

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, May 31, 1972

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements; Tabling of Reports; Notices of Motion.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Before we proceed to introduction of Bills I would like to draw the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 60 students of Grade 6 standing of the Oakenwald School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Sawchuk and Mrs. Fitzpatrick. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

We also have 70 students of Grade 6 standing of the Harrow School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Hanna and Bayduik and Mrs. Holenski. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Arthur. On behalf of all the honourable members I welcome you here today.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills. The Honourable Attorney-General.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. A. H. MACKLING, Q.C. (Attorney-General)(St. James) introduced Bill No. 65, an Act to amend The Landlord and Tenant Act; (Recommended by the Honourable Administrator of the Government of the Province of Manitoba)

And Bill No. 75 an Act to amend The Companies Act.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Selkirk) introduced Bill No. 73, an Act to amend The School Tax Reduction Act. (Recommended by the Honourable Administrator of the Government of the Province of Manitoba)

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Education)(Burrows) in the absence of the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation introduced Bill No. 67, The Museum of Man and Nature Act. (Recommended by the Honourable Administrator of the Government of the Province of Manitoba)

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson) introduced Bill No. 60, an Act to incorporate Transcona Country Club;

And in the absence of the Member from Crescentwood, Bill No. 74, an Act to incorporate The Native Alcoholism Council of Manitoba.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. JEAN ALLARD (Rupertsland): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege as a member of this House. First I would like to thank you for the speed with which I was given a seat when I decided to change my seating arrangements. On the other hand, I am denied at the moment a privilege that exists for all the other members of this House and it is this one every visitor in this House is led to believe that sitting in my seat is a blank. That, Mr. Speaker, is not the kind of rumour -- now, Mr. Speaker, that is not the kind of rumour that I want to leave sitting around too long, and I want to nip it in the bud. Every visitor in this Legislature is given a seating plan of where the members sit and in this chair there is a blank. I am afraid I don't want to see this continuing.

Under the present employment circumstances when there are so many students that are unemployed it would seem it would be a particularly rewarding task for one student to spend his time correcting the existing form and either writing in or stamping in my name. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: This is the question period. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Inkster): Yes, Mr. Speaker. On the point of privilege I wonder whether it wouldn't be considered to be a part of the extra curricula activities of the honourable member if the forms were given to him and he could make the corrections in order that there is no blanks . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I shall take the matter under consideration.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Opposition)(River Heights): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I have a question for the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder whether he can inform the House whether the government intends to go into the auto shredding business?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I do believe it's a policy question.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I'll frame the question another way. I wonder if the Minister of Industry and Commerce could indicate to the House whether the government is negotiating for the purchase of an auto shredding . . . company.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture)(Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the members would agree to give leave to allow me to issue a statement.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Can we have agreement? The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, there is a provision in the rules for the issuance of statements and I don't know why the members of the Cabinet cannot make those statements at the appropriate times. I have no objection to the honourable member getting leave to revert to a motion in order to enable him to make that statement, but I would much prefer if they would make those statements at the appropriate time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: On that same point of order, Mr. Speaker - that was a point of order - it is really not my preference to make it, but I'm afraid the members opposite may feel that the privileges of the House have somehow not been complied with because of a press conference that was held only a few moments ago. So it is for the benefit of members opposite.

MR. SPEAKER: Do we have unanimity? (Agreed) The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce to the House that at 2:00 p.m. today - copies are . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Would the page pick up the copies. Thank you.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce to the House that at 2:00 p.m. today, the Province of Manitoba signed an agreement with the Canadian Dairy Commission to enter into the Market Share quota system. This is a supply management system for industrial milk and cream and gives Manitoba a fair share of the national market for dairy products. This agreement gives Manitoba the opportunity to double its production of industrial milk over the next three years. This opens the market for additional dairy sales of \$4 million to Manitoba producers. Representatives of Alberta and Saskatchewan officially entered their provinces into the agreement at the same time, joining Quebec, Ontario, and Prince Edward Island, in the program. This means that over 90 percent of the production of industrial milk and cream in Canada is now included in the Market Share quota system. The agreement in addition to the expansion of Manitoba's share of the market protects the producers of this province from further loss of subsidy eligibility quotas retroactive to April 1, 1970. The authority to administer the plan is vested in the Milk Control Board of Manitoba. The agreement in my view will effectively reverse the trend of declining milk production in Manitoba and will improve the viability of processing plants.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, the Minister's statement reminds me of the story of the 14 year old boy on trial for his life for murdering both his parents, pleading for mercy on the grounds that he was an orphan. The statement of the Minister would not have had to be made were it not for the Dairy Commission setting the quotas in the first place. If farmers of this country, dairy farmers in this country had had the opportunity to supply the market that existed in this province, as they should have had the right to do, there would have been no need for making this announcement; no reason to believe at all that the dairy farmers of Manitoba are reluctant, or incapable, or do not lack the desire, to produce the milk and the dairy products that are required for this province. They are able to do that, and perfectly willing to do that. It is only when governments interfere with the normal market channels that they are denied the opportunity to provide for a market that exists in their own area, and naturally we do not quarrel with the increase in the share of the quotas for dairy farmers in the province of Manitoba. It is a share of the market that is rightfully theirs in the first place and should not have been denied to them by government action a few years ago. We are always

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd) amused by the government when they stand up to make statements about how they are doing such wonderful things for people; things that they would not have had to do in the first place had they left them alone to carry on their normal obligations and pursue their normal occupations. The government's statement is welcomed naturally, but it's one that should have been unnecessary in view of the circumstances.

MR. SPEAKER: We now go back to the Oral Question period. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD -(cont'd)

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Premier. Apparently there was an inaccurate statement made that the Pensioners' Home Repair Program would be extended to the end of May. Because of the confusion that has been caused by that statement, would the Premier give consideration to extending the program to the end of May?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I am aware that as the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie suggests, there was a rather, shall I say, misleading report in the - at least one of the papers that I happened to see, and that this did result in a number, quite a number of phone calls on the part of persons interested in the Winter Works Program. However, Mr. Speaker, I have looked in Hansard on page 2405, last Monday's Hansard, and I see that in reply to the question that was asked by the Member for Souris-Killarney in the first place, that my reply was quite clear. That I indicated that with respect to projects of Pensioner Home Repair already under way, that these would be allowed to be completed beyond the May 31st deadline, but I also made it very clear that with respect to applications that came in after the deadline of the application date deadline, and that the work which had not yet been commenced, that the answer is no, and I find that set forth in a very clear way here in Hansard. So accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the most obvious course of action is to simply advise those who do call, or inquire, that applications not yet made certainly cannot be approved now, but will be held pending the decision as to the continuation of a Pensioner Home Repair Program next fall and winter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder if he can inform the House whether the government has given the Board of Directors of the Manitoba Development Corporation instructions to purchase an auto shredding business?

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

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, the honourable member, regardless of the particular question in hand, is asking a matter of internal administrative procedure.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I understand that honourable members would be interested to know that the Blue Room is being kept open from 10:00 a. m. to 7:00 p. m. today, tomorrow and Friday inclusive, so that members who wish to express condolence on the death of His Royal Highness the Duke of Windsor may be able to do so by signing the Condolence Signature Book. It was felt that this announcement would be of interest to honourable members.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I would like to go back for a moment, and just direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture so far as the Dairy Commission and the quota system is concerned. Have we now got an agreement with the three prairie provinces and with the Federal Government that we have representation on that commission?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the representation of that commission is not changed.

MR. WATT: Then there has been no pressure on the Federal Government outside of the regional representative Mr. Coxford in the Province of Manitoba that was set up when I was the Minister - there has been nothing further established since that time.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Would the Honourable Member ask his question. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. PETER ADAM (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Acting Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I have an urgent call from the Husavick area about the level of Lake Manitoba, and I would like to know how much water is now coming into Lake Manitoba

(MR. ADAM cont'd) from the Waterhen River and the Portage by-pass; and I would like to know how much water is going out at the Fairford Dam; and now that the crest has passed on the Assiniboine River will the by-pass be closed; and what is the present level of Lake Manitoba at the present time?

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I would thank the honourable member for the courtesy of giving me notice of this question. The amount of water coming into Lake Manitoba through the Waterhen River is now approximately 6,000 cubic feet per second. The amount of water coming into Lake Manitoba through the Portage by-pass is nil. The other question --(Interjection)-- there is no water going through the Portage by-pass. The other question: how much water is going out at the Fairford Dam? I'm advised by the Water Control Branch that 5,000 cubic feet per second is now moving through the Fairford Dam at this time, and we are taking steps now to remove certain stoplogs to increase the flow to 8,000 cubic feet per second by June 1st. Another question was: is the by-pass -- now that the Assiniboine crest has passed is the by-pass, the Portage by-pass, closed? The answer is yes and it has been for some time, Mr. Speaker. The last question: the level of Lake Manitoba at the present time. I'm advised as of today, May 31st, the level of Lake Manitoba is 812.25 feet.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister for Northern Affairs. Could he inform the House as to why the bureaucracy which is running Leaf Rapids have not allowed, or encouraged, a grocery store to be opened at this time?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister without Portfolio.

HON. RON McBRYDE (Commissioner of Northern Affairs)(The Pas): Mr. Speaker, the Leaf Rapids Development Corporation does not come under the responsibility of the Commissioner of Northern Affairs, and I'm not positive - I imagine the Minister of Mines and Resources is the correct Minister to direct the question to.

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I will look into the matter, but my latest information is that steps are being taken - it's part of the development process at the Leaf Rapids townsite to provide adequate grocery store facilities if that is the expression to be used. Construction is proceeding as quickly as possible in order to provide all the facilities necessary for the people in the Leaf Rapids community.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, in view of the reply of the Minister I would ask: would he not encourage some free enterpriser to get in there to serve the 45 families who have to go 65 miles for their groceries?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. Order, please.

MR. EVANS: . . . Mr. Speaker, as I indicated to the honourable member I am going to look into the matter but I'm quite sure, quite certain, that the families don't have to go so far to obtain groceries. I'm quite certain that arrangements are being made to fly in supplies, obviously.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is there, or how would a person make application to get a business at Leaf Rapids?

MR. EVANS: Yes. Mr. Speaker, instead of -- well instead of a private developer in this case we have a public developer, namely the Province of Manitoba through the Leaf Rapids Development Corporation. It's a publicly-owned community development corporation; it has a general manager whose offices are in the Power Building and application can be made at any time.

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

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Has any area been rented to any business person in Leaf Rapids? Any space been rented to any person in Leaf Rapids, business person?

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

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable members are now asking me very detailed questions. I know . . .

MR. BEARD: . . . detailed question, Mr. Speaker. Has any space been rented to any business, or any person, in Leaf Rapids?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I believe the answer is positive, and certainly the mechanisms do exist for space to be leased, or rented, to any interested party or individual.

MR. BEARD: A subsequent question. What was it positive yes, or positive no?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, if it's in order, and I'm not sure that it is, but if it is in order I believe I could give some information that would be helpful, and to the point of the last couple of questions. Certainly the policy has already -- the decision has already been taken with respect to how matters pertaining to application for the rent, or lease, of space that might be required by any entrepreneur that would be wishing to set up a business, retail business, or service business, of some kind or another, could be handled, that is to say the applications received, considered, and decisions taken. As the Minister of Mines and Resources has indicated that mechanism already exists. It exists in the form of the Leaf Rapids Corporation and those that are responsible for its administration and operation.

I would ask the honourable member to bear in mind that at any time in the incipient stages of the building of a town, whether it be Thompson or Leaf Rapids, there is always in the very initial stages some difficulty with respect to the decision-making as to what particular physical areas shall be made available for industrial retail purposes, etc., but that is precisely what is under analysis and consideration by the Leaf Rapids Corporation administrators, and applications definitely are at the present time being received by the Leaf Rapids Corporation and decisions will soon be taken.

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

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Acting Minister of Mines and Resources. Can he indicate whether the transcripts from the Manitoba Water Commission will be available for tomorrow's meeting of the Public Utilities Committee?

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'm not in a position to indicate.

MR. CRAIK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Inasmuch as it was indicated about May 5th that they would be available within one week, can these not be made available now?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I have tried to impress upon the responsible officials that we would be very appreciative of obtaining the transcripts of these public meetings as soon as possible for anyone who would be interested in reading them, and I'm advised that any holdup is strictly a technical holdup, and we would be on this side of the House just as anxious to receive them and read them as members opposite.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary. Can the Minister explain to the House why it should take three months for the printing of transcripts?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day. The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I have two questions for the Attorney-General. The first one is: when can we expect the transcripts of the hearings of Rex Grose in front of the Commission Inquiry into CFI?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, in answer to that I expected that I would have been able to have announced their having been provided in the Legislative Library but it's a question of about \$7,000 for the cost of one copy of this transcript, and I wanted to get a return of a set of this transcript so that we wouldn't have to make another copy. That I hope we'll be able to do shortly and have it there. If not then we're going to have to incur the additional expense.

MR. BOROWSKI: The other question, Mr. Speaker, has to do with the recent apprehension of two Americans who were caught smuggling currency into Manitoba. Does the law provide for free legal aid to people who are not Canadians if they make application?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, in answer to that question the Attorney-General's Department has a responsibility to prosecute all cases of individuals who happen to have found themselves in violation of the law while resident, temporarily or otherwise, in the Province of Manitoba, and concurrently there is an assumption of responsibility to provide defense counsel for those cases where incarceration is likely to be the result if conviction occurs, and that is true for anyone who is so charged.

MR. BOROWSKI: Just for clarification, Mr. Speaker, do I take it to understand that free legal aid will be given to anyone whether he's Canadian or foreign, who commits a crime in this country?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, where someone is charged with an offense that is likely to lead to conviction, if conviction occurs, then it is incumbent upon us to provide a legal --

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) or a defense counsel. That is presently the case, has been the case for some years under the provisions of maintenance of legal aid under the Law Society, and I trust will continue to be the basis, and of course no one qualifies for legal aid unless they are unable to afford counsel. Now if they've made sufficient money on the counterfeit money, I would assume that they would have the money for their own counsel.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID R. BLAKE (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, thank you. My question will be to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder in view of his absence from the House for the past couple of days, if he can inform us if he has been successful negotiating any sales for buses during his trip to the recent Transportation Convention in Washington?

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this particular trip was not to sell but to learn of new ideas and techniques which will enable Flyer Industries of Manitoba to diversify its product line. I can advise the honourable members that there are one or two very interesting prospects.

I'd also like to advise honourable members that we have had an opportunity to meet with Mr. Jean Luc P  pin the Federal Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce in Ottawa, and the Honourable James Richardson, to discuss federal financial assistance for research and development in a continuing program to support and enable the expansion of Saunders Aircraft Limited. As you know the Federal Government of Canada has decided to support the aircraft industry in Canada, and we have taken the opportunity to remind them yesterday that Manitoba has a thriving, budding, young industry that's going to give jobs to people in rural Manitoba and I'm sure the honourable member opposite would be . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. I do believe that . . . Order, please. Let me state that the Oral Question Period is for questions and for information. If the Honourable Minister wishes to make a statement there's a heading underneath our Routine Proceedings where he can make that. The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Mr. Speaker, at the risk of eliciting another speech from the Minister, I would direct it to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder if he could now tell us if the sale of the five aircraft that he announced last January to the United States from Saunders Aircraft has now been completed?

MR. EVANS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. My question is for the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Has the government received any offers for the purchase of the dormant machinery at John Bertrand Plant at The Pas?

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

MR. SCHREYER: We have here again an example of a question which asks a very specific question as to particular firm or brand of machinery that has been bought. How could anyone in reason anticipate that it would be possible to answer a question of that specific a nature without the courtesy of notice or in written form.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia. The point is well taken.

MR. PATRICK: Was the equipment at John Bertrand Machinery Plant at The Pas sold to Manitoba Hydro, and what did Manitoba Hydro pay for it?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, it was indicated in this House some time ago that it is true that there is consideration being given to that subject matter just mentioned. It was also indicated clearly at the time that if and when it is possible to make an announcement it will be made, and not a day sooner.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (BUD) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs as the Minister reporting for Autopac, and ask him why advertisements for a Claims Manager for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation offering a salary between 15 and 19 thousand dollars annually are appearing in the Toronto Globe and Mail and not in the local Winnipeg newspapers?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: They're presently appearing in the Toronto Globe and Mail and not in the Winnipeg papers due to the fact they did appear at one time in the Winnipeg newspapers. They had not been successful in obtaining response, and it would be a waste of money to repeat the advertisements which had earlier appeared.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry. Order, please.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will advertisements in the future for officers of this type be offered to Winnipeg and Manitoba newspapers on a competitive basis at least with other parts of the country?

MR. PAWLEY: . . . the honourable member had not apparently heard my remarks. The ad for a claims manager had appeared in the Winnipeg papers.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I'll direct my question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture - I'm not sure whether this is the proper Ministry to direct it to. If not, someone else could probably take it. Could the Minister indicate under what Federal or joint Federal-Provincial program do farmers qualify to secure trainee help paid for in part from public funds?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I think I'll have to take that question as notice. I think it involves my department, but it involves Manpower people at the federal level as well.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, the question is for the Minister of Agriculture. I wonder if the Minister would be able and willing to give us copies of the details of the agreement with the Canadian Dairy Association, and perhaps as soon as possible?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Yesterday I asked him if it was correct that the province had withdrawn assistance insofar as the control of perennial and noxious, that is deep-seated weeds you know we're talking about . . . and so forth and I wonder if he's got an answer for it today, and if he could tell me why the province has withdrawn their assistance.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I did take this question as notice yesterday and an answer will be forthcoming.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: I would like to direct a question to the First Minister. Since it has been announced by the member of his government, which is also a member of the Hydro Board, that the cost of the 850 level diversion on South Indian Lake is now less than the combined costs of the diversion of Lake Winnipeg, plus the cost of the 854 diversion of South Indian Lake, why this undertaking was not done many years ago?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the . . . The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the fault may be mine or it may be the honourable member's. I am not suggesting that it's necessarily his, but I fail to catch the whole import of his question.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the importance of the question is \$100 million in case the First Minister is not aware. The statement was made by the Member for Radisson, who is a member of the Hydro Board, that the cost at 850 on South Indian Lake was less than the combined cost of Lake Winnipeg regulations, plus the regulation of South Indian Lake of 854 feet.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. --(Interjection)-- Matter of privilege? Order please. Does the Assembly wish me to run their meeting? The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, I did not state that the cost of the diversion of the Churchill River to 850 level is less than the combined cost of 854 on Lake Winnipeg regulation. I stated that the diversion and the Lake Winnipeg regulation is less than the cost of the 854.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would attempt to answer the question of the honourable the Member for Riel. He is well aware of the cost calculation comparisons that are

(MR. SCHREYER) cont'd) charted and graphed in the Manitoba Hydro Task Force Report and in supplementary, or subsequential reports. The data is there for him to see. He may not agree with the data, but it has been calculated in a way that is satisfactory insofar as the advice we have received is concerned, and when the Honourable Member for Riel puts forward a figure of \$100 million, I reject that figure with contempt.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I would ask as a final supplementary, whether or not the government might take under consideration the facts, or announcement, given by the present member of the Hydro Board which made that statement and the statement is on tape.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour on the point of order.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour)(Transcona): I believe it should be well known, if it is not, that it is beyond the competence of any member of this House to question any statement made by any other member of the House outside of this House. The only proper question --(Interjection)-- It depends on whether you understand Beausiesne or not, but I doubt whether you do, but, Mr. Speaker, this has been a matter, this has been a matter that has been the subject matter of consideration on numerous occasions and you, Sir, have issued --(Interjections)-- you're a dead hatch. You have on numerous occasions, Mr. Speaker, indicated the type of questions that are proper during a question period. The only possible question for the Honourable Member for Riel is whether or not that is government policy, and no member of this House has to answer inside of this House to the questions as proposed by the Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I do think the point is well taken the question period is for eliciting information, not for debate, or matters expressing opinions contrary to what another member may have said. I think if we all follow the procedures, we'll probably get through this period as well.

The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Agriculture. He took the previous one as notice, and when he does reply, would he also indicate at that time where a person would apply for such assistance, and also whether this is a continuing program.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

HON. PETER BURTNIK (Minister of Transportation)(Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, several days ago the Honourable Member for Assiniboia asked a question which, or two questions which I took as notice. One was whether the Manitoba Telephone System has purchased 90,000 shares in Teleset Canada. That is quite correct. This took place between December 17, 1970 and March 1, 1972.

And he also asked a question as to how many of the 35 ground satellite stations that will be built in Canada, will be built in Manitoba. The information I have here that Teleset Canada has located one mainland station at Belair, Manitoba, and this station is presently equipped to receive and transmit television. In addition, Teleset Canada has located one smaller receiving station at Churchill, Manitoba, and this station also is equipped to receive television.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for his answers. I have a further question. Will any electrical work for the Teleset stations, will any of this work be done in Manitoba?

MR. BURTNIK: Mr. Speaker, I couldn't answer that at this time but perhaps I can give you an answer to that later.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. I have to preface my question. A very large number of . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Briefly.

MR. PATRICK: There's a large number of writers of fiction in technical books reside in Manitoba. Has the Department of Industry and Commerce consulted these authors and local publishers as to the possibility of printing and/or in publishing some of these books within the province.

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I can just assure the honourable member that the Department of Industry and Commerce and this administration is doing everything that's possible to increase employment and job opportunities, including printing activities in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: I wonder if the Minister is aware that even the Red River Community College has . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I do believe that I've indicated that awareness on a Minister's part is not a necessary procedure.

The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. ENLARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. A question I asked many weeks ago, and to my knowledge I have received no reply. My question was: has the Minister done anything, or requested the Canada Manpower to continue the date of March 17 for assistance to farm help? The question the Member for Rhineland was asking. To my knowledge I've have no answer on that. I'm wonder if the . . . ask for the extension.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member is debating the question. Would he place his question.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to again ask the Minister of Agriculture, has the Minister requested the Canada Manpower to extend the date from March 17 to a further date for assistance in people seeking employment on farms? My supplementary question is, how many have sought employment through this program on farms in Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I was of the opinion that that matter was cleared up but I'll have to take it under advisement again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Mr. Speaker, my question would be to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the Minister responsible for Autopac. Could he inform me, and as well the House, that in view of the ad placed in the local newspapers for a Claim's Officer in the salary range from 14 to 19 thousand dollars a year. Did they not receive any applications from Manitoba and was this the reason they placed it in the Ontario papers?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think I should go into a little detail on this question. The ad was placed in the local papers quite some time back, and I'll be glad to provide members across the way with the copy of the same once I have obtained it. Bit it was some time back - there was response, but there was not the type of response that would result in the fulfilling of that position. And I'm sure that all honourable members in this House are interested in an adequate job being well done, and once the response is not such as to achieve that object as a result of advertising in this province, I'm sure that nobody would object to obtaining adequate assistance elsewhere.

MR. BLAKE: . . . question, Mr. Speaker, Among the applications received, were there not several applications from former insurance agents and former adjusters among those?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think that we have been very successful in hiring pretty well all adjusters in this province who have applied for positions with the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation, that had applied.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: I'd like to direct a question to the Attorney-General. Will the funds be now released to assist the South Indian residents to hire legal assistance to assure their rights will be protected?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: I don't know to what funds the honourable member makes reference.

MR. BEARD: Is it correct there is some \$50,000 worth of funds left over from the allocation from two or three years ago?

MR. MACKLING: I am not aware of any funds being left over. The honourable member may have information that I haven't got.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, my . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Subsequent? The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: Would the Honourable Attorney-General kindly look into it and perhaps ask the First Minister if there are not funds available, the funds are still available?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, this is the first indication from anyone in this House of any concern in that matter and of course I'm always interested in the observations of the Honourable Member from Churchill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the First Minister. When a member of the government bench is appointed to be a legislative assistant should it be part of his duties to supervise a poll for the NDP members?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek is referring to a legislative assistant, I would say that certainly there are no greater restraints on him than there would be on a member of the Cabinet, and certainly I'm not aware of any restraint whatsoever so far as the member of Cabinet, or of a caucus, being free to spend time canvassing in an election campaign if he is able to do so. And I rather suspect that some honourable members opposite are doing likewise.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. As a legislative assistant, should he not be working continually for the taxpayers instead of a party poll?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, there is no difference whatsoever insofar as the time that might be spent on campaigning in election as between a minister, a private member, or a legislative assistant. Certainly if it were otherwise, then how could one justify the Premier of the province, or Prime Minister of a country, or the Leader of the Opposition, jetting from one part of the country to another campaigning.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the First Minister. I wonder whether he can indicate to the House whether legal counsel will be provided for the residents of Southern Indian Lake and paid for by the province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I believe that same question has been asked of the Attorney-General.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The question that was asked . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. There is no point of order in demanding an answer. Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Public Works. I wonder if he could tell us, or the House, what the total number of computers owned by the Manitoba Government and its Public Utilities - the number owned by the government or the Utilities.

HON. RUSSELL DOERN (Minister of Public Works)(Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I believe that's a subject of an Order for Return.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, in view of the crisis in the Greater Winnipeg area regarding the canker worm attack on 25 to 50 percent of the trees in the area, I direct my question, I think, to the Minister of Agriculture. Can he indicate whether there is any co-operation or communication between the Provincial Government and the Metropolitan Government for control of this?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the government being the representative of the people of Manitoba, I'm sure that every opportunity is made available to anyone requiring that kind of assistance.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. The proposed minimum wage increase announced by the Minister the other afternoon - is farm labour affected by this increase.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: My answer was given some days ago when I made the announcement. The answer to my honourable friend will be found in Hansard.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. McKELLAR: I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. In the advertisement for a Claims Manager, did you advertise in the Saskatchewan papers?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. ALLARD: Mr. Speaker, on a point of clarification on a question to the Attorney-

(MR. ALLARD cont'd) General. I'm just trying to make sure - has he agreed to tell the House whether funds will be made available, or whether funds will be released, funds that were already --(Interjection)-- Well if they did not exist, then the question that now exists is: will funds be made available for the residents of South Indian Lake to protect their . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is asking a question which is basically supplementary to that asked by the Member for Churchill. I can say that I am not aware that there is any residual of monies left from some year, or years gone by. It may well be that there was an appropriation which if it were under current account would have lapsed with the end of that fiscal year. If there is some amount that was not under current appropriation but rather in some special fund that did not lapse, whether it be monies made available by the Crown directly, or by a Crown agency such as Hydro, I do not know. Certainly that can be checked. Insofar as whether or not it will be intended to provide for ways and means to provide the local people of Southern Indian Lake with legal counsel and advice with respect to questions of damage compensation, their own direct interest and advice thereon, the answer is affirmative, affirmative. There will be monies available for legal advice for that purpose, for that specific purpose.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to try another question on the Minister of Public Works. Is it not a fact that the total computer utilization of owned, computers owned by the government and its utilities, is less than 20 percent of its full capacity.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I doubt that. I do know that there is a study being undertaken to best utilize the computers that we have available, and I know that the purchase of the new computer is being studied. But in short my impression is that the present computers that are running are in fact being used to full capacity.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance. The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: In view of the answer to an earlier question by the Minister of Agriculture, I wonder if I might direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, whether the botanical expertise of his department might not be made available to the Metropolitan Government to assist in the canker worm crisis that is now evident in the Greater Winnipeg area.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance)(St. Johns): I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Arthur on another oral question.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to just follow up my colleague, the Member from Riel on his question about the problem of the trees in Winnipeg - could he not get advice from the tree pruners that they brought in from the arid wastes of Saskatchewan to the Province of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, if members opposite would extend a little courtesy to this side from time to time, they might get better answers. The Honourable Member for Riel . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I have very great difficulty hearing the questions and the answers. I wish the members would co-operate. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, a question answered is usually answered in the way it is put, and that is my usual response to members that don't want to show some respect to the members on this side. If the Honourable Member for Arthur or the Honourable Member for Riel want to know something from my department, then I would hope that they would be reasonable in their questioning and the Honourable Member for Arthur and Riel should know that the services of any government department are available to all people who need those services.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance. In view of the unhappy and angry response of Mayor Juba to his tax relief plan for Winnipeg, is there going to be consideration given to sweetening the pot so to speak?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, the minute we get onto Estimates, I will be able to deal with it more extensively, but let me say at this stage I have not received any angry response from the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question to the Minister of Finance then. I wonder whether he can indicate whether the Unicity Committee that met with him indicated the formula that they thought should be applied with respect to the mill rate equalization?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, the minute I get this motion passed on Supply, I will be able to deal more extensively with matters in relation to the question asked.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, might I direct a request to the Minister of Agriculture then since he has now responded - as to whether or not his department cannot offer their services to the Metropolitan Winnipeg agency which is dealing now under Mr. Martin Benham with the problem facing Winnipeg?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, we do have a Minister of Urban Affairs through which I would hope any representation on the part of the City of Winnipeg would be made, to my department and we're prepared to undertake any suggestion that might be reasonable.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: May I say that as soon as we get into my estimates, then a question along those lines might be asked. Therefore I am prepared to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I thought I was going to get the flag too.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Logan in the Chair.

. continued on next page

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 115 (a) The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs. Order please. The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, possibly Committee would like to hear some response to the number of contributions made yesterday by various members of the House. I would like now to try to deal with various aspects that were raised yesterday. May I first say, Mr. Chairman, that I had an opportunity to look briefly at the two daily Winnipeg newspapers issued this morning and I'm quite appreciative of the fact that the newspapers felt it their responsibility to print charts to give information to the reading public about the government proposals.

May I say though I'm somewhat disappointed that they did not give the specific information that I had prepared for each municipality, because personally, I thought it would have been of interest to the residents of Winnipeg to know how the calculations applied to each municipality. Nevertheless information was given and no doubt more can be and possibly should be given. May I point out that in the Winnipeg Free Press, there was a chart published of the comparative figures for combined school and municipal mill rates. One column provides the increase and decrease in mill rate due to equalization. In that case they showed the decreases in brackets, but they did omit to show the largest decrease of all - which is the decrease that applies to the former City of Winnipeg, what is now known as the Inner City - \$1,401,039.50 is not shown in brackets and should have been shown as being a decrease, equivalent to 4.04 mills which should have been shown in brackets, and I assume that the Winnipeg Free Press will have located its oversight. Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Roblin spoke with some vehemence yesterday and misquoted me again in saying that I said there would not be any increase in cost at the time of unification - that's a false statement. I propose to discuss that further. It's a statement which was also stated by the Member for Assiniboia both yesterday and previously, and if the Member for Roblin was quoting or using as his authority the information given by the Member for Assiniboia he must now know that he should not rely on him for information. Now one point that he did make - he said, why didn't the province say that it would be contributing 75 percent of the cost?

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the Honourable Members wish to conduct meetings, I wish they would go elsewhere and do them, instead of in the Chamber here when an honourable member is speaking. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: It is correct that the province stated that it would - or I stated on behalf of the province that the province would be contributing two-thirds in the first year; one-third in the next year. On review and reflection and consideration that formula has been increased to the benefit of those taxpayers affected by the cost of equalization, and the Member is right in saying we did not say it would be 75 percent; the fact is we said two-thirds, which is 66-2/3 percent and we have gone a little better than that. I don't know - I think the Honourable Member for Roblin joined the Honourable Member for Emerson in talking about using Manitoba monies for the City of Winnipeg. I think that that attitude was adequately dealt with yesterday.

He also quoted me as saying that the proposal would create equality for all of Manitoba - I never made that statement. I was dealing with the City of Winnipeg and I was talking about equality within the City of Winnipeg - so again he misquoted me.

Now the Member for Assiniboia - and I excuse the Member for Roblin because he hasn't been listening quite as much to the debate that has been going on; and he may have been listening to mis-statements of others, and I certainly excuse him for his mis-statements. I do not excuse the Member for Assiniboia about the statements that he made in quoting this government. But before that he asked the question - which was asked I think by the Member for Charleswood earlier - what will happen in 1974? And I have to answer the Member for Assiniboia by saying that in those former municipalities where the mill rate has gone up due to equalization, what will happen at the end of the program of contribution by the province will be that those municipal ratepayers will be equalized where they were not equal before. And that is one of the purposes of equalization, to create an equalization for all of the City of Winnipeg; which means that certain areas that were overpaid for services are being helped, and those who were underpaid are being paid. And the Member for Fort Rouge had occasion last year to speak along this line - and if you will recall she supported the bill although she disagreed with various aspects of it - she said that the people, and I'm not quoting her directly,

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) but I'm speaking now from my memory of almost a year ago where she said that the people of the former City of Winnipeg were paying costs that they should not have had to pay; that there was an inequality - and she supported the bill because she felt there should be that equality created, and that's exactly what we have attempted to do.

I also note that the Member for Assiniboia when he was asked more than once what he thought was the role of Headingley in the City of Winnipeg - should it or should it not be within the boundaries of the City of Winnipeg - he waffled on the answer, he ducked the answer. All he said is they should pay less because they are not getting the same services - and the question may then be, suppose in one area there is garbage pick-up three times a week and another one once a week - should they pay less? And does he then want even within his own area in Assiniboia, to start measuring the benefit return, house by house by house, and fixing different mill rates. The answer is nonsense. But the true answer is he was not prepared to, and maybe didn't feel competent to express an opinion as to whether Headingley ought or ought not to be within the City of Winnipeg borders. I expressed an opinion - it wasn't government's opinion - it was my own; but the Honourable Member for Assiniboia either doesn't have an opinion or doesn't want to state the opinion, and I say that after having given him several opportunities to answer.

And now he's talking possibly of local option which means that we ought to ask the people in Gimli - and I don't know why I picked Gimli, except it just came to mind - whether or not they want to be in the City of Winnipeg. If the honourable member as an elected representative for at least ten years doesn't have an opinion on proper planning of city boundaries, then I don't know where he's been in the last ten years and I don't understand his failure to have an opinion and to express it. But all he says is let them make the decision. Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't think that's adequate enough, but it obviously is adequate enough for him. I would point out that areas such as Headingley or any area which does not receive the same amount of service as do certain portions of Winnipeg are certainly assessed on the basis of value of their land; if they don't have the services their assessment obviously is lower, and when the assessment is lower in the end they pay less taxes - that should be a rather obvious statement.

Now the Member for Assiniboia, was either quoted by or is quoting his Leader who is busy out now electioneering - who in today's newspaper is quoted as saying, stating that the province's formula is "total betrayal, a withdrawal from a very clear commitment". And I don't blame the candidate for Wolseley from the Liberal Party - he hasn't been here, he hasn't listened. Maybe he can't read - and that may be the problem of the Member for Assiniboia too, because he actually produced a document and he couldn't read it; or if he could read it, he couldn't understand it; or if he could understand it, then he must have willfully refused to explain it. So, Mr. Chairman, I have dug up some copies of this - I would ask the Pages to distribute them to all members who will be interested in seeing what it is that we said a year and more ago. This is a pamphlet, a brochure which was distributed at every community committee meeting and it's the one from which the Member for Assiniboia purported to read the policy of this government as stated at that time.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I believe it is so well stated that I should read it into the record so that if other members want to know just what was said it will be in the record of Hansard; and I start in the inner portion which deals with - starting with the heading "Equalization of Mill Rates":

"The urban area is a social and economic unit. Most of us live in one municipality, play in another and work in yet another. It's only fair that the costs of providing services should be shared equally across the whole area - that way, if one municipality has a large industry which pays large taxes, everyone will benefit from it. After all the industry employs people who live in all municipalities and sells its products to residents of the whole community." And then the next paragraph is quite important, and possibly I should read it to the Member for Assiniboia rather than rely on his reading it to himself - and I'll read it to him: "On the basis of raw actual 1970 budgets the effect of tax base equalization would have been to produce a reduction in the mill rate for 80 percent of the people in the Greater Winnipeg area" - rates in eight municipalities would have gone down or would have gone up - nobody has challenged the correctness of that statement.

Then the heading goes on - "Provincial Government Help for local Taxpayers" - When the entire community shares equally in all the resources of total area, inevitably some areas will find that their mill rates when equalization comes into effect will go up. The reason for

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) this is either that these areas, about 20 percent of Greater Winnipeg's population, have (1) enjoyed unequal benefits in the past as the result of unequalized assessments; or else (2) that their standards of service to their areas have been very low. In order to cushion the impact of any increase which results from equalizing previously unequal assessment, as in (1) above the provincial government will subsidize such increases in mill rates during the first two years after unification, two-thirds of the increase in the first year, one half of the balance of the increase in the second year. The province will also help to lower mill rates throughout the Greater Winnipeg area through additional payments through grants in lieu of taxes."

I'll depart from the reading for a moment to indicate that we have indeed already paid the first installment on the additional grants in lieu amounting to some one and three quarter million dollars - it will end up as more once it's calculated. I might say that we have already paid some or undertaken to pay in reduction of the budget of the City of Winnipeg some \$850,000 in additional monies that we felt that we could justify in making payment and thus reduced the budget, and may I now refer to a newspaper comment which quoted the city as having asked for \$7-1/2 million. The time they asked for \$7-1/2 million, which was their total, their calculation of the total increase was before they set the mill rate, before they set the mill rate we were able to indicate to them a million dollars in additional revenue they had not provided for. We also indicated this \$850,000 additional revenue which the province granted to them, and thus reduced their increase to some \$5-1/2 million.

Now I go back to the test. "Throughout the years" -- and I wish the Member for Assiniboia would listen because I found that he doesn't read very well -- "Throughout the years there has in nearly all parts of the urban area been an almost automatic annual increase in mill rates. These increases have been the product of many factors ranging from rising standards in services, increases in wage levels, increases in the cost of living, and so on. These factors continue to operate and exert an upward pressure on tax costs. Through the equalization of mill rates however an effort is being made by the government to control and moderate this rate of increase, and at the same time to provide a better quality of services and better value for the citizens' tax dollars." Mr. Chairman, what person can read into this a statement that there would not be an increase in taxation for the people of the City of Winnipeg? What person who understands English could possibly read that kind of a statement into this, into this pamphlet? We talked about the fact that there are rising costs year by year; we talked about the fact that equalization would provide that these factors operate and exert an upward pressure on tax costs, and we said that through equalization an effort is being made to control and moderate this rate of increase. Now does that mean reduce? If it does to the Member for Assiniboia then he must use a dictionary as well as his head in trying to understand what was said.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, the Minister asked me a question. I would like to answer it. It did mean that to the Minister, or the Chairman of the Finance Committee of the City of Winnipeg; it did mean to the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg, and it did mean to almost all the municipality mayors when the amalgamation bill was before the House. It did mean that to them.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, may I say that, and may I suggest that if the Member for Assiniboia is correct that that is what this meant to the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg and the Chairman of the Finance Committee of the City of Winnipeg, I can only say that either they have the same inability to understand as the Member for Assiniboia, or they deliberately -- possibly like the Member of Assiniboia -- want to draw a red herring across the situation for their own purposes. And I say that unequivocally that, if that's it. But the fact is that the Member for Assiniboia was waving this document around. He wasn't talking about what the Chairman of the Finance Committee of the City of Winnipeg thought, he waved this document and quoted from it as if to say that that is what this document said, and it's not true, Mr. Chairman, it's not true. And I do believe this: I do believe in the honesty and integrity of the Member for Assiniboia. I do believe that he would not wilfully misquote a statement, and I do hope that in view of the fact that I have pointed out to him the full reading of this, and that it is not the way he interpreted it, that he will stop misquoting. But if he insists on continuing, then all I can say is that my faith has been misdirected.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Assiniboia is still justifying what he said on the

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) basis of what somebody else said. And I'm just asking him, please read it, understand it, and then if you continue to make the statement, bear in mind that what you're saying is incorrect and false.

Mr. Chairman, I want to touch briefly on the Member for Sturgeon Creek. I hadn't quite finished dealing with some of the matters he spoke about. He talked about gradual unification, and that's the word I wrote down so I assume that's what he used. He says the Boundaries Commission Report cited nine cities but he said if there were five, if there were four, a slow and gradual one, and I don't know whether he actually suggested that it should in the end end up as one. --(Interjection)-- Well I'm told that he did, and he says he didn't, so I'll just assume that he meant a gradual unification. To me that would be the most foolish approach to try and to develop what is right. If you know what is right in the end, then painfully achieving that end over a long period of time will only help to increase costs, step by step by step, and we of course debated that last year so I needn't develop it further.

The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek also talked about our school tax rebate program for 72; the \$50.00 is a hoax because he said the school boards will use up the money. I can only tell him that the same people who elect him, elect the school board that operates in his area. If he has no more faith in the people in the school board that are elected by his constituents, then I must question their ability to elect their member of the Legislature by the same rationale. I believe, and I accept the fact that elected people assume their responsibility and take it seriously, and until proven differently I will continue to have some faith, not only in democracy generally but in the electors of the area of St. James-Assiniboia.

Now the Member for Emerson is not in the House but he talked again about the \$50.00 rebate. He still tries to get to know what is the percentage of urban residents who will receive the \$50.00 rebate; what is the percentage of non-urban residents, and the Premier made a guess of 50/50, and I suppose he did that on the basis of Manitoba's population. As far as I'm concerned the rebate is going to individual taxpayers who pay school taxes regardless of where they live, and regardless of whether they're urban or rural. That's the important thing. It's not the percentage of geographic location, it is the question of who is to receive it, and it is the individuals.

Yes, yes, yes, the Member for Sturgeon Creek on page 2478 of Hansard stated and I quote: "Let's say that we have seriously looked at the situation of amalgamating this city in a gradual scale, and I am not so narrow-minded to think that we couldn't have come to one city." So he did say that. He's not that narrow-minded. So he did say that. And therefore I say that the way we did it made more sense than the way he proposed it, a gradual step by step building up of the problems.

Now again the Member for Emerson made quite a fuss about mill rates and suggested that I had given him the 1971 mill rates. I'll put on record, since he's not here, the information I have, which may be in error and if it is we'll correct it, but the information I have for a residential taxpayer in Sprague, which is what he was talking about, is that in 1971 the Foundation Program mill rate was nine mills; the special levy was 68.7 mills; the municipal mill rate was 19.9 mills, which adds up to me to 97.6 mills. 1971. 1972 -- I gave the figures. Foundation levy 8.4, the special levy 64.2, the municipal mill rate 22.7, total 95.3 mills. What do we find? This year in Sprague there was a drop in mill rate of 2.3, a drop. And the member last year - I don't recall his making this kind of a speech that he made this year - he was talking about increasing costs, rising costs. I'm not saying that 97, or in this year, 95 mills is not a great deal. Of course it depends on the assessment of the land, but I'm not saying that it's a great deal. But the fact is it's less this year than last year, and he was relating the two. So I thought he'd like that information. --(Interjection)-- Pardon?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister has five minutes.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I can conclude this portion of my remarks by bringing to the attention what came to my desk yesterday in a routine way and that is a quotation -- a news clipping from the Globe and Mail of May 27th, 1972, dealing with Toronto's municipal taxes, and I'll just quote excerpts. "The city hall began churning out the biggest tax bills for Toronto homeowners in the city's history with an average increase over last year of \$91.50 on each residential property. For the public school system supporter with a home assessed at \$5,000, the total property tax will be \$525.75." I had someone check out what it would be in the Winnipeg area. I find in the City of Winnipeg the \$5,000 assessed home would have a tax of \$372.00, and a resident in St. James at that assessment would have a tax of \$357.00, and the

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) members opposite are the ones who keep talking about Manitoba having the highest taxation in Canada. And if they look at a person who had owned a \$5,000 assessed home and think of what the difference in income tax is, which is what they scream about, as compared to Ontario and Manitoba where it's admittedly higher, and look at just the municipal and school mill rate in Toronto where the difference between St. James and Toronto, St. James \$357.00, Toronto \$525.75, let them not forget that kind of a difference when they talk about taxation in Manitoba. The mill rate, the residential mill rate in Toronto 105.15 mills, up 4.95 mills from last year. And that's where they have a metropolitan form of government, and again I don't have Hansard at hand - I'm under the impression that the Member for Sturgeon Creek sort of wished he was back in the days of a metropolitan government as compared with what there is now. So, Mr. Chairman, I feel that members opposite are doing what they interpret as the role of the opposition and that is to criticize and complain, and they have a right to do that, but I hope in the end that the people, particularly in the City of Winnipeg but generally in the Province of Manitoba, will agree that we are going forward again in building a better community with greater equality within the City of Winnipeg.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I do wish to make a few comments in connection with the Department of Urban Affairs and the subject matter that we have been discussing for the last several hours. I was interested in the remarks made by the First Minister yesterday and also the Minister of Finance. I think the statement by the First Minister that the legislation passed last year was forward-looking and that this was a centralization program. No doubt this was a centralization program. We united all those various municipalities and suburban cities into one.

And I was also particularly interested in the Minister of Finance's statement that efficiencies would be made. This statement, Mr. Chairman, I question very greatly. Not only question it, I think that experience has shown us that this is not the case. Wherever you have centralization taking place the costs have increased. And we can go on and bring in evidence to that effect. Look at the Health Department when we centralized, what happened? Look at the school situation where centralization of administration took place and the increased costs that have resulted over the years, it's tremendous. The same in the welfare system. Costs increase, and they're still increasing. There's no limit to the amounts that are being spent and will be spent over the coming years because once we centralize the control no longer rests with the local people and therefore they are unable to control the costs. So that as a result we have these increased costs taking place. The incentives to economize are lost because once you centralize the cost is spread over the whole area and that even if you try to economize in certain areas it won't benefit the people locally who make those economies and therefore the incentives are lost and this is why you have increased costs.

I think we already have an indication that the police brought into the new Unicity plan that the costs went up, that the salaries were raised to the highest level, and no doubt this will later on apply to the fire department and to the other services that are being provided. In fact because of what happened to the increases given to the police some of the people in the fire departments of the suburban cities did complain. I have spoken to some myself, and they thought it was unfair if they are raised, the level for salaries in one area, the others should have the same right to these same increases, and what about it? I would like to hear from the Minister on this. How can they justify or how can Unicity justify this situation? I think if the money that has been poured into the centralization programs, and other departments that I mentioned such as Education, and Health, and so on, if that had been poured into the system where local people -- under which local people would have control, the costs wouldn't have nearly risen to what they are today, and I think the services could be just as good, or better, than what they are today. Centralization doesn't mean better services at all. I still feel that the people who are in administration, and the more local you can make it, the better. Certainly in my opinion centralization does not save money but that the reverse is true that it costs more money.

And now we find that we are having payoffs. Last year before the Act was finally passed, a payoff was made to the former Mayor of Winnipeg and that the elections were made at large. Originally this was -- the Mayor was to be elected by the council, but the payoff came before the bill was finalized and the mayor was going to be elected at large. Now we find another payoff in that the City of Winnipeg is getting additional money. The Minister just stated first a million and three-quarters in lieu of taxes, another 800 in additional monies was handed to them.

(MR. FROESE cont'd) This represents roughly \$5.00 per capita, Mr. Chairman, and I asked the Minister of Municipal Affairs the other day whether they were not going to increase the per capita grants. But there was no response. The other municipalities in this province are not getting any increase in the per capita grants but the people of the City of Winnipeg are getting additional grants, and I don't, I don't subscribe to this. This is just another carrot that was hung before the people just so that centralization should be more palatable to them when it was brought in.

The program that is promised in addition to the amounts given in lieu of taxes, and the 800 additional, \$800,000 additional, we find that another 75 percent is going to be paid in the first year and the difference of rates for relief purposes 50 percent the second year, and 25 percent the third year. Mr. Chairman, on what basis can this be justified? How can you justify 75 percent one year, 50 percent another year and 25 percent a third year? That's going to hurt just as much the second year and the third year, and the years after that. On that basis, if you're going to try and accommodate these people, how was this arrived at? On what basis is it being made? I think there should be some logic in this make-up and I fail to understand what logic is being used because I'm sure that the costs will not be less next year for the citizens of Winnipeg. Most likely it will increase as stated in this pamphlet, and this is the first time I see it, last year it wasn't distributed to members of the House, and it's the first time that I read some of the remarks printed in that paper, and certainly we also have from the sheets that were passed out, the information given by the Minister, the statement of fact that increases in mill rates have gone on practically every year, except in years where special grants are made by the government in respect to school costs. So that in those particular years the mill rate may have fallen back. But other than that, increases have been taking place generally, and no doubt this will continue, as the statement was made a little earlier, too, and so that a 50 percent next year will probably have only half the effect of the 75 percent this year, and no doubt the 25 percent will be a very small amount in the third year because by that time costs will have increased further. Although here again we're dealing in percentages and so that the amounts that are going to be required - is the calculation going to be made each year as the situation arises or are we going on calculations that are presently before us? Are the 75 percent, and 50 percent, and the 25 percent, going to apply on the figures that are before us, or will they be using the figures of next year and the following year?

I certainly feel that we are by this action discriminating against the other areas in this province. Brandon for one last year, large amalgamation took place, and I'm sure there was many people hurt in Brandon as because of what happened there. What is the government doing about them? No consideration is given to those people, and I feel that if it's justified in one place it should also be justified in another area. And I would like to hear from the Minister whether consideration is being given to Brandon and the people there that are going to be hurt.

I notice the people in Cornwallis Municipality had a very low mill rate up till now, and I am sure that many of them must have very large increases because of what took place last year and because of the portion that was amalgamated from Cornwallis Municipality into the City of Brandon.

In a way, I am presently surprised about the reaction on this side of the House to this whole measure because some years ago when the unitary system was brought in, the same thing applied, and some of the divisions were hurt quite badly that wouldn't accede to the government plan. Either you had to go along with what they wanted, or you were short-changed, you wouldn't get the assistance. Now we have the same thing happen again. It's another program of centralization; you have to go along in order to get the additional amounts. And now we have a reaction taking place by some of the members on this side that wasn't there when the unitary was brought in. But I rather like the reaction because I think it brings home the points that I tried to make over all those years that the principle was wrong in that we should be treating our citizens on an equal basis.

Mr. Speaker, these were some of the points that I wanted to raise, the carrot of three and a half million and one half million is in the Estimates. Where is the other two million going to come from? Is it going to be taken out of the capital voted under the 42 million in Capital Supply, or will the Minister bring in supplementary estimates to cover the additional 2 million that is needed? I think when we're still in session we should have the additional amounts taken care of and approved by the House so that it needn't be done towards, or some other way of financing, so that members would have a right to vote on the issue.

(MR. FROESE cont'd)

Once more I want to firmly state that I take exception to what is being done. I think if we are going to assist these people, we should be assisting other areas in Manitoba as well. When I look at the literature, or the statements, passed out in connection with Bill 55, it's very interesting that as far as the farmers are concerned, 66 percent are supposed to get the full \$140.00. What does this mean? This means that those people are at the very very low income, that they have no taxable income to reduce the \$140.00 and this I think indicates the seriousness of the situation in rural Manitoba, when 66 percent have no taxable income to reduce that \$140.00 and I feel that if that is the situation, and we have the Minister's statement for that, then certainly relief should be given to them as well and not only to certain areas in the Greater Winnipeg. Mr. Chairman, this 66 percent also means that the farmers are getting much less than the minimum wage today because under the minimum wage he would still have a reduction of his \$140.00 tax credit, a very substantial one. --(Interjection)-- Yes, the Minister for Universities says, no, -I'm sure it does because at 40 hours a week, and at the minimum wage, and then multiply that by 52 weeks, you get something like \$3,600, and a married man will probably have an exemption of \$3,000 so that he would still have to pay on \$600.00 which would be a \$6.00 deduction from the 140 so that he would probably get \$134.00, so that when we see on the paper that 66 percent of the farmers are going to get the full tax credit, this means that 66 percent of the farmers are getting less than the minimum wage. So I think this, Mr. Chairman, really justifies the need that we not only give relief to certain areas in the Greater Winnipeg area but that the whole province, especially the farming section, gets some relief from taxation in the current year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Chairman, I just want to add very briefly to some of the observations of my colleagues and of the Honourable Member from Rhineland on the subject of these Estimates from the Department of Urban Affairs. This is a second year, I believe, we've had these Estimates in front of us, and I've been sitting here rather patiently as a representative of an urban community to hear from the Minister of Urban Affairs some mention of the problems of the urban community of Brandon and of, in fact, any of the other urban communities of the province. I presume that when the name or the title of this department was chosen that the Minister was under some difficulty because he wasn't able to say in advance what the name of the City of Winnipeg would be at that time, but it's becoming rather clear to me, and I say this in not any devisive way but simply in a serious way, that the department of Urban Affairs in my view is misnamed, because it's quite clearly a department of Winnipeg Affairs, and I don't need to remind the Minister of the derivation of the word "urban" because he knows it is from the Latin meaning city or town and Manitoba happens to have a number of urban communities. So I think it's rather important right at the outset to discuss and have the explanations from the Minister why this title was chosen. I don't think there'd be anything wrong with having a department of Winnipeg Affairs since half of the people of the province live in this Greater Winnipeg area, and certainly it would more clearly define the role of the department as I now understand it. It would perhaps explain one of the curious things that has come to light here in respect to the announcements of the Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs from Ottawa when he was speaking in Quebec City on May 25th, when he mentioned to the gathering there of municipal representatives of urban communities in Canada that his department had visited each and every province in Canada to discuss the problems of urban renewal and that they had requested the committee meet with provincial government representatives along with representatives of urban communities. Now, Mr. Chairman, if the Department of Urban Affairs does represent Manitoba, and its urban communities, then I would expect that any such meetings which were held would have included cities like Portage la Prairie, and Brandon, and others, who have their urban problems.

Now I know that Brandon has an urban renewal problem. I know also that it has an urban renewal plan that was produced some years ago at considerable expense, and that it is waiting now for implementation. So that if a meeting was in fact held by the Department of Urban Affairs with Ottawa representatives to discuss urban problems in Manitoba, then it's rather strange that other urban communities were not involved.

I would hope that the, perhaps the problem lies in the designation of the department. If the affairs of Brandon, and of Flin Flon, and other, Thompson, other urban communities are properly under the jurisdiction of the Department of Municipal Affairs, I think it would be much

(MR. MCGILL cont'd) more clearly represented to all factions, to all people involved, by a different title. And what really is wrong with a Department of Winnipeg Affairs, because I think that's really what your department is dealing with.

Much of the discussion up to this point in the Estimates has of course been taken up with the way in which the Minister is dealing with problems which have arisen, to a large extent no doubt in the hastily conceived and hastily implemented legislation. When things are done rapidly there are bound to be problems and I think the Minister, and we sympathize with him, is attempting to deal with the first few of these problems that are surfacing, that is of the tax problems. But in his dealings there he certainly can't ignore problems that may exist similar to these in the Winnipeg area and other urban communities, and I suggest that Brandon has a tax problem. It had a residential mill rate in 1971 of 86.25. Fairly high. I could mention the commercial rate but I've been warned that the Minister is not too interested in commercial tax rates. But it is 114.75 in Brandon, and these rates are representative of another urban problem in the Province of Manitoba. So that in the kind of assistance that the Minister is now contemplating in Winnipeg, it should be designed so that if there are other areas with some similar problems that it could be extended. But really, Mr. Chairman, I'm concerned that we clear any confusion that may exist in the name of the Department of Urban Affairs. I think when we're dealing with urban areas in Manitoba, and there are many - the First Minister speaks in the plural when he talks about Manitoba's urban communities, but the Minister of Urban Affairs, I think, speaks in the singular when he talks about his problems with the City of Winnipeg.

Mr. Chairman, these are the points that occur to me. I am not going to go over the issues that have already been well explained, and well represented by my colleagues in respect to the proposals of the Minister to meet the tax equalization problem in the new City of Winnipeg. But I do think that the Minister might explain clearly to the House why the department is called the Department of Urban Affairs; why it does not represent all urban communities in the province; and why it wouldn't be reasonable at this time to consider a change in the name of that department?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, I will not try and get into another argument with the Minister of Urban Affairs in respect to the pamphlet. But all I can say to him what I try to convey to him is exactly what most municipal people who had much more experience in municipal affairs than I did, and many of them had as much municipal experience or almost as much as the Finance Minister, so surely some of them must have known what they were talking about. I said that almost all councillors or mayors from area municipalities last year or two years ago made these statements - in fact, some were extremely critical of the Minister himself. I have a clipping here that one mayor called the government a dictatorship, and went on with a big story. I am not prepared to take the time of the House to put it on the record what they had to say, but these were the remarks made by most municipal people - surely many of them knew what they were talking about. Much of what we said in this House certainly is true today, that 80 percent or so of the people will have an increase in the mill rate - an increase in tax. I know the tax bills will be coming out in a few weeks - well you said in your pamphlet, based on the 70 budget, based on the 70 budget; and I'll accept this, based on the 70 budget - but it still meant the same thing.

I see the Minister got involved in talking about the tax is not too high. In today's paper I would like him to - if he hasn't got the time to read - to just maybe he can refer to the Business and Finance section, where one of the business people in this community, what is he saying? He says taxes are driving businesses out of this province - and he goes on to say that they are leaving, you know, quite a few of them are leaving this province. I don't know if the Minister is aware that some 20 businesses in the town of Thompson have gone broke or out of business. I don't know what effect the production tax will have - how further it will affect these businesses in the area of Thompson. So surely the tax of the Minister must have some effect on business because that's not the first businessmen - you had Baxter, R. C. Baxter and Company left; there's many that could be documented. So surely the Minister must be, you know, somewhat more concerned - and he just passes it off lightly and says look, our taxation is not high. But I would like to touch on a new area and this is what really concerns me. When the Department of Urban Affairs was established there was a tremendous amount of publicity given to the Department, what this department will get itself involved with - what will

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) it do? Either the Minister is not too ambitious or is not prepared to deal with such serious and important problems, as really serious urban problems - housing, city problems and so on. Surely the Minister is aware that by 1980 we'll have some 700,000 people living in the City, that every thousand people need anywhere in the neighbourhood of 380 some acres of land - and we accept that the new Unicity Act is in a very neophyte stage, but I'd say to the Minister that you have to think about it right now, the changes that have to be made in the Act, not wait just prior to the next municipal election.

There are problems. I know that in the late 70's we will have to concern ourselves with much spending on such things as government housing; such things as development of new cities in this province and - I'll be very short, I'll complete my remarks and then the member can listen. I know that most members will agree that an enormous amount of money has been spent on education and social services during the 1960's. The next period of spending will be due to such things as environment and urban planning and the thrust will have to be greater improvement of our environment. There will be a requirement, such things as co-operation between government and industry on development; on transportation matters; on urban design - and surely we could have, you know, expected a little more in this Department of Urban Affairs than just what we have. Certainly it deals with one grant to the new Unicity of Winnipeg - and I think the Minister will have to concern himself with these problems if he's really serious about the Department of Urban Affairs. Or is it just a camouflage to tell the people that the government is doing something. Really I think that this is the kind of thing that he will have to concern himself; I believe that the public will demand this. And for some unknown reason, I agree with the Member for Brandon that the government is not prepared to come to grips with these problems - and it has to - it really has to.

I think that when we passed the Bill - I think the Bill was amended that the first time that the mayor will be elected and after that that the mayor will be appointed. I think this should be clarified not left just prior to the next election, municipal election. I believe right now that we have a serious problem within the Unicity Act in respect to zoning - there was considerable amount of complaint from almost every municipal community and every city in respect to the long delay in zoning; and I understand under the present system the delays are much longer, twice as long in fact, because the zoning still has to be approved by the provincially appointed municipal board. And I wonder after the municipal board - I believe they have to get requests from the Minister and the Minister has to okay it; perhaps there is no need for a municipal oriented board, and the city council can deal directly with the Minister where perhaps they can get a quicker decision. But there are great problems - we are losing industry - we are losing development because of such long delays.

I know there is a second point that I know has been of some concern to the municipal people and that's in respect to borrowing. I understand they are now limited to half a million dollars. If I'm not correct the Minister can correct me. I feel that they feel they should not go before the municipal board for larger amounts - and I say to the Minister, you have to start dealing with this problem now, not wait until just prior to the next municipal election. If we are really concerned about Urban Affairs Department, let's deal with the housing problem - let's deal with city problems, let's really deal with environmental problems with city design.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . the time being 4:30 we've reached the hour for Private Members' Hour. Committee rise and report. Call in the speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply directs me to report progress and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

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

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Ste. Rose that the report of the committee be received.

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

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: The first item on Wednesday during Private Members' Hour is Orders for Return -- Address for Papers -- referred for debate. The first motion -- the Honourable Member for Crescentwood. The question is open. The Members that have spoken on the question are the Honourable Member for Crescentwood, the Member for Portage la Prairie, the Member for Thompson, the Member for Morris, the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

Is it the desire of the House to adopt the motion or to defeat it?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would mind just running over that list once again?

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. The Honourable Member for Crescentwood; the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie; the Honourable Member for Thompson; the Honourable Member for Morris; the Honourable Minister of -- oh, that's it -- the Honourable Minister of Labour I'm sorry, and the Honourable Member for Birtle-Turrell. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, our attitude on this resolution is that there is a good deal that would not be revealed by this kind of information, and I think that other members on this side mentioned the various factors that are not available. It would be unfair I believe to doctors who have the reports made and know that they are not getting reports on the amounts paid -- say by Workmen's Compensation or by Insurance Companies, private individuals -- and there would be a distortion there.

There are also doctors who work for the, say the University, or for hospitals on salary who do the billing, and the monies are then paid to let us say the hospital or the institution for which they work and in which they only have a partial share. There is also the fact that these payments that are being made by the Health Services Commission are gross payments; and the net would be quite different, depending on the cost of operating of the various doctors. So that this kind of information could be distorted in the minds of the readers that don't understand all the implications. Nevertheless, the government believes that this kind of information is what should be available in the report from the Health Services Commission -- and that just as the Health Services Commission now makes its annual report, it has in the report shown the category of the different specialties and the monies paid on their behalf. I think it showed the average as well as the total and therefore you do get some picture of the distribution, proportional distribution of the monies. Nevertheless, we feel that this information will be contained in the next annual report of the Health Services Commission, and I believe that a request has been made or will be made to the Health Services Commission to consider including this information in its annual report.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt? The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, on this particular request for Order for Return on the incomes of the doctors, we have examined it and we think that if the government is prepared -- as a general policy if the government is prepared to table the information regarding all other aspects of the endeavours that come under government financing, that this is probably a legitimate request. However, and I add that, we have had requests that have come before us at this session from the opposition side that have asked for information that have been turned down -- and I see that it's going to be difficult for the government to answer this specific request for information.

I think one might look in particular at the area of the university and say that's fine, if you are going to table information regarding the income of doctors, because the doctor's income usually includes his overhead and his staff, which I suppose is overhead as well, and if it averages out to \$40,000 it doesn't tell you -- or \$50,000 whatever it might be -- it doesn't tell you what the doctor's income is. And if you are going to table this sort of information, I think the government ought to be prepared to table information regarding the cost of financing -- for instance a university professor whose salary only reflects in normal circumstances 50 per cent of his income; and the other 50 per cent of course is represented by capital supply of buildings and equipment and research supply; and also for secretaries, also for secretaries and also for technicians and for the back-up supply that is equivalent to a doctor's -- and in which case if you do this then you can get to a true comparison of the cost.

But I think that what's happening in this request of an Order for Return is that what the member knows, is that the doctors do in fact in most cases have an overhead cost which is

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) their technicians, their nurse or their secretary whatever it is -- their receptionist and their office, from which it must be paid. So anyway, if the government is prepared and will agree that if they are going to supply the information on this Order for Return, which it now appears they won't -- but if they are, and if they are considering, if some of them are considering supplying the information on doctors, we are not opposed to it providing they will indicate that they're prepared to provide similar information on people that also come under the financing and the support of government, and this would include universities, schools; schools of course when you include in addition to the part of the cost of a teacher's salary you add the other 35 or 40 percent of educational costs attributed to back-up supplying.

If in the Attorney-General's Department they are prepared to supply the cost per prison warden; if they're provided to supply the cost per judge as the Member for Thompson has indicated; and if they are prepared to provide it, worked out the cost per enforcement officer in the province -- and put everybody that comes under provincial financing, provincial budget on the same footing, we're very prepared to look at this. And I think that this is a fair and judicious way to compare the costs of medical supply to the Province of Manitoba.

But what is happening, Mr. Speaker, is that in the case of the Member for Crescentwood he's attempting to single out the medical people as being the villains of the peace because their medical returns which are high by other standards but not nearly as high as what he would like to indicate in comparison -- in his attempt to manufacture them as the villains of the peace, we are having a distorted comparison between those people and other segments of our community who have their salaries free from the costs of overhead, capital costs, back-up, personnel costs and equipment costs, which of course have to be included.

So that I leave that with the government. If they're prepared to provide along with the information that we've requested otherwise with respect to people in the Crown corporations; people who come under the jurisdiction of the Attorney-General's Department; people who come under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Colleges and Universities; and personnel coming either indirectly through the school boards under the costs of the Minister of Education, and all others -- where they're prepared to break down the costs on the basis of the back-up, capital and personnel, then we're prepared to support this resolution. But if the intent of the Member for Crescentwood is simply to isolate and to hold into the light of day in isolation the doctors of the province, then we don't feel that this is a particularly relevant request. I know that the Orders for Return by agreement of the House last year -- or the year before -- are not available for amending or for making recommendations for amendment, otherwise I would recommend that. But I would say that if the government is prepared to compare the costs of all people falling under the supply of government, then we're prepared to support it. Otherwise I think this resolution is one that doesn't require very much further attention.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, it would be foolish to pretend that there isn't a good deal of validity to the arguments made by the Member for Riel in this particular case. Nevertheless I do believe that certain aspects of his arguments are not really directly relevant to the motion that is before us. Let me just suggest to my honourable friend that in the first place it has to be admitted that there is a fair amount of inconsistency with respect to the way in which the Crown shows payments made of public monies to various individuals and groups that receive monies directly from the Crown, directly or through agencies of the Crown. To begin with there is the long standing practice of showing through Public Accounts which are tabled annually the amounts that are paid by the Crown or its -- certain, not all of its agencies; to persons for example supplying goods and services, contractors, those that are working on hourly rates. There are certain modifications however, certain limitations, qualifications to the extent to which this disclosure is made. For example, it's my understanding -- I would have to check on this to be absolutely sure, but I believe that in Public Accounts the practice is of indicating payments to individuals or groups in excess of \$7,500 in the direct employ of the Crown. Those in receipt of less than \$7,500 are not shown in Public Accounts -- and I suppose the reasoning behind that practice is a practical one, that it would be voluminous, require voluminous documentation, listing of names to include all, including those receiving relatively low amounts and those being in direct employ of the Crown. So there's that one modification.

In addition to that now I see that the Honourable Member for Riel is suggesting that if we

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) do commence this practice of showing the payments through the Health Services Commission, doctors for professional services rendered, then to be consistent we ought to make similar provision with respect to the University Grants Commission and the amounts paid through the Grants Commission to the colleges from the colleges to professional people on the teaching staff of the colleges. I suppose in terms of the strictest of logic that argument is valid, although it is not as though the University Grants Commission is making payment directly to people on teaching professional staff. The Grants Commission makes block grants to the educational institutions who in turn make payment to professors by way of salary.

And then I realize full well that if one were to disclose professors' salaries, the disclosure of public monies involved would not in itself be a complete accounting of the number of people in professional faculties engaged in the practice of providing consulting service for which they obtain retainer fees and ad hoc fees of one kind or another. I suppose this is the kind of problem that the Honourable Member for Riel was referring to in his remarks.

We are not proposing that this Order for Return can be accepted at this time. I do not believe we would be able to provide a fair and accurate accounting that quickly. But as the Minister of Finance has indicated, it is the intention to make arrangements for the publishing of this information in a systematic and fair way as possible in the next annual report. But pains have to be taken, Mr. Speaker, to make it clear that the payments involved are gross payments; they are not net. It makes no effort to indicate how much is overhead and expenses-- and related questions -- so that there would have to be a very clear explanatory footnote or preface or whatever to the actual list of gross payments made by the Crown through the Health Services Commission to these medical practitioners.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I believe that does indicate just where we stand at this point in time. I am not pretending for a moment that having taken this decision that there are no further changes or adjustments that ought to be made at the next and ensuing sessions with respect to getting more consistency of practice relative to the disclosure of public money payments to persons in receipt of same, whether they be contractors, whether they be those in hourly employ, those in direct employ, etc.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would be very surprised if all members on the government side of the House were in favour of this particular Order for Return. Obviously there would be some who are in favour of it but my own inference, my own reading of the remarks of the Minister of Finance and conversations with others lead me to the conclusion that there is no substantial degree of unanimity among government members on the Order for Return. And I think that those who are critical of it and are opposed to it share the same view that we do on this side, which was expressed in large measure by my colleague the Member for Riel a moment or two ago. My personal feeling is that the specific Order reflects a specific bias and that it singles out and zeros in on one particular profession -- not only a particular profession, but a particular group which happens to be the pet target of the member moving this Order for Return at the present time. And for that reason I would not find it possible, notwithstanding the kinds of disclaimers that the First Minister offers, and the kinds of underlying principle that the First Minister says he has in mind; notwithstanding that, I would find it impossible to support this Order for Return. We are familiar with the attitude of the Honourable Member for Crescentwood towards the medical profession. He has made it plain and clear and left no doubt about it in recent statements, and it appears to me, Sir, that this Order is just another arrow in his bow, another arrow in that assault, in that attack on that particular group.

The question of university professors was raised by my colleague from Riel. I think it's interesting that he should have raised it because it's a question I think that's been on the minds of many of us in recent months where this whole argument of disclosure of public salaries or publicly funded salaries and incomes is concerned. I recall not long ago reading that -- I believe some charges had been brought to bear against a particular academic who was involved in income tax evasion to the extent of many thousands of dollars, I think it's a very substantial sum. And one is left with the question in mind as to how an academic or a university professor with a full time responsibility in the teaching field at the post-secondary level being funded in terms of salary by the public purse would be in a position to evade income tax to the extent that he is alleged to have evaded it. I think the sum was somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$90,000, but that's a -- I'm just recalling from memory and I may be in error there, Mr. Speaker.

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd)

But the fact remains that if there is a justification for pursuing the kind of information requested here in this Order for Return by the Member for Crescentwood, there is a justification for pursuing the kind of information in the broader sphere and broader sense to which my colleague from Riel has already made reference. There are interesting conflicts I think that have only barely surfaced between this government and the medical profession in the Province of Manitoba. I think there is much much more of that story that still remains to be revealed and that still remains to be written. One cannot escape the impression sitting in this Chamber-- on the basis of certain remarks made inside and outside the Chamber by the Member for Crescentwood and others, that there is a deep and profound conflict between the government -- or some members of the government -- and many members of the medical profession. Now what is at the base of that, what is at the root of it and how it'll be resolved remains to be seen, but it's impossible for me, Mr. Speaker, to avoid the conclusion that this Order for Return is simply part and parcel of that particular bias -- that particular campaign being waged against a specific group -- a specific group that has been singled out independent of others for attack this particular year. And for that reason as I say, notwithstanding the approach that the First Minister may take and has described to us I would find it impossible to support this Order for Return and my reading of the situation is that many government members will find it similarly impossible.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm just going to take a few . . .

MR. JORGENSON: . . . find out whether the Member for Thompson has already spoken on this matter. My recollection is that he has.

MR. BOROWSKI: Yes, I have.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, the honourable member has spoken.

MR. BOROWSKI: I can't speak any more?

MR. SPEAKER: No, Sir.

MR. BOROWSKI: Freedom . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure . . . the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, my comments will be very brief. However in case someone should call for a roll call vote I just wanted to qualify my voting. Maybe this will not be necessary, I don't know. But I too feel that if we are going to supply this information and I don't say that the government shouldn't -- in fact we are making public through Public Accounts a large measure of those people that receive the higher incomes, and I don't quarrel with this at all. In fact I think this should be done to satisfy ourselves -- and also in the public interest, because we're dealing with public funds. And I don't think that this necessarily should be limited just to the direct employees of government; I think Crown corporations should be included in that report -- and I certainly would have no objections of doing what is being proposed now and what the First Minister says is being contemplated for in the future. But I also would be in favour then if this is done, that this be made applicable to universities because from what I understand we have -- well I don't know how many but -- professors who are only doing part time work and yet drawing a very good salary; and I think information of this type should be made public, and I think it should also be made public whether this is part time work or not -- of that nature. So that certainly if I vote for the measure here I think it should not be restricted to this particular group in itself and that it should be widened.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J. R. (BUD) BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): It appears as if this Order will be going to a vote, Mr. Speaker. I just want to place on record my viewpoint at this time. I really have no hang-up about supporting it, but nevertheless there is some connotation there that we are perhaps singling out one profession at the present time. I personally think it is rather regrettable that in our society that we can't face up to our own personal existence at a certain level in our society. I for one would like to see many people have a better life than they have, but nevertheless I think we have to do something to have people accept perhaps their lot in life on certain occasions. I personally do. I know within myself if money grew on trees there'd be people around that were smarter than I was that would be able to convince me that I should go pick it for them. So I really don't think that singling out the medical profession or any other profession to say that perhaps they're earning more than they perhaps deserve will solve the problem.

(MR. BOYCE cont'd)

There are many other pieces of information in the realm of health services that I would like to see brought forward. The First Minister in a speech the other day pointed out some of them where there was some reason to look at the delivery of health services in metropolitan areas vis-a-vis the rural areas; that perhaps the people in the City of Winnipeg for example were making more demands on the health services than should be reasonably expected. On the assurance that we will re-examine this approach to making public information which should be public, as pointed out -- I hate to agree with the Member for Fort Garry too often, but when he mentions that perhaps we should make available to the public the total cost figures of delivering on education in net dollars per pupil; how much does it cost us to train a medical student, how much does it cost us to teach a child -- perhaps these are some of the figures that we should bring forth. So it is with a certain amount of reluctance, Mr. Speaker, that I find myself in a position not to be able to support this Order for Return at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't have much to add to the debate that has gone on up till now, but I would like to add my feelings on the Order for Return. And I would like to point out that in the first instance the -- this was not of the doctors' own choosing that Medicare became a fact; they certainly didn't ask for it, and I'm sure that those that had the opportunity to opt in or opt out, those that eventually opted in for obvious reasons, weren't thinking at that time at this particular stage rather that their earnings may become public knowledge, and I'm sure you're all very much aware of the figures that we are going to be presented with will be gross income and it's difficult to convey to the public the difference between a net income and a gross income. There are many who enjoy the services of their family doctor and all of a sudden they're going to pick up the paper and see that that doctor's income was \$110,000 or \$90,000, or \$60,000, whatever figure may come up for that particular doctor. And that is all that's going to enter their mind. They're going to think that that doctor made \$90,000 last year and I should have him here at my beck and call 24 hours a day, and we all know that that isn't possible. I am saying that this certainly should be kept in mind, and I agree with the other members who have said that there are many other incomes that probably should be made public if we're going to make this information available, we should make other information available also, because it is the impact with which this information will hit the public that is going to be important and as we all are well aware in this Chamber, that it's gross income and not net income and we are also, all of us in this Chamber well aware that what gets into the newspapers isn't always taken by the public the way it is intended when it is delivered in this House.

And I say that there are many many things to be considered in voting for this bill, and there are also many things to be said in voting against it. It's something that will have to be decided by the individual member. And my earlier remarks about the doctors certainly didn't ask for Medicare and there are many that opted in after Medicare became a fact, that opted in for obvious reasons -- there was the matter of bookkeeping and it was very difficult for them to maintain a staff to do their own billing. Had they elected to opt out this information, I am sure, is not going to be available under the Order as it presently stands.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief. I think that the members who have taken both sides probably have expressed opinion on what we're going to do, but my own feeling is that the general public if this resolution is accepted by the House, the general public may misconstrue the information that will be presented here. If income would be reported as net income it would be a different situation, but I believe that reporting as gross income which would indicate probably quite high incomes and certainly wouldn't be the earnings what the doctor has really made, and this is my greatest concern. If this would be net income reporting I would have no worry or concern, so for this reason I cannot support the resolution, or Order for Return in its present form. I feel that also, some of the other members have said it, some of the other groups are shown what they earn when they are paid by the government and government agencies it probably should apply to everyone. But in this case I feel that there is a danger that this would be misconstrued and for this reason I cannot support the Order for Return.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: This seems to be a day of baring one's soul, Mr. Speaker, and deciding what you're going to do. I think I've changed my mind two or three times in the last few minutes. I don't think the medical profession are that weak that they really have to depend on just exactly what we're going to decide in these few minutes. I believe that they're strong enough to stand up under the decision that we will take. I don't think that they should be singled out. I really think that the point that is brought home and affected me mostly is the fact that how many people are going to take advantage of the gross amount that is going to be named and say, that is the figure that my doctor earns, or somebody else. And they're going to use it against the profession and I don't think this is right. And I don't care what anybody in this House says, or anybody else, those that are unethical are going to say this is what the doctor gets. And if he wants to say different, then let him prove that he doesn't get what it states on this paper. They're going to say, let him prove that it cost him so much, and I don't think that they should be put in that position that they have to prove what their net income is because if that is the position that we're putting the medical profession in today, then it is a sorry position. So actually we're judging them as being guilty of earning too much money because we are assessing them on a basis of one value, one figure, not knowing what it's costing and not giving them an opportunity other than revealing their whole private business and the way they conduct their business.

On the other hand, I would say it would be inconsistent, and this is what's bothering me because I have supported other private resolutions asking for the salaries and those that, particularly that are working as man and wife teams in the civil service, etc., and trying to find out different inconsistencies that we say that belong in that type of earnings of the public purse. But I do feel that doctors never did apply to become wards of government. They didn't apply to become civil servants; they fought it vigorously, and I don't think that they necessarily have to be blamed today for the high cost in medical care. They warned us that the cost would go up, as they have warned in all other countries that have gone under Medicare. And I don't -- (Interjection) -- That is not nonsense. The Member for Inkster can say it's nonsense until he rots in his seat.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. BEARD: But the medical profession are not responsible for the high cost of Medicare. The Member for St. Matthews is another one. He just wants them to starve to death in a hurry so he can take all their money when they die.

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

MR. BEARD: No. I think that we've got to take a good look at this, Mr. Speaker, because it's something that we've got to decide in what the policies are when we start to declare ourselves in respect to Medicare, situations in respect to doctors because we depend on them, we are using them, but then I don't think we should turn around and beat them over the head because we want them there when we need them, and when we need them individually the price is not too high, and I have no fear today as an individual that the doctor in this province is getting too much. And until I personally am afraid the doctor is getting too much, I don't think that I am going to support this type of resolution. But if there comes a time when I feel that the doctor is becoming greedy, then I will say so.

But there are ways of getting around those people that are breaking the laws, if the doctor is breaking the laws, if he is not really, if he is contravening the Act under which he is carrying on his profession, then it is up to the Attorney-General and the medical Department of Health to see to it that they enforce the law. That's what it's there for to keep the doctors in line. But I don't think that it is up to us to decide what the worth of a doctor is.

If the Department of Health had sat down and negotiated in private with the medical profession, and they have negotiated in private with the profession in respect to fees, then they've made their decision, and I don't know whether both sides came away satisfied but at least they came away, and that is one of the points that we must be happy about as people living in Manitoba. But I believe that a gross income figure is something wrong to be used because it will be unfairly, it will be unfairly used, and this is the thing that bothers me most about it. If we could, we could make some assurance that this was not going to be unfairly used against them, then it wouldn't bother me. But I don't expect every doctor to be able to get up and individually say to his patients, and to the people of Manitoba, these are the expenses that I have had during this year, because they'll differ and it would be impossible for

(MR. BEARD Cont'd) us to judge each of them, and there's really no reason today why each of them should have to do it. Certainly we haven't come to that. If we have it's a dark day in fact for the doctors, and it is because of this that I think that the best thing to do is to vote against this and, Mr. Speaker, let me make it abundantly clear that I don't want somebody getting up, whether it's on this side of the House or the other side, and I'm trying to say, that's fine and dandy you would protect the rich doctor and you don't care about the so-called little fellow. I don't know who this little fellow is but they talk about him all the time. I don't want to hear that because it's got nothing to do with this, there's nothing in common with the problems of either these two. We're talking about doctors right now and there's nothing to compare either one or the other with. The doctor is there to provide a service, and we have laws to make sure that he does provide a proper service or in fact he is not allowed to carry on his profession.

We have a law with Medicare in Department of Health to make sure that the fees are in line, and if that isn't done properly then we should have a police service that makes sure that it is being done properly because that's what accountants are for. There's nothing wrong - the medical profession I'm sure would not be against publicizing those that would defraud the public. The Member for Osborne seems to think that somebody would be against that. I don't think there's any member in this House that would be against that. I don't think anybody should be hidden from revealing any name of any person that would be trying to take monies that shouldn't. But, Mr. Speaker, far be it from me to set up as a critic of the medical profession and decide what is fraud and what is not. The Member for Osborne has decided that he knows, and maybe he'll instruct us in the next 20 minutes as to what is a fraud and what is not, and how the medical profession are.

But I don't intend to carry on a witch hunt because believe it or not I think that the medical profession are a pretty good bunch of fellows and women. I think they carry on pretty well in the Province of Manitoba and in Canada, and I believe that they have a good record, and I think all people will generally agree with that record. And I believe that if we support them that they will certainly give us the confidence and the service that is necessary to see to it that we have good Medicare service in the Province of Manitoba. And so it is that I feel that this in many ways could be considered unfair to the profession, and so it is that I feel that I once again will be voting against it. Apparently there will be many that will be voting for it but that is the decision that apparently each of us will be able to make.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I really had not intended to become involved in this debate which I don't think has quite the dire results that have been mentioned on either side of the House. But the Member for Churchill seems to feel that the resolution is somehow unholy because it amounts to attacking the doctors for something that they at no time wanted to be involved in and which they had indicated would create a crisis in high costs in Medicare and that the Medicare Program was responsible for the high costs, and that the resolution seeks to blame the doctors. The Member for Churchill implied or stated, and I hope I'm not being unfair, that the high costs that we are experiencing are attributable to Medicare, and I would assume that he is saying that the corollary is true that if it were not for Medicare we would have low costs, that the costs of medicine would not have gone up at the rate at which it has gone up.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like the Honourable Member for Churchill first to examine what happened before Medicare, and I suggest to the Honourable Member for Churchill that in the years 1965, 1966 and 1967 the costs of medical service under the former system of private medicine purchases went up faster and at a higher rate, than the cost has gone up between the years 1968/69, 1970, 1971 and 1972. But I know that that will not satisfy the honourable member because he will agree with me that in the years between 1966 and 1969 that the doctors accelerated the price of their income, the cost of their fees so as to come into Medicare at a high rate, and therefore in the years following that immediate acceleration it wouldn't have gone up as quick, and maybe that would be his explanation. But, Mr. Chairman, if he is not willing to accept that comparison then let's compare the costs of medicine in those countries of the western world that don't have Medicare programs, where the state doesn't collectively gather its revenues and then pay the health costs of individuals, with those that do. And the one that we know of, Mr. Speaker, at the present time that is in the keeping with what the Honourable Member for Churchill seems to think is the ideal and cheapest way of providing medical services, and the only significant one in the western world is the good old U. S. A. And is my

(MR. GREEN Cont'd) honourable friend really suggesting that the costs of medical services in the United States have risen more slowly, less quickly, and are cheaper than the costs of services where this is done as a public service, such as Canada, Britain, Israel, France, Germany, and many other countries of the western world? Is that what my honourable friend would have us believe? Because, Mr. Speaker, the exact contrary is true. The medical costs of the United States are so prohibitive that it is impossible not only to pay them as an individual without disaster, Mr. Speaker, I know people who went down to the United States and were struck with medical problems that fortunately could still come back to Canada and have those problems treated under -- because they had not lost the right to do so -- under medical services and it was cheaper for them to make the trip back to Canada, be serviced here, and some of them had to remain here because staying in the United States would have been a disaster, financially to them. It would have wiped out everything that they had. -- (Interjection) -- Well that is the cost of hospital care. To buy private medical insurance equivalent to what you are getting in the Province of Manitoba, or in Canada, is absolutely prohibitive. Don't talk about \$300.00, talk about six, seven, eight hundred dollars. And then if you have a disease that they don't like they can cut you off and say that you're on your own for that disease. So that any suggestion, Mr. Speaker, any suggestion that introduction of the concept whereby society gathers a pool of funds for the purpose of taking care of the medical costs of those people who are sick raises the cost of health care, is a fraud that is attempted to be perpetrated on the public by the medical profession and people such as the Member for Churchill. It is just not true.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I would like to indicate that I have allowed a tremendous amount of latitude in regards to debate but I do think that the resolution before us deals with the acceptance or rejection of this particular proposition and not Medicare itself. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, and I am going completely in line with the suggestion that the publication of these figures is some way going to be a disaster from one point of view, or it's some way going to be a boon from the other point of view, and that it's going to affect medical costs. If you don't want to deal with medicine alone, and if you want to get into those areas where the grubby socialists have kept their hands off and left a free opening to keep costs low, then go to drugs because the socialists haven't bothered up until now the area of health costs due to drugs, and the Honourable Member for Churchill would then say, well since the state has kept its grubby hands out of it the cost of drugs should not have risen as fast as the cost of either medical or hospitalization. But, Mr. Speaker, I was a Minister of Health and I saw the figures displayed to me, and it may surprise the honourable member, and the members on the other side of the House, but that area in which the state kept out of accelerated at the highest rate; that the cost of drugs have gone up faster than the costs of hospital care and faster than the cost of medical services. How does my honourable friend explain that? He would say well that has been left to the good old free enterprise system of each man for himself as the elephant said when he danced among the chickens, and that therefore those costs have remained relatively stable. Well they haven't remained relatively stable. They have accelerated at a faster rate than the cost of either hospital care or medical care. What happened is that we are having more people served but surely my honourable friend doesn't suggest that we should reduce our costs by creating more sick people. That's not what he is suggesting. --(Interjection)-- Well, Mr. Chairman, I heard what the honourable member said, and I said nonsense. He said that it wasn't nonsense. He said that it's Medicare that is responsible for the high cost of medical services and yet those countries that don't have it have higher costs of medical services, that area of health care which the state has not been involved in has accelerated faster than that area which the state has been involved in. Is the honourable member saying that dental care services have not risen as quickly as medical care services because the state has kept out. I tell the honourable that he is wrong, that that is not the case.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about - for a few moments on what seems to be, on what seems to be, and I say that it's a common misimpression on both sides of the House that somehow the publication of individual doctors' incomes, and don't forget that we now publish them on a broad basis, and I don't think that it's crucial one way or the other, but that somehow the publication of individual doctors' incomes will bring such down on the doctors that somehow this will result in some disservice to the medical profession.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have never been ashamed of trying to make money. I want to tell you that in my lifetime I've tried to make as much as I could, that when I became a lawyer that more people didn't patronize me because I was a poor lawyer rather than when I became a

(MR. GREEN Cont'd) relatively better-off lawyer, that this did not cause me to suffer. The Honourable Member for Minnedosa says that somebody's going to find out that some doctor made \$90,000 a year and he thinks that maybe people will be therefore critical of that doctor. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you, I suggest to you that one of the effects of passing this type of resolution, and again I repeat it's not crucial, that rather than bring on the doctors with the high income it really gives him an advertisement that we are a high-priced doctor and that, Mr. Speaker, nobody, but nobody, will say that I won't go to that doctor because he's earning \$90,000 a year. As a matter of fact, if anything, they'll look through the list, they'll look through the list and say, this doctor he's earning \$10,000, can't be a very good doctor, I'm going to go to the doctor that's earning \$90,000 a year. I have never yet, Mr. Speaker, seen this notion that having made a good living, or a better and better living, has somehow brought disrepute upon the member who did it.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Fort Garry - and I'm terminating my remarks - had a personal experience in this regard. He ran against Jim Richardson, and you know if some of the theories on this side, or on that side were true, that somehow making money puts a person in bad repute then Jim Richardson wouldn't have got a vote from anybody in Winnipeg South. But I can tell you that his wealth was not a disservice to him, it was an asset to him, and that a lot of people voted for him because he was wealthy and, Mr. Speaker, I see nothing wrong with that. I don't see that there is some problem that a person has to be sensitive about the fact that he has been successful.

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