects of political life, where one does measure up to one's promises within the time within which it becomes possible so to do. But I didn't want to dwell on the question of it being a political move in the eyes of the honourable member, but rather to point out that the decision as to the relief of medicare premium was a decision that was fully within the authority of government and fully within the program of government.

Now if the honourable member meant by reading this resolution that any increases should be subsidized out of general tax revenue then he might relate it to the program that we carried out on medicare premium, but that isn't the proposal. The proposal is that this legislature shall rescind certain increases granted or permitted in the gas rates and electric power rates, and that is in no sense related to what this government did in the question of medicare, where the previous government through the Hospital Services Medical Services Insurance Corporation imposed a flat premium tax and we changed the form of taxation, the form of financing, so really there's no relationship.

But what actually is proposed by this resolution? It is proposed that the Legislature, I think the honourable member will agree that it's only the Legislature that could take the position of enacting legislation which would rescind gas rates and electric power rates, because only through legislation as I know it, or as I understand it, can these rates be rescinded. In other words, we would have to step into a field in which the Legislature has not participated before and pass legislation telling the Greater Winnipeg Gas Company the rate increase that you received, whenever you received it, is rescinded; or we would have to pass legislation telling Manitoba Hydro the rate increase which you passed, which you adopted, which was later reviewed by the Public Utility Board, is rescinded. Now that's legislation and possibly the honourable member who proposed this resolution would want to bring in a bill along those lines. But what is important is really the principle and that is whether or not this House and this government should step into an area which the Liberal Party of Canada has not been prepared to step into, and that is to impose ceilings on prices, and that is to impose by compulsion rate reductions or cancellation of rate increases. This was never accepted by the Conservative Party to my knowledge - I'm sorry by the "Progressive" Conservative Party to my knowledge. -- (Interjection) -- Well I look at the Honourable Member for Lakeside, and maybe that's why I forget the word "progressive", but I do apologize for that omission to those to whom the

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) word is important. Nor was it ever accepted by the Liberal Party to my knowledge. Indeed the Federal Liberal Party did not take the position that it called for in this resolution, and this document, this announcement from which the Honourable the House Leader of the Liberal Party read, does not indicate any form of compulsion, but rather review, and may I tell him that this government took a very strong position at the Premier's Conference on the question of inflation, that there should not be permitted to be any price increase until after the review, that is along the lines quoted in section (h), but the Federal Government would not agree to that. Well it so happens that the Honourable the House Leader of the Liberal Party agrees with the government because it was the government of Manitoba that took that position. We said, if you really mean it, and we are not sure you do, but if you really mean it, then impose price control and we did not hesitate to say, "and that may well include wage control," and we also said, impose credit restrictions, and the Federal Government did not go along with that. So I think if the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party wishes to support this government in its position, then he'd better move over to this side and start being more effective through the voice of the Manitoba government than he is in the position which he is.

. Continued on next page

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Would the Minister permit a question?

MR. CHERNIACK: Of course.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Do I understand the Minister to say that he is urging the Federal Government to be restrictive; yet, when their government has the power to be restrictive on a corporation within this province, they do not wish to do so.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, now we get into a whole debate on that area which I don't propose to be an expert, but I would certainly suggest to the honourable member that Manitoba is certainly not the economic area which is the cause or the source for the root of inflationary problems, and that for Manitoba to try to impose those kinds of restrictions which the Federal Government has the power to do, would be ludicrous, because in no time at all you would find that the weaknesses of the economy of a province like Manitoba as compared with that of Ontario would become more and more apparent. It would really be ludicrous for the Province of Manitoba on its own, in the whole spectrum of Canadian Government areas, to move in that direction which it felt the Federal Government should do, but just give us a chance, Mr. Speaker, and let us form the Government of Canada and we will carry out the very programs that the honourable member, the House Leader of the Liberal Party appears to support.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate that the Government of Manitoba did not endorse many of the theories propounded by the Prices and Incomes Commission on the cause of inflation and indeed the methods in which one deals with inflation, but we did endorse the fact that it would be important in the fight against inflation to try to restrain cost increases, to try to restrain the cost of living through the various ways we propose, and one of them was of course voluntary. We said it wouldn't work, but we said by all means let's try it. But what was discussed then was that - and I suppose I could find it in this document but I don't want to take the time of the House to look through it - was the principle that the restraint should be of such a nature that profits should not go up, and of such a nature were profits from the previous year should actually be cut into to the extent that there would be sacrifice not only on the suppliers of raw material or material to a manufacturer, of labour, but also on the part of the enterpriser himself, who would sacrifice some of the profit which he had been making in the previous year, and that's why the suggestion was made that any increase should be less than the cost.

But what are we talking about? We are talking about a Crown agency, I assume, Manitoba Hydro, which is not permitted to make a profit, which is bound to sell its power at cost. Well, the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie said he never said it. I don't know what he is rejecting, what he said, I am telling him that Manitoba Hydro is not permitted to make a profit and that Manitoba Hydro is bound to sell its power at cost, and I don't know whether he is disagreeing with my statement or not, but the other thing that he may be saying is that he's not suggesting the Manitoba Hydro rates be reduced, but surely he did say that. Surely he is saying that Manitoba Hydro rates should be increases, should be rescinded. Yes he is saying that, and this in the light of the fact that Hydro, which didn't have to do it but went to the Utilities Board and I assume it was at the request of the previous government and it probably came as a result of debate on the increases - it instituted a rate increase after certain studies and then it referred the rate increases for review by the Utility Board, which spent - and I don't think I'm far out of line - some half a million dollars for a report on rate structure, which reviewed all the Hydro financing and accounting and then came back and said that in the interval since the rate had been increased that it could foresee the need for another rate increase - which I think was some 14 percent increase - due to increased costs, and those increased costs are now known because we've had to borrow money for Hydro and we had to pay interest rates which were higher than those contemplated at the time the existing rates were set. So just what is it that the resolution proposes other than to force Hydro to operate at a loss? This was never contemplated under the Prices and Incomes Commission.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: . . . question? Is the Hydro operating at a loss under the present rate structure before the increase?

MR. CHERNIACK: Was it operating at a loss? I can't answer that question but I can answer that Hydro projected that it needed a rate increase in order not to operate at a loss. I think that's clear, and I'm certainly not speaking with any knowledge on this matter. This was nothing I've consulted Hydro about, but it is clear from the legislation, as I understand it, that Hydro projected that it was necessary to have a rate increase in order to pay its costs of which it was aware of that would come in the future, and as a result needed to put in the increase so as not to operate at a loss, and clearly the report of the Public Utility Board, after reviewing

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) Manitoba Hydro rate structure, was that you had better increase it, and I think that the report recommended an immediate increase over and above the existing increase as being one that would be necessary to prevent loss in the future. But we know, and I only know as much as anyone else who read the newspaper, that Manitoba Hydro has decided it would not institute the suggested increase in rates suggested by the Utility Board, believing that it could continue to carry on for some period of time before this was done, so that Hydro of its own accord made that decision.

Now, does the Liberal Party, as represented in the caucus in this House, say that we should now pass legislation telling private enterprise - I'm assuming Greater Winnipeg Gas Company or whatever gas company is operating in Manitoba - "we are forcing you to give up the rate increase which you carried out." Now let us remember that before they could put in their increase they had to go to the Utility Board. The government agency, the Public Utility Board, must have approved the rate increase that is being referred to in this resolution, as they are now suggesting, and I'm assuming the Liberal Party of Manitoba is suggesting, that we go to that private enterprise public utility and say: in spite of the fact that you submitted your rate structure to the Utility Board, in spite of the fact that the Utility Board approved of it, we are forcing you to cut back. And if that is what they're proposing, I would be prepared to consider that, as I think the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources indicated that might be a matter of consideration. It may well be that the best way to solve such a problem is to turn that private utility into a public utility and then it would be more within the control of government. But if indeed the Liberal Party of Manitoba is supporting that type of approach, and I believe it is from reading the resolution, then it is going far beyond what its counterpart in the federal scene is prepared to do. Far beyond that. And I would like to hear more from the Liberals of Manitoba as to what they're doing with the federal Liberals - I assume it's still the same party and that they talk to each other - to convince them to carry out that kind of program. I'd be very interested to hear that, and maybe we will discover that we have much more in common in policy than I thought we had until now. But I do not feel that we are, at this stage, ready in this Legislature to accept the concept that we shall bring in legislation rescinding gas rates and electric power rates that were imposed previously and submitted to the Utility Board, Public Utility Board, and received its approval, because, Mr. Speaker, I repeat only, I think this is a silly motion.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the Minister asked me a question and I waited until he was finished. Can I answer now?

MR. CHERNIACK: I don't remember the question but I have no objection if nobody else has, providing he ends it with a question so I could respond as well.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well he said, "Is the Liberal Party ready to support this sort of an action and support the government?" Well I think in the last few days the government have taken themselves out of the position where they can impose any sort of restraint on anyone, when they announce without reason, with no reasons whatsoever, they announce about a 30 percent increase in all fees to do with land title transfer, discharges, withdrawal of caveats, issuing of statements of claim. When they announce themselves a 30 percent increase across the board with no reasons whatsoever, they're the last ones to preach restraint to anyone else. So I don't see how -- (Interjection) -- Well you asked me if we were prepared to support you on this course of action, but I'm saying that you have destroyed yourself by the way you make increases yourselves. One was announced today about a 25 percent increase in the use of parks, without one reason. There wasn't a reason given. Just an increase. Is that practicing restraint?

MR. CHERNIACK: I knew I'd get a question.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Is that practicing restraint? No it is not.

MR. CHERNIACK: Now I can reply to the question. The honourable member asks whether that is practicing restraint, and I have to answer the honourable member by saying that the increase in fees which we have carried out is one that is in line with costs, and in my belief falls in accord with the principles set out in the Prices and Incomes Commission requirements as to the type of restraint that would be imposed. Now we made every effort to -- (Interjection) -- we made every effort to relate the increase to cost because, Mr. Speaker -- and I know that the Honourable the House Leader of the Liberal Party, unlike some other members, does have the courtesy usually to conduct himself in an orderly manner without interruption except with permission, so I feel free that he will not interrupt me.

MR. JORGENSON: I don't think that the Minister of Finance should talk about the Minister of Transportation when he's not here.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well it's nice to hear an amusing thought coming out of the Honourable Member for Morris. It's so seldom that he says anything that amuses me that I'm happy to have had that interruption, although it was completely unparliamentary and one would think that a person who had his training in two different Houses of Government would not have wanted in any way to break or even bend the rules of the House which he holds so dear. However, one can see that weakness. Now, I'm still answering your question. I'm saying that . . .

A MEMBER: This could go on all day.

MR. CHERNIACK: I'm saying that the fee increases that were imposed were in my opinion increase in fees related to cost of supplying the service and were not taxation, and if they were I would have to adjust to that and discuss that but I don't believe they were, and I don't see anything wrong with increasing taxation providing it has a good basis and a good program to carry it out. But the answer, to repeat my reply, the fee increases that have been carried out have been related to costs for the providing of the service, and in my opinion are in accord with the general principles of the Prices and Incomes Commission, and I repeat: we did not accept the basis or the plan in its entirety at all; on no occasion did we do that; and therefore I feel that we've acted in consonance with the position we took on this issue.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, just a moment or two on this resolution, and it's the kind of a resolution undoubtedly that one would like to be in favour of, and perhaps members of the caucus of the group that I represent have spoken favourably to it, but I find myself having to concur, by and large, with what the Minister of Finance has said today because not to do so would of course indicate a lack of appreciation for, in the first instance, the Public Utilities Board. Members of that board, as the Minister indicated, have reviewed the necessity for price increases past and present or the ones that have been projected for the future, as well of course within the management of the Hydro people or the Utilities people that are there. However, I, and I would want to indicate to him whether or not the Progressive position or the Conservative position makes much difference, I would be more interested in the general context of this resolution, that is the total supply of particularly power, and I tend to come down on that particular one rather than the question of gas rates because gas rates is somewhat more difficult for us in the Province of Manitoba to regulate and control, namely because we do not generate our own supplies, it is imported to us from other areas, but certainly in the question of our capacity to develop our own power we have it. And it's our indecision, or lack of decision, in pursuing vigorously and enthusiastically the power potential of this province that I would make a few comments to, that might well be, although may be stretching the outer limits or the boundaries of this resolution, but in my judgment have a bearing on the price or the rates of power that future Manitobans and present Manitobans will have to pay.

And I remind the House, the members, that it's been a long time, Mr. Speaker, since we have had the privilege of having the Public Utilities Committee before us. I think we called for them all during the last session but were denied that privilege of being able to examine the Hydro officials themselves with respect to their projections of future power that could be available or made available, and at what rates for Manitoba purposes. Also, as I've made on one other occasion, the general position that we now find ourselves in in the power field, having foregone, for the moment at any rate, the opportunity of exporting power - I believe we are on a net import basis. We import power, we do not -- I would ask the Minister to correct me, but I do believe that we in Manitoba now do not generate sufficient power for our own use and that we are in a net import position from time to time; you know, it . . . out, or at least will be in that position. If I'm not correct, the construction of the line, the current transmission line, that is currently being built to the south envisaged that it will be importing power from the southern, or our American neighbours, for a period of time until such time as some additional generating capacity is installed at Kettle, that we will in fact be in a totally self -- supporting ourselves sufficient position with regard to the production of power.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, it is my impression that the arrangements made with the United States for a link was one that was suggested quite some time ago, to make possible a north-south link such as the east-west links that have existed for quite some time, in order to create the power grid and in order to make it possible to exchange power rather than sell or buy power. As I understand it, the projection was that in the winter months it would be

(MR. CHERNIACK con t'd.) worthwhile bringing power from the States to Canada, and on the other hand in the summer months to send power from Canada to the States, so it's more a question of surplus powers being involved. I can't answer the direct question as to whether we are in a net import position. I don't believe we are at this state, but of course what the future holds in store is difficult

MR. ENNS: I accept the Minister's clarification. I think it is essentially correct, with this one very fundamental and important fact, that in that arrangement that was arrived at with our southern neighbours, our American friends, with the judicious use of power, it's because our demands are heavy in the summertime and lighter -- or heavy in the wintertime, lighter in the summertime, because of our capacity to produce our maximum amounts of power just in the opposite times, when water is flowing in the summertime as against storage in the wintertime, that it makes just for good economic sense to have this interchange of power going on.

There was, however, and I'm sure the members in this House, particularly such veteran members as the Minister himself and the Honourable the Minister of Labour will remember with what glowing enthusiasm a former premier of this Assembly, the premier previous to the current leader, Duff Roblin, referred to and suggested and held out the hope that there would be an abundant surplus of power generated that would have a very significant effect in terms of being a net dollar earner for Manitobans, for the people of Manitoba, and let's understand, let's be very clear that in this instance it surely would be welcomed by the members opposite; this is a public utility, the Manitoba Hydro, and that it's that aspect of it that concerns me most, that we have forgotten or we do not talk about that forward-looking position of being in a position to export power. We do not talk any more in terms of using the surplus power capacity that we have in the north, that we have already laid many millions of dollars in such places as Kettle, in fact we may even find ourselves not fully utilizing it, if not in the -- I'm not suggesting that we will not ever fully utilize it, but every year counts, Mr. Speaker, for us. Every year counts for us, Mr. Speaker, and it may well do what the resolution here, or may help to do what this resolution is trying to do, in the sense that it would enable to, if not rescind the rates because I agree with the Minister that that seems to be a most difficult thing to do to ever roll back the wheel of costs, but certainly to prevent or to make sure that the next rise in Hydro rates will not come about as drastically or as quickly as has in fact been suggested by the Utilities Board, who I believe are asking for an immediate 14 percent increase, and as the Minister indicated the - 14 percent - as the Minister indicated the Hydro Board at the moment has rejected.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am one who would of course want to stay within the full rules and ambits of the rules and the regulations of the House, but I did see an opportunity in this resolution, which the Minister of Finance calls rather silly, but I find that I would possible have to concur with his description of that resolution in the sense that it is perhaps not silly but unrealistic; unrealistic to suggest that we can roll back without regard to cost, without regard to the responsibility of those people who have charged or who have found it necessary to set up these rates, but I do support, and I believe the Member for Fort Garry spoke in a supporting vein with respect to this resolution. I support it from the point of view that we have lost, we have lost that forward progressive motion that we were in a few short years ago when we did have a Progressive-Conservative administration in this province, when we recognized that untapped potential in the north could be brought to bear and to the advantage of all Manitobans, and could help our industrial situation, could help our labour situation, could help our total environment throughout the Province of Manitoba, and unlike the shortness of vision on the part of the members opposite, who feel that unless the benefit is right there in their hands to be seen, like the immediate reduction of the Medicare premium or the immediate short term savings of an automobile insurance premium, or the immediate, you know, ta-da-de-da -- I think they are getting the message, Mr. Speaker. I don't think ta-da-de-da is unparliamentary.

But, Mr. Speaker, what we of course were trying to do, and, Mr. Speaker, what we obviously failed to do, what we failed to project to the people of Manitoba, was our sincere dedication to the utilization of our northern resources, and despite all the lip service that we hear from yonder side, and particularly from some of the members who are representing the north, the far north, whom we've often heard on many occasions speak about the need for the development of the north and so forth, and it never ceases to amaze me, Mr. Speaker, that they have failed to grasp or to be able to understand the sincerity with which we approached northern development, when we had the vision of harnessing the mighty Nelson and Churchill

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) Rivers for the benefit of the people of Manitoba.

So, Mr. Speaker, without belabouring the point any further, I would have to concur with the Honourable the Minister of Finance in stating that the resolution as it stands is unrealistic. I chastize the administration for not having allowed us the privilege of seeing or speaking to the Manitoba Hydro officials directly throughout the last session, and we are in the seventh week of this session and we have received no notice of when we will be able to meet with these same officials at the Public Utilities Committee. We have no first-hand information other than the very demonstrable indecision on the part of the present government in deciding what to do and how to move forward with Hydro Development in this province. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether my honourable friend would permit a question.

MR. ENNS: Certainly, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PAULLEY: I am somewhat confused at some of the remarks. Do I gather from my honourable friend that he is opposed to the resolution before us?

MR. ENNS: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I am opposed to the resolution.

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

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. PAULLEY: Could we have the matter stand, Mr. Speaker? (Agreed.)

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, this resolution is probably one of the most important ones that we have seen on Private Members' Resolutions in a good long while, and it's a very large topic which many of us are not too familiar with, and I include myself in that category. However, it is one that I have listened to a great many debates on, and speeches on, and argued about and heard stories about, and we are all waiting in wonderment to see whether in fact Mr. Benson in Ottawa is going to bring down his White Paper.

Now we haven't heard very much on a provincial basis and of course this is the reason, I presume, of the Member for Ste. Rose bringing in this resolution which, as I said, I think is an extremely important one and an extremely good one. I find myself in almost complete agreement with the resolution and have nothing in it -- there's very little that I might add to it. I think the categories of concern regarding the White Paper, the overall concern about the White Paper is that it has been introduced as an end in itself and it's being treated as an end in itself rather than a means to an end, because the policies on taxation, particularly these changes and reforms, are going to cause a basic change that is going to affect the social structure of our country. Therefore it is more than a means of raising money, more than an end in itself in that respect; it actually has an impact on the social structure of our country.

I think the comments that I would like to make would be in three categories; basically, the effects of taxation proposals on business; secondly on mining; and third, but not last, the effects on the social structure of the -- part of the social implications that it has with regard to people across Canada in various income categories.

With regard to business, I think it's important to realize that we are going to feel the impact from a business point of view more in Manitoba relatively than we are in other parts of Canada; in Manitoba because we have such a much larger proportion of our business that falls into the small category. The statistics indicate that across Canada and perhaps I can follow this fairly closely -- the contribution and importance of small business to regional economies as compared to the national economy is very pronounced in the differences. Areas such as the prairie provinces and the Atlantic provinces, which are in a transitional stage from a primary economy, have almost no large industries. This point is conclusively illustrated from the figures which are available from the DBS. Now in Canada, those termed as being small manufacturing firms employ 47 percent of the workers in Canada. Now it's 41 percent in Ontario but it's 68 percent in Manitoba. While small manufacturing firms paid 40 percent of the manufacturing wages in Canada, it's 32 percent in Ontario but 62 percent in Manitoba. While small manufacturing firms account for 41 percent of the value of goods shipped of their own manufacture, it is 36 percent in Ontario and 60 percent in Manitoba. And so we find that

(MR. CRAIK cont'd.) whereas we tend to deal in national averages, which indicate that 40 percent will be categorized as small business, we find that in Manitoba that's not true; it's probably 65 or 68 percent would be categorized as small business.

Now the importance is that the proposals in the White Paper would tax small business the same as it does large business; that is, at a 50 percent taxation, corporation taxation on earnings. Now this is hardly fair in light of the fact that at the present time small business has been able to survive and play its important part in Manitoba as a result of the lower taxation rates that prevail today. Again, the White Paper implications are that 60 percent of the businesses - that is the businesses that employ 60 percent of the people in Manitoba - would be imposed to double the taxation that they are now exposed to, and this has very, very serious implications for the economy of Manitoba at a time when we can ill afford to have a setback like this in the economy that's in a transitional or immature stage. Furthermore, the financing of small business much more comes from retained earnings than it comes from borrowed capital, and expansion of small businesses then take place on a much more self-sufficient basis than does large business. Large business has a tendency to borrow for capital expansion. Small business, on the other hand, has more of a tendency to grow through retained earnings. Now that in brief sets the stage for realizing the very serious implications that the White Paper has for people, 60 percent of the employed people of industry and business in Manitoba, being faced with the probability of a taxation rate which is going to more than double.

Now the second area that I mentioned that I think is critical, is mining. We find that where they indicated business is going to be taxed under these proposals at a rate of 50 percent, mining companies are going to be taxed at a rate which is roughly 57 percent, even higher. In addition to that, in areas where mining is beginning, and mining expansion is very important to the economy, those companies are going to be faced with the elimination of a three-year tax period, tax-free period, at the beginning of operations when they are writing off every heavy investment. Now you can look at many of the mines in Manitoba including the one that was announced this morning, and it falls in this category; that is, under the provisions of the White Paper, this mine in the initial three years of its production would under the previous system have been able to have a tax-free period for three years while it wrote off and compensated itself for the costs of exploration and development. Under the provisions of the White Paper this period no longer exists. I think the strongest argument against the three-year period is that mines have been accused of high grading in that three-year period and in fact loaded up their good ore in that period. This is, I think, probably very, very limited grounds on which to make the accusation. In fact, there is as much indication that under the provisions of the White Paper what mining companies would have the incentive to do is to high grade right through, because they would have to high grade in order to meet the same profit position that they had prior to that.

Mining in Manitoba is much more important to our present economic expansion than it is in the established areas such as Ontario. In fact you could say with a good deal of accuracy that mining development in Manitoba is at a stage now that Ontario and Quebec were in decades ago when the present mining laws that we enjoy were introduced, and they were introduced to provide the incentive to allow new mining companies to get moving in new territories. So we find that now in the area of mining and in the area of business, small businesses, expanding mining companies, which categorizes business and mining enterprises in Manitoba, are going to be hit harder, will have more of an over-all impact than the same businesses and mining companies or industries in Ontario will be hit.

There have been very good briefs presented on the topic of mining by the various provincial associations. I think it is worth putting on the record the breakdown of what happens to \$100.00 of earned profit, or \$100.00 of income for a mining company under the previous tax system and \$100.00 of income under the proposed tax system. First of all, if you assume under the existing tax laws \$100.00 you find that first off - and I'm quoting from B. C., British Columbia - the mining tax comes off first to the province and that would be 12-3/4 percent in British Columbia so you subtract that and you have \$87.00 left. Now you have a depletion allowance which has allowed extract of industries, the depletion allowance would be \$29.00; that brings it down to \$58.00. The \$58.00 you tax at a rate of 50 percent the same as other corporations, bringing it down to \$29.00. The net income then is the difference, which is \$29.00. Now the effective tax rate, the income tax, is 29; you add the mining tax, that's \$12.00, brings you up to \$41.83 before so that the percentage of income is 42 percent - that is the taxation

(MR. CRAIK cont'd.) works out to 42 percent.

Now, going through exactly the same categories under what's proposed it works out that the percentage of income that would be taken is 57. This means that mining companies which we're so dependent on for northern development would get an increase from 42 percent to 57 percent, or an increase of 15 percent in taxation. This is before there are any major changes of any sort to mineral taxation. This is money -- taxation money, income that goes to the Federal Government; part of it comes in mining tax to the province but a small portion of it only.

So with those two topics as a background, Mr. Speaker, I think that the resolution is well founded and obviously this is a very deep topic that requires the province and the members of the Legislature to take a much more extensive look at because it is a reform in taxation that we will not see except possibly once in an individual's lifetime or certainly once in every one or two generations. And it has very important implications.

The third area was the impact on the social structure of Canada and led to the conclusion that the taxation proposals had more implications from a social structure point of view than in fact they did on business and mining, and the concern that arises from the fact that when the Federal Government introduced the White Paper they first of all, their first statement was that there was going to be less taxation on people in the lower income bracket. The second statement was that there would be more -- or I suppose a simultaneous statement that there would be more taxation income from the high income brackets, all those over a certain point, and then the last thing that we found out was that in fact the winner of it all was the Federal Government who were going to increase roughly the annual taxation returns to the Federal Government by approximately \$700 million. So that by neatly pitting one income group against another income group, they were able to walk away with the marbles which added up to \$700 million and that's where we stand now. And this brings about the accusation that in fact taxation of individuals is being treated as a means, a means of money for the Federal Government rather than a means of establishing some social structure based on some over-all philosophy.

The basic question is: how much we should take from people in various income brackets. We know now that there is a sliding scale which will take anywhere from about 18 to 80 percent of a person's income, depending on the bracket he's in. That's what the argument is basically about, and what impact did this have on the incentives that people maintain; what makes them tick; what makes them work; what reward should they get for inventiveness, creativeness, energy and drive, and then we get down to a philosophical argument. Well, it's a very difficult answer to give, a very difficult argument to -- it's an interesting argument to get involved in but it's very difficult to find an answer. So you look for comparisons, and I must admit that I've been wondering for a couple of years what was happening in some other countries. And I was particularly interested to find, to discover what would happen, what sort of incentives were used in a country like the Soviet Russia, because we do have some history there of some rather extensive changes taking place over the last several decades. And in a recent issue put out by a technical magazine, I actually was able to find some statistics which can take a given category of people and actually compare them with North America.

Now, the category of people that they have taken have been engineers who fit into a social economic group, I suppose, and I think it's rather interesting to tabulate exactly the information that they have discovered in the survey. First of all, from a junior position which would be basically a university graduation position, to a position of director's level in their given profession, the multiplication of earnings was ten to one. Now this means that a young graduate would probably start out, if he was in a similar circumstance in Canada, would start out at a graduation rate of say, \$6,000 per year and in a multiplication of ten would end up at \$60,000 at a director's level. The information indicates that also in the Soviet Russia the set of incentives that have been developed to provide for the requirements they need to obtain from their technical people, that their income tax rate is 17 percent across the board. In other words, it's flat whether you're at the beginning level or you're at the high income level.

To give an idea, to relate the income at the upper income level the cost of a high quality new automobile is roughly three months' salary . . . rather than get into rubles. It's probably the best way it's compared, to a loaf of bread or an automobile or something of that sort. But the basic point I want to make is that out of a great deal of experimentation they have apparently discovered that an incentive plan is necessary to get productivity from people in this particular social economic group, and the incentive plan provides for a ten times to one ratio from

(MR. CRAIK cont'd.) beginning salary to a director's level, which would be roughly the top of the technical scale. Now in Canada -- I think first of all, Mr. Speaker, we'd have to agree that this is a pretty large carrot to put out in front of people in terms of a financial incentive; to multiply over that period, his life span, his income by ten times providing he wanted to avail himself of it through his efforts. Now comparatively in Canada, and I think this is the critical point, over the same period the same person would multiply his gross earnings by roughly three times or four times - let's say four times and be on the safe side - but his pay scale or his income tax scale would escalate from 18 percent to something between 40 and 50 percent, so that in final analysis the gain made would be roughly two and a half to three times multiplication over his working period. That means that a young person during his lifetime in Canada, with an input of initiative and incentive and drive to go from a junior position to a more senior position, could multiply or improve his position financially, at the most by two and half to three times. And the comparison is that in the Soviet Union the multiplication factor would be roughly ten times.

Now I bring these comparisons in because the argument that we keep being confronted with is that we must tax people on the ability-to-pay principle. So the question is: What is the ability to pay? Who has the ability to pay? And the answer is that it's always the fellow next door because it's never you or me or anybody else that happens to be in close proximity. But somehow we seem to think that there's somebody there who has the ability to pay and all the time we're doing this, attempting to level out through taxation of individuals, we're defying the fact that in over-all terms that a taxation philosophy is necessary. It's not just a matter of taking money from people as legislators and our members of parliament should be looking at it, it is a case of grasping and selling a philosophy of taxation, not just a means of bringing more money into the Federal Treasury or into the Provincial Treasury. Because the fact of the matter is that somewhere between this free enterprise system that started all this business of inflation, and the socialistic countries - I'm not sure we can call it that; perhaps the Communistic countries where there's been control completely of their incomes - we've crossed one another in the dark some place, and we find that individuals there produce, through a financial incentive system that is far greater now than ours is, still we find a vast segment of our population insisting that there is a group in Canada, whether they're 10 percent of the population or 15, who have the ability to pay and that we must get that group - and of course it's a great fallacy; it's just not a point at all. It's a good emotional argument, but in terms of a basic taxation, over all taxation philosophy, it's a fallacious argument, unless it can be proven to the people that we want to put on an income basis everybody at the same point, and of course it has been tried in other parts of the world and it hasn't worked; and if they have come to our basic position, then there is good reason to think that we should try and preserve some of what we have.

Mr. Speaker, with those words what I wanted to make was a slight amendment to the Member for Ste. Rose's motion that it would take into account the sociological implications that are in here as well as the economic. So I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Morris, that the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose be amended by striking out all the words beginning with the last "Whereas" and adding thereafter the following:

"WHEREAS wide-ranging basic social implications are involved in addition to economic factors;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House consider the advisability of establishing a Special Committee of the Whole House for immediate study of the entire matter and the presentation of a non-partisan recommendation to the Federal Government."

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Swan River, that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this for the Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I rise to participate in the debate on this resolution with

(MR. MACKLING cont'd.) pleasure. The Honourable Member from Assiniboia has had a degree of success in thinking in advance of some of the positive measures that a responsible government would consider and I have to say and compliment the honourable member that he's been doing some pretty fair second guessing some time.

In respect to this resolution as honourable members know, there has been considerable thought given to this matter across the country and I would like to indicate that when reviewing the question of the age of majority as it relates to the rights and responsibility of infants, one must consider the following categories:

1. The whole area of contract through the acquisition and disposition of property.
2. The right to consume alcoholic beverage. The right to operate vehicles, motor vehicles.
3. The whole question of the right responsibility that attaches to persons who assume the responsibility as executors, administrators, and trustees.
4. The whole question of the right to litigate an action in court including the responsibility of an infant in tortious action.
5. The whole question of the acquisition of domicile.
6. The question of the school leaving age, parental responsibility in respect to minors. The economic opportunities of minors and the whole question of the legal age of marriage.
7. The next area is the whole subject of voting privileges and rights. The right to hold public office, a question which honourable members recall was dealt with at the last session of the Legislature.
8. The question of criminal responsibility which should be pointed out is not really a topic that can be considered or should be considered when the Legislature wishes to consider the question of the age of majority because in many respects some of these things have been decided for many, many years.

It can be pointed out that the following jurisdictions have already considered the age of majority. In Ontario the report of the Ontario Law Reform Commission 1969 recommended that the age of majority, or the age at which a person is no longer a minor should be 18 years of age. But in so doing it did not make recommendations concerning the age of majority and contracts as they felt further study should be made in that area. The reasons given for recommending the age of majority being age 18 were:

1. In a judgment most young men and women of this age are capable of managing their own affairs.
2. In practice they do manage their own affairs. And
3. That such young people wish to be independent and to participate in society as adults.

The second jurisdiction that's considered this matter recently, the Province of British Columbia. It had considered passing legislation, and has enacted legislation which has the effect of making the age of majority in that province 19 years of age for all purposes. Our neighbouring province to the west, the Province of Saskatchewan, has recently considered legislation which has been enacted by that province which will permit a person to attain his or her age of majority at age 19. In the English Parliament based on the report of the committee of the age of majority 1967, or better known as the Lakely Commission Report, the Commission recommended that for all purposes the age of majority be age 18; and, in fact, passed legislation in 1969 which permits a person attaining full age on attaining age 18 instead of the previous age, 21.

At present, for all intents and purposes, the age of majority in Manitoba is age 21. One can, however, point out the following exceptions to this rule:

1. A person may marry without the consent of his or her parents once attaining age 18.
2. Under the Wives and Childrens Maintenance Orders Act a parent is only responsible for the maintenance of his or her children until they attain the age of 16.
3. A person may obtain a learner's permit and license for operating a motor vehicle once they attain age 16; and
4. The permissible age for leaving school in Manitoba is presently age 16.

As I've already indicated, Mr. Speaker, this Legislature at the last sitting, last session, enacted legislation permitting young men and women at age 18 to stand for office and to be elected to this House and enact laws.

The probability of a young person being in a position to stand for office, and in fact, be accepted by the electors for office, may prove such a formidable difficulty for most young

(MR. MACKLING cont'd.) people that this may not happen, but it's conceivable this would happen. I think the position of this Legislature is therefore that we now have a law in this province which permits young people at age 18 to vote in elections in this province, to stand for office and to be elected, to enact laws covering every aspect that this Legislature can deal with under the British North America Act. That is a very broad spectrum of law, I think therefore the lady and gentlemen, honourable gentlemen in this Legislature, face a situation which is somewhat clear-cut. Now there may be some serious reservations in respect to some, in respect to some particularity of the implication of the change that was brought about. But let me remind honourable members that no one, no one in this House at the last session rose at any time during Law Amendments Committee or when the bill was reported in this House, to object to the major amendment which was made to that legislation permitting the reduction from age 21 to age 18 in the Manitoba Elections Act.

Similarly, Mr. Speaker, when our Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs considered the exhaustive recommendations for amendment to the Municipal Act, and the Local Authorities Elections Act, no one in either of those committees -- and they were very substantive committees composed of, as I recall, at least 19 members of this House -- no one that I recall during the course of the committee meetings, raised any objection to the basic recommendation. As a matter of fact, the amendments were made unanimously recommending changes in the Municipal Act and the Local Authorities Election Act to provide for young people, young men and women to stand for office and to vote in municipal elections at age 18.

I wish also to advise the House that a good deal of publicity was occasioned on the announcement of the decisions that were arrived at by the Legislature at its previous session and the resultant amendment of the Elections Act to provide for young people to stand for election to office at age 18, and I for one, have not received any advice from any of my constituents to the effect that we erred, nor do I recall anyone making representation to the Municipal Affairs Committee which considered the matter and there was I think some fair publicity in connection with those further considerations of the Act, and no one that I recall, and my recollection is fairly vivid, made any representation to the committee in respect to this matter. I think, therefore, that there has been abundant precedent and the position for this Legislature is made relatively clear. I would also like to indicate that there are numerous reasons which one can give for supporting age 18 as being the appropriate age. However, it is to be pointed out that whatever age one picks, be it 18, 19, 20, 21 or even age 25, there will be people who will state that "you are going too far" and others will state that "you are not going far enough". It is to be pointed out that there is no magic about age 21 except for historical purposes and this age is really no longer relevant for our times.

I think that I would like to refer at this time, Mr. Speaker, to a quotation from the Lakely Commission Report, and I take the quotation not from that report, but again it was a quotation embodied in the report of the British Columbia Liquor Enquiry Commission which considered this whole question of age of majority in relationship to the problem they were considering in respect to the age at which a responsible person or persons should have the responsibility of purchasing and consuming alcoholic beverage. Comments of the Right Honourable Lord Gardner who is Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain, were taken from his address received immediately prior to his being conferred an Honorary Degree of Laws at the instance of the Law Society of Upper Canada, and I quote from Lord Gardner's speech to the Law Society of Upper Canada: "The Act" - and Lord Gardner is referring to the Age of Majority Act in Great Britain, "The Act also reduces the age of majority for all purposes including that of marrying without anyone's consent from 21 to 18. What happened was this - I'm a very old member of the Labour Party but I never had any personal political ambitions but merely help the party when required through the Society of Labour Lawyers. Some years ago at the request of Mr. Gatakill who was then the Leader of the Labour Party, I became Chairman of the Youth Commission and thought that I had better remind myself of our Law under which no one under 21 can own property or obtain a mortgage or give a valid receipt. He may be a pop star earning \$10,000 a year with a wife and two children, but he cannot make a valid Will unless he is a soldier on active service. I looked to see why the age was 21 and not 22 or 20, but the books gave no answer to this problem. So I asked my clever friends in the Universities but they also were unable to tell me. I therefore had to go back to history and back and back until I came to a period when the age of majority depended on your social class. The peasant's son came of age at 15; the merchant's son when he could count pence and measure cloth, and it was only the knight's son who did not

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) come of age until he was 21. But why did the knight's son come of age at 21? Why not 22 or 20? And then I discovered that the answer was that all these three tests were purely practical. The peasant's son was not going to learn any more after 15; the merchant's son was a practical test and as this was the period when armour has never been so heavy before and was never to be so heavy again, they found that until he was 21 the knight's son could not sit on a horse with all that weight of armour and wield a great lance as well.

About 200 years later the tendency in English laws always being to assimilate to that of the upper classes, the judges decided that the age of majority should be 21 for everybody and having decided that they sank back exhausted, and it is literally true to say that neither House of parliament has ever considered whether 21 is the appropriate age today nor has there ever been an enquiry into what the age should be. One of the first things, therefore, I did as Chancellor was to appoint a committee with a young divorce judge with a teen-age family of his own as chairman and five men and women of considerable experience of young people, who heard evidence on the subject for two years and produced a unanimous report saying that there had to be an age, that whatever age was chosen would be too old for some and too young for others, but that they had no doubt that on balance the right age at which young people today ought to be treated as responsible was 18, and we have since agreed to parliamentary votes at 18 as well."

(MR. MACKLING cont'd)

Now I think that the words of Lord Chancellor Gardner are extremely relevant and interesting. I want to go further, Mr. Speaker, and say that in addition the Lakely Commission on page 20 of that report gave five main reasons for choosing age 18 instead of age 19, and these are as follows:

1. There is undeniably a great increase in maturity toward that age.
2. The vast majority of young people are in fact, running their own lives making their own decisions and behaving as responsible adults by the time they are 18 years of age.
3. Those of our witnesses, and these are witnesses to the Lakely Commission, who seem most closely in touch with the young, say that 18 is the age of which it is not only safe to give responsibility but undesirable, if not dangerous, to withhold it.
4. This is the age at which, on the whole, the young themselves seem to reckon themselves of age. Giving reasons supporting this point they point that an important factor in coming of age is the conviction that you are now on your own, ready to stand on your own feet and take your weight off the aching corns of your parents, fully responsible for the consequences of your own actions. We think that given responsibility at 18 they would rise to the occasion, but as a soufflé the results of waiting too long might be as disastrous as acting too soon.

Eighteen is already an important watershed in life. Among the reasons that they point out are, and some of these are applicable in Manitoba as well as in England. Liability for armed service when there is conscription; applying for a commercial pilot's license; driving a car; a motor bike. In a sentence they say at 18 young people nowadays already become emancipated for many purposes of their personal and private lives and are free to order them as they will. And I'm given to understand, Mr. Speaker, that in excess of 60 percent of our young people when they have attained Grade 12 standing and therefore approximately 18 years of age, do not continue in higher education but join the ranks of the commercial and industrial sector of our society.

Perhaps the most important consequence of changing the age of majority from age 21 to 18, in my opinion at least, will be in the questions of contract, the right to consume alcoholic beverage, acting as executors, administrators and trustees, the question of litigation, the whole question of the right to enact a valid will and so on.

Dealing with the question of contracts. Presently the law as it now stands makes an infant only responsible for contracts for necessities. These are clothes, loans for school education, and it could be pointed out here that already the age barrier has been broken down by the student loans provided for by both the Federal and Provincial governments to students who are in need of such financial assistance. Of course those who object to lowering the age of majority will point to in this field as the one where people under age 21 will be taken for a ride by the sharp door-to-door salesman or sharp operator selling cars, clothes, items that are appealing to young people at heart. However, one can be quick to point out that the young people between the ages of 18 and 21 in many cases are more capable of looking after their own interests than many young people long past the present age of majority. I certainly note, Mr. Speaker, the fact that we have in this province extensive consumer protective legislation and that by and large the young person of today is much more able to appreciate the techniques and the vicissitudes of our modern society. They have been exposed to a far greater range of educational media.

Considering the question of litigation. The main problem here, of course, is the question of whether an infant is responsible enough to conduct his own affairs when he is suing or being sued. Presently he must sue by way of his best friend and if sued his defense is put forth by his guardian ad litem or the official guardian so as to protect his interests. Again as with the question of contract, it is a question of the infant owing up to the responsibilities of entering into certain obligations. If they are of age to drive a car and work etc., then certainly they should be of age to be responsible for their conduct in such affairs as well as to be responsible for protecting their interests, whether he be a plaintiff or a defendant. And the question of whether a person is 18 or age 21, in my opinion at least, at this present stage of the social development of our society, does not make a person more responsible for overseeing such litigation.

The question of drinking alcoholic beverage is where the mood of the public opinion is most important. As we all know the Winnipeg School Board has just in recent weeks expressed its opinion on this topic and stated that it felt age 18 was not the proper age for allowing people

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) to drink. My only comment on this point is a personal opinion, and that is that if we are going to lower the age of majority to age 18, which I think we should do at this time, then it must be lowered for other things and for all things, the right to drink alcoholic beverage included. It could be pointed out that it is not so much that the infant should be prevented from drinking or that anyone should be prevented from drinking, that is the important point. It is the education of our population as a whole as to the effects of excessive drinking, and age is no barrier when it comes to the necessity to educate people as to the consequences of excessive drinking.

I think there are many arguments, Mr. Speaker, that can be advanced in respect to the whole problem of young people who have been put in a very difficult position of having alcoholic beverage readily available and yet being prohibited from consuming it. I'm not suggesting that I advocate any increase in the consumption of alcoholic beverage, not at all. But I think that this will make for far more responsible attitudes on the part of people between the ages of 18 and 21. I could go on at some length, Mr. Speaker, but I'll try to determine my remarks . . . (Interjection . . . four minutes) Thank you very much. -- very quickly.

I've left the question of executors, administrators and trustees to the conclusion of my remarks because this is a field which I personally can least anticipate the effect of reducing the age of majority from age 21 to 18. It is here where people of young age may become suddenly administrators of a large estate. But of course it should be pointed out that laws such as these are not to be passed for the minority but with an eye to what the responsibility of the majority should be. It is in this field where an obvious anomaly in the law as it now stands becomes apparent. Persons under age 21 cannot construct his or her own Will. However, should that person be a member of the Armed Forces then not only can a person die for his country but he can also be responsible for making his own Will. This points to the fact that presently in Manitoba a person can vote, belong to the Armed Forces, leave his parents' home, work for his own living once he has reached the age of 18, he can be compelled to appear in adult court to face charges brought against him and yet he is not responsible for the consequences of many of his actions. Of course in considering this litigation or in considering the suggestion that the age of majority be lowered from 21 to 18, one must accept the fact that there are certain people who by instinct and by perhaps their own ignorance of the capabilities of today's youth, are very much opposed to permitting an infant to be responsible for the consequences of their acts. However, one could be quick to point out that with today's modern means of communication, higher standards of education and the great mobility of today's youth, the standards of past generations are no longer applicable to our present generation of young people.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude my remarks by reminding members of this Assembly that it is not a question of advancing the rights and opportunities of young people alone, concurrent with the granting of rights becomes an acceptance of responsibility, and I think I am in favour of the argument that concurrently with the giving of rights there will be an acceptance of responsibility on the part of youth. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that in many societies there has been a recognition that an early granting of responsibility in certain areas has been a very positive force in developing a better and fuller understanding of our modern society.

With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I recommend highly to this Assembly the acceptance of this resolution and indicate, Mr. Speaker, that not only will we consider the advisability of the import of the resolution, but shortly I anticipate that the legislative draftsmen will have readied this bill for introduction. It has been under active consideration long before the Honourable Member for Assiniboia placed his resolution on the Order Paper and I want to assure him that we have been acting very responsibly and in reasonable haste to make sure that this legislation is in accordance with the highest standard.

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

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

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

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if this might be a convenient time for you to call it 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER: It's been a most interesting afternoon. I would hate to adjourn it prematurely; however, if it's the wish. It is Friday.

MR. PAULLEY: That's right.

MR. SPEAKER: I call it 5:30. I believe we require a motion today.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs, Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the House do now adjourn.

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