

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
8:00 o'clock, Thursday, July 6, 1972

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports; Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Oral Questions; Orders of the Day.

GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, will you call Bill 81.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed Motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour. The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, Bill 81 is the most important bill before the Legislature and the most important item that we will deal with at this session, and at this stage of dealing with it, I would like to pass comment on two features of the bill that I think are important, not that that they are the most important, but are important along with a number of other features.

Mr. Speaker, I think that in this debate, similar to the debate that took place just before supper with regards to the school aid issue, that there is some concern that there is a fair amount of tribute and lip service paid to aspects of the bill that are going to be paid more facetiously that they are in the school aid issue. I think that by and large the bill does contain some good features but it certainly contains some features I do not consider to be progressive legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the first one I want to speak about is the Section 4 of the bill that does away with the exclusion from the Labour Relations Act of those people that would normally fall under the professional category. Under this present bill we would find that people that would normally have come under the old act into the professional category where they fell more under the rules and regulations of self-governing bodies which exist in other legislation that is on the books, that these people will now if they are employees come under the effect of Bill 81. And the result, Mr. Speaker, is one that can be drastic and may in fact not be in the best interests of those people that have normally considered themselves to be in a category of employment where by they felt they had an obligation to things other than the normal employee-manager relationship. And therefore, I think that this inclusion in this bill for the most part, Mr. Speaker, is wrong and should be done away with and that the provisions of the former act should be included and that if necessary extra provisions may be brought in for certain circumstances, but not provisions that do away with the traditional obligations which some professional people at least feel they have to the State, to themselves, to their profession, to their employer, and such other things, but not have it solely dependent on an employee-employer relationship.

Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Bill 81 such people as accountants and engineers, lawyers who work for a salary, doctors who work for a salary, but I would say primarily in numbers it would include mainly those people that would fall in the category of either being a professional engineer or an accountant, will fall in many cases in employment in Manitoba under the situation where a plant that has a large number of employees that can fall under one union, can by virtue of the powers of this act include the accountants or the engineers in the bargaining unit as well. And only by appeals to the Labour Board will those people be able to have a case made for exclusion. And there are no provisions in this act, Mr. Speaker, that say that those people, even upon an appeal to the Labour Board, will have any particular reason to expect that they should not be included in the bargaining unit that is being formed in a particular place of employment. The alternative logically which they face if this does happen is for the Labour Board to say no, you have to form your own bargaining unit, or you have to be included where all types are lumped together; or I suppose they could say to him, no you can operate as an individual, continue to operate as an individual, continue to operate as an individual. But my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that the most likely thing to happen is that of the legitimate cases made by those who would fall into the professional category, that the alternative given them by the Labour Board is very much likely to be the alternative of forming their own separate bargaining units. Well, Mr. Speaker, if this was the will and desire of those people that would be fine, but

(MR. CRAIK cont'd.). . . . such is not the case. I can tell you in one specific case that the membership of the Engineering Association was polled in the fall of 1971 in this regards, and 74 percent of them replied that they did not wish to in any way be involved in a collective bargaining unit or in a bargaining position with their employers. Well, Mr. Speaker, I suppose that means that 26 percent felt that a bargaining position with their employer may be of advantage to them, but the fact of the matter is that the vast majority of those polls, and it is already known, do not wish to be included in any bargaining setup, formal bargaining setup with their employer. Still this act here goes far beyond that. It does not even state a provision in here for anyone who is in a special category such as that to form their own bargaining setup. There's no mention made of it. The only possibility that exists is that upon appeal to the Labour Board that they would have that alternative.

Mr. Speaker, this raises the question as to whether this whole category of employees that have traditionally fallen under the Professional Act should now be thrust upon the mercy of that one all-powerful board, the Labour Board. A board, Mr. Speaker, which by virtue of this act, anyway, is going to be overworked in satisfying the requirements that are going to be thrust upon it by the different other provisions of the act. But why, Mr. Speaker, should a group of people who have served the province well, and who have served it with a degree of dedication that they hold, not only to their employer but by their relationship and membership in another association which they pay dues to, which can range anywhere from I suppose 30 to 35 dollars up to \$150.00 a year to be a member of that and to be recognized as a so-called professional person. Why should they in turn have thrust upon them by the arbitrary action of a Labour Board the requirement that they must join a union because the power's in the act to include them, or alternatively to form their own union that may not in any way have a relationship to the Professional Association they belong to, and all of this, Mr. Speaker, at the discretion of the Labour Board.

Well I think that the case should be self-evident. We have a group of people—we're not only dealing here in this act with the traditional employee—employer setup, the formation of the union under normal circumstances, we are by virtue of this act including a whole new group of people that probably in the Province of Manitoba number several thousand, they would number at least three thousand and probably number higher, who are now going to have a significant proportion of that number subject to the Labour Act solely because under Clause 4 of this act anybody that works as an employee, regardless of his other affiliation, is now going to be subject to the provisions of this act.

So, Mr. Speaker, the request that is very legitimate in this case is that this classification of employee, those that belong to other organizations that are governed by the self-governing body's legislation, be excluded from the act so that they can pursue their normal way of life and their normal procedures of the deciding by the given and take method of deciding what their salary should be, rather than putting them into a category where they have to now govern only their actions by going to the bargaining table. I think that we have to realize that many people in this category do not work by any of the traditional governing factors that govern those that come under union agreements as to hours. I would say that the vast majority of the people in this category work for salary and are happy to do it, and work all hours depending on the requirements of their job and do not, have not up to this point concerned themselves or preoccupied themselves with trying to increase their earnings through collective bargaining.

Mr. Speaker, I think that what this bill does it forces those people to assume a new role in life in their job that they have heretofore not assumed. And they have not assumed it many times because of their own volition even though it may in fact have cost them something in terms of monetary returns. But I think we have to realize, Mr. Speaker, that monetary return is not the only governing factor that governs and dictates to all people what they should do. This is not saying that in collective agreement that the only factor involved is monetary return. But certainly the monetary return factor in collective bargaining far outweighs the other factors to a greater extent than it does for those people that would fall under the self-governing body acts. Therefore I think that there are alternatives here that could be brought in to the previous labour legislation that may, Mr. Speaker, not shall but may, allow them in a particular circumstance where they feel it is to their advantage to form a unit if they feel it is advantageous but leave it as a voluntary thing that they should do, but by no stretch of the imagination force their inclusion which Bill 81 does - it does, except for the blessing of the Labour Board.

And, Mr. Speaker, there's no reason on earth why the provisions of exclusion cannot be spelled out in the act and not left to this powerful body. We found in North America that the only

(MR. CRAIK cont'd.) . . . . place for people that have traditionally fallen into a professional category, have organized as bargaining units, are in the very large centres such as the aerospace industry in the United States, and in some situations in Ontario there has been some inward drive to do this, which is a quite legitimate drive, if the employees in a professional category so desire. The only place that there has been a natural thrust for this to happen is in the case where you have hundreds and hundreds of people in a particular professional category working for salary where it becomes more of an important requirement. But, Mr. Speaker, that's not Manitoba industry. Manitoba industry is not that breed of an industry. Manitoba industry that hire professional people by and large, hire them by the small numbers, one, two, ten, twelve, maybe 25 people in a professional category, and 25 would be a very large industry by Manitoba standards. And there's no reason in an industry of that size containing a number of people in the professional category, why they should have to belong to a unit, or why in fact there should be any compulsion upon them to belong to a unit if there is not a natural desire on their part.

So, Mr. Speaker, this legislation may have application in some parts of North America but it certainly has no application in the Province of Manitoba. And I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that there will be a concern expressed by this group as we go on to the Law Amendments Committee. --(Interjection)-- When I'm finished, I'd be pleased to.

Mr. Speaker, the other aspect that I want to raise on this bill is that of the technological change. The provisions that are in this act are going to work a hardship again on Manitoba industry in general, and when I say industry it refers not to ownership and management but to the entire industry, including the employees, because we're in a particular position in Manitoba where we have an industry that has suffered for many years because of the lack of technological input and the lack of innovative forces to change and to keep up with the demands of the marketplace which by and large may be outside the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, essentially what industry here is faced with is the lack of technological input from a Manitoba Research Council, from the size of the industry which is small where the owner is usually the manager and is also the innovator, and also now you're going to be faced with a fact that even after technological input takes place, that the results of all of it are going to be open to the scrutiny of the collective agreement. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, this legislation is stiffer legislation than exists in any collective agreement that the government can produce in the Province of Manitoba right now. There are industries that have technological considerations in the collective agreement, but I challenge the government to produce any collective agreement, private collective agreement, in the Province of Manitoba that has the stringent requirements that is contained in this bill. So, Mr. Speaker, if the employer fails to notify the bargaining unit 90 days in advance that a technological change is going to take place, the employer can find himself in the extreme difficulty involved here, and faced with a cancellation of the collective agreement that has already been bargained for, and what he sought to settle for. Mr. Speaker, the only discretion in here is whether or not the technological change is significant. Well that's a very broad change, Mr. Speaker, and the provisions such as exist in 75 (e) which allow the cancellation of these clauses, except for 72, the cancellation of these clauses is dependent only on the fact that there may be a mutual agreement between the employees and the employer to exclude themselves from these clauses. Mr. Speaker, what bargainer in his right mind would bargain with any thought of winning to have himself excluded, or have the agreement excluded, for something that existed in legislation. So, Mr. Speaker, effectively clause 75 (e) hardly needs to be put in; nobody is going to exclude themselves. Employees in their bargaining position would be crazy not to avail themselves of the provisions of this act. Why would they allow themselves to be bargained out of something that existed in legislation: and the employer only if he's completely naive or trying to establish a bargaining position would hardly be foolish enough to even attempt to bargain an exclusion from the provisions of this act.

So essentially what you have, Mr. Speaker, over a very short period of time at least is the inclusion of all the collective agreements that come under this act, the provisions for technological change that are contained in Bill 81, and they're extremely stringent. For instance how does somebody in a competitive industry where there is a degree of competition with another manufacturer, how does he establish a new product that requires a high degree of innovative and change, that is going to require technological change, it may require automation in the process, and bring his product on the market without first of all going to the union 90 days ahead of time, then going to arbitration, and if he fails to do so having his plant, the threat of his plant

(MR. CRAIK cont'd.) . . . . closed down because of his failure to do that? Mr. Speaker, it will in some cases be a case of the employer having to telegraph to the total industry what he is doing by first of all announcing three months ahead of any specific technological changes to the union. Well essentially this is what's contained in this legislation; not only that, it just doesn't add up that should totally in this province spend millions of dollars in training institutes and work towards the development of people, technological people, who are encouraged because we're in a climate where it's difficult to keep people here because of the lack of technological challenge, we're going to now say to them that despite your best efforts anything you do is still going to open to the complete powers of the collective agreement that exists between the employer and the employee, and everything you do is not going to be judged on your innovative skill, on your productive skill, or on your ability to try and keep your company into a competitive position but is all going to be subject to that final screen which is the collective agreement between the employer and the employee. Now why should one category of people who are dedicated to technology have everything they do subjected to that. Is that fair? Mr. Speaker, I insist that it is not fair and in the bill I think that that is one of the most critical parts that is in it, and I don't think that Manitoba is in a position to afford it.

Mr. Speaker, most of the members of the government that have belonged to unions are big union men; they don't belong to small unions; they have no experience to speak of in the small companies. They're people who have a background of experience in the big unions, in the railroads, in mining, and so on, where you have big numbers that have to go through the collective agreement process. But that is not the makeup of the Manitoba industry. The Manitoba industry is made up primarily of small industry, certainly small industry by comparison with Canadian standards, eastern Canada standards, and much of western Canada standards, and these are the people who are going to be affected here, and the input of technology is the only saving grace that is going to apply in the future for many of these small industries. So, Mr. Speaker, in the government's efforts to create an equitable situation for economic development in Manitoba they have completely forgotten about the interests and the desire and the very honest attempts by an industry, and by the technological people in that industry, to develop and to make their company competitive and this legislation, Mr. Speaker, hangs over with these applications in sections 72 to 75 on technological change, hangs over the industry like a guillotine that can be dropped at any time, a guillotine that can be dropped at any time on those other people who have an input into making Manitoba industry healthy and competitive and from that point of view, Mr. Speaker, I say that this legislation is one sided and suffers from tunnel vision, and it suffers from the interest of those members on the government side who have belonged to big unions and are now dictating to the Province of Manitoba to insure that everything they wanted over their history is now put in and they can wear the halo around their heads. But, Mr. Speaker, there are others in this province besides those people . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder if we may now interrupt the proceedings of the House. It is my understanding His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor awaits to enter the Chamber to give the Royal Assent to certain pieces of legislation that have received the consideration of the House.

#### ROYAL ASSENT

His Honour, W. J. McKeag, Esquire, Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Manitoba, having entered the House and being seated on the THRONE:

MR. SPEAKER addressed His Honour in the following words:

MR. SPEAKER: May it please Your Honour, the Legislative Assembly, at its present session, passed several Bills, which in the name of the Assembly, I present to Your Honour, and to which Bills I respectfully request Your Honour's Assent.

The Clerk of the Legislative Assembly read the Titles of the Bills to be assented to as follows:

MR. CLERK:

Bill No. 3 - An Act to amend The Mortgage Act.

Bill No. 13 - An Act to amend The Expropriation Act and to validate Certain Confirming Orders made under The Expropriation Act.

Bill No. 28 - An Act to amend The Lord's Day (Manitoba) Act.

Bill No. 29 - An Act to amend The Unsatisfied Judgment Fund Act.

(MR. CLERK cont'd.)

Bill No. 32 - An Act to amend The Court of Appeal Act.

Bill No. 34 - An Act to amend The Northern Manitoba Affairs Act.

Bill No. 39 - The Sand and Gravel Act.

Bill No. 42 - An Act to amend The Amusements Act (1).

Bill No. 48 - An Act to amend The Hearing Aid Act.

Bill No. 51 - An Act to amend The Real Property Act.

Bill No. 61 - An Act to amend An Act to incorporate Association for Retarded Children in Manitoba.

Bill No. 62 - An Act to amend The County Courts Act.

Bill No. 65 - An Act to amend The Landlord and Tenant Act.

To these Bills the Royal Assent was announced by the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly as follows:

"IN HER MAJESTY'S NAME, HIS HONOUR THE LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR DOETH ASSENT TO THESE BILLS."

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. CY GONICK (Crescentwood): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support Bill 81. Mr. Speaker, I believe that this legislation marks a milestone in the labour history of Manitoba, in the labour history of Canada. Certainly to my mind it ranks with the pioneering legislation of the CCF government in Saskatchewan regarding universal hospitalization, medicare, public automobile insurance, and other pioneering efforts by CCF, NDP governments.

I want to comment briefly on some of the remarks by members opposite. The Member for Thompson last evening mentioned that members of the back bench of this government had something to do with the writing of this legislation and that members of the labour movement had something to do with the writing of this legislation, and I want to say for myself that certainly I, for one, can not claim any of the credit in the development of this bill. I don't think any other backbenchers can claim any credit either. In fact I think there are very few members in the front bench, aside from the Minister of Labour, that can claim credit for this legislation. And I know that from personal information that the leaders of the labour movement themselves were as unaware of the contents of this legislation as most members in this House. So, Mr. Speaker, this to my mind is to a very large degree the creation and the accomplishment of the Minister of Labour and certainly is a crowning achievement in a long career in labour movement, and in my mind the highlight of this legislative session.

Mr. Speaker, many members opposite last evening and today, and earlier on in this session, have expressed fears that this legislation by expanding the rights to strike to members in the labour force in the public sector can create havoc throughout Manitoba, as it is claimed this extension of rights has created havoc outside of Manitoba where it has occurred. Members have said the strike is an outmoded, outdated, weapon of labour not required any longer. But, Mr. Speaker, they have not to my knowledge, I certainly haven't heard them provide any alternatives and, Mr. Speaker, the only alternative, I believe, to outlawing the strike for any group of workers is to compel them to work under conditions or wages which they are not agreeable to, and that, Mr. Speaker, is a form of economic slavery. It is certainly true that unrestricted strikes in so-called essential industries can cause much inconvenience, but the only known alternative is compulsory arbitration, and as long ago as 1917 the International Labour Organization exposed the fundamental flaw of compulsory arbitration. The ILO in 1917 said that a free society cannot coerce any section of its population into working conditions which are not freely and generally acceptable. Mr. Speaker, the experience of countries which have tried compulsory arbitration as a means of avoiding the strike substantiates the position of the International Labour Organization of 1917. Britain experimented with it after World War II but had to repeal this legislation in 1951 when it proved to be unenforcible. Australia which has a labour force smaller in fact than Canada's, sustains nearly as many strikes and man-workdays lost through strikes as we do despite its longstanding compulsory arbitration system. Mr. Speaker, to believe that it is possible to ban strikes through legislation simply is not borne out by the experiences of those countries and those jurisdictions which have attempted to do so through the only known alternative to the strike system which is compulsory arbitration.

The most exhaustive study that I know that has been done on this subject was made by the New Jersey Commission in the 1950s, New Jersey, New York. In its report to Governor

(MR. GONICK cont'd.) . . . . R. B. Mather, this Commission declared, and this is a quote: "In none of the English speaking countries did anti strike laws result in the elimination of strikes and at various times we in the U.S.A. were relatively more free of strikes than were the people of the countries which legally prohibited strikes." Mr. Speaker, I think that members of this Legislature have been blinded by some of the more spectacular strikes that have occurred in the public service these past few months and feel that this is something which will occur in Manitoba, not only as a temporary phenomenon but something which will be with us on a continuing basis. And this, Mr. Speaker, I think we have to examine because I don't believe for one that the strikes that have occurred in various parts of Canada in the public sector, though they have caused much inconvenience is necessarily a permanent phenomena.

And, Mr. Speaker, I think it is due to factors which I don't think need occur in the Province of Manitoba under an enlightened government. The immediate cause of these strikes in Montreal, in Toronto, in Nova Scotia has been the determination of governments at all these levels to hold down their labour costs. They have done this by setting arbitrary limits on wage increases in the public sector, while not establishing and certainly not enforcing the same wage freezes in the private sector. The governments of British Columbia, Quebec and Nova Scotia have all imposed wage ceilings on civil servants, teachers, hospital and school board workers and the public utilities of 5 to 6.5 percent. And the Federal Government has done likewise. Now while these wage freezes have occurred most recently, and we all know that wages in the public sector have dragged behind wages in the private sector for many years thus creating a very substantial gap between the two. On top of that there is imposed a wage freeze in the public sector while wages in the private sector are allowed to rise and take a more natural course. Naturally employers in the public service resist what they consider to be a forced subsidization of public services through substandard wages. Mr. Speaker, I believe that that is the major cause of most of the strikes that have occurred in the public sector in recent months which we have heard of and which I think members opposite are referring to. And I don't believe that need occur in the Province of Manitoba which is willing to provide wages to public employees which are the equivalent of wages of workers in the private sector. I think that is the general policy of this government not to have a labour force in the public sector which is any way inferior in quality, in standards, in wages than that which exists in the private sector. And with that kind of an attitude, Mr. Speaker, I don't expect any greater strike activity in the public sector than that which we know, which we have had in the private sector of Manitoba which as members opposite have said has not been a major problem in this province for some time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk also about some of the matters raised by the Member for Wolseley last evening, or two evenings ago. He mentioned - I think this was his opening shot - that collective bargaining is fair providing there is equal strength on both sides of the bargaining table between labour and capital between labour and management. So, Mr. Speaker, this sounds like a reasonable statement. It's obviously true that collective bargaining cannot be fair and equal unless there's equal strength. But, Mr. Speaker, to my mind that is a contradiction in terms within a free enterprise economy. There are some exceptions to the position I take but I think that in general the conflict between labour and capital and the free enterprise economy is one which favours for reasons which I shall try to explain the forces of capital as against the forces of labour. The real leaders of power, Mr. Speaker, I believe are held by the large business owners, by the finance companies, by the mining companies, by the manufacturing corporations. I'm not talking about small enterprise, Mr. Speaker, I'm talking about the large business enterprise which control and dominate most industries, not only in Ontario but also in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, let's examine some of the kinds of advantages which capital has over labour, inherent in the system irregardless of collective bargaining which no legislation, I shall go on to say, with regard to labour law, can really affect. For example there's the case of location. Imperial Oil just some months ago announced it was relocating its operations from Winnipeg, Regina and I think Calgary to consolidate in Edmonton. We have other announcements from Union Carbide, and these announcements have occurred in all provinces where arbitrarily, without any negotiations, without any reference to the Minister of Labour, or to any public authority, the decision makers who in many instances in this regard - in fact in all instances in this regard, do not reside in Manitoba, mostly do not reside in Canada - decide that it is more profitable for them to abandon their location in Manitoba, and check out to other points that they find more profitable.

(MR. GONICK cont'd.)

Mr. Speaker, when this occurs there is no strength that labour has to stop it from occurring, because managers and owners have assumed that they have the right to decide to make this decision; and labour has no say, the Government of Manitoba has no authority.

Well, Mr. Speaker, let's talk about the levels of production. We have had examples in Thompson and other points where International Nickel was building up its inventories like mad; only eighteen months ago, twenty-four months ago employing people double shifts, overtime, calling for workers from all over Canada to come work in Thompson, and many of them came and located there. Then all of a sudden without referring to the Minister of Labour, without referring to the union, decided that it had over-supplied, and so it cut down its production and laid off its labour force. And many of the people who had come into Thompson from outside found after having undertaken the expense of moving, of dislocating their families, discovered that there were no jobs after all in Thompson; and many people who had been living there for some years found that their investments in housing and other facilities were in jeopardy as a result of a decision made arbitrarily by the owners without any reference to the unions, without any reference to the Minister of Labour, without any mediation of any kind.

Mr. Speaker, those are just two examples. There are many others one can cite where there is an inherent advantage to the business enterprise which the unions have been unable to cope with, and will be unable to cope with regardless of what happens in this Legislature with respect to labour legislation.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order.

MR. GONICK: Mr. Speaker, there are ways in which the owners of business are able to compensate for increases in wages where in fact unions have had an impact. They can compensate for their increase in costs by speeding up production, by requiring workers to work faster; they can compensate by cutting down the quality of their work and the quality of the materials that are used - and this happens, as anyone in business knows this happens. They can pass on their increased wages as prices to consumers, and everyone here knows that that happens as well among those businesses that have control over their products. And those are the business enterprises that I am talking about, the large scale enterprises which are commonly known as monopolies or oligopolies.

There's the question of technology in the whole organization of work which until now it has been very difficult for unions to cope with. Certainly management does not come to the Minister of Labour when it is about to automate and displace a dozen, two dozen, a hundred members of their work force. The Minister of Labour is not informed, there is no mediation, it is done arbitrarily. So, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that inherent in the economic system that we have, that according to the terms of the Member for Wolseley, however liberal they sounded and however nice they sounded, there cannot be real equality of collective bargaining in our system. And by this I do not mean to discount the important roles that unions have had on wage scales, on seniority, on conditions of work, and hours, and all the other matters that the Member for Flin Flon spoke of this afternoon. But even with respect to wages where the unions perhaps have had their greatest impact - again most people opposite who have dealt with unions, who have had something to do with large businesses, know that these businesses have programmed into their plans a certain increase in wages, so that what the unions are bargaining over and what management is bargaining over is a margin of one or two percent when collective bargaining occurs.

Mr. Speaker, organized labour is the only force in society that is obliged to fight for and to justify any increase in its income. The only possible exception to that are the farmers of Canada who are, in their own way, in a similar situation. The manufacturers who wish to raise their incomes simply add another cent, a dollar, a hundred dollars, two hundred dollars to their product. The retailer adds to his price. The doctor, the lawyer, the dentist, the architect raise their fee. The bankers raise their interest rates so there are other fees. The landlord raises his rent, and all these increases in prices and costs are made unilaterally: there is no negotiation with labour, there is no reference to the Minister of Labour, they are made arbitrarily without restrictions of any kind, any regulation, any law, any form of control. In fact, since in those climes of big business - and again I want to remind members that is what I am referring to - business which are large, and which I say again dominate most industries in this province, as well as in this country, in these lines of big business and in their professions price competition has been a dead letter for over 50 years. Businesses and taxes, Mr. Speaker, mentioned by the member opposite - I never had as much faith, nearly as much faith in the idea that

(MR. GONICK cont'd.) . . . . one can tax profits away from business through some kind of progressive tax systems, I believe that businesses which control the price of their product, and those are the kinds that I'm talking about, over a period of time will pass those prices, those taxes, on to the consumers. And it is working people and poor people who pay the taxes, and the large corporations don't pay one cent of taxes and never have since the beginning of, certainly since the beginning of the era of big business in this country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, businesses and professional people simply announce that their customers and their clients and their tenants who have to contribute so much more to their incomes beginning on a certain date, and that's the end of it. And there's no government mediation, there's no reference to the Minister of Labour, there's no negotiations with the unions. Mr. Speaker, imagine a situation that would arise if all other groups had to negotiate the increases of their incomes in the same manner as the unions have to do. Every time they wanted to raise their incomes they would have to negotiate those raises with other parties. Suppose, for example, that landlords had to negotiate all rent increases with their tenants and failing an agreement went on strike by locking their tenants out of their homes. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is the equivalent of what unions are forced to do when they cannot come to an agreement with businesses, when businesses refuse to provide them with the wages which they would like to see. Suppose that the bakery industry had to negotiate price increases with their consumers, or automobile producers, or milk producers, and failing an agreement withdrew their products from the market because that was the only thing left they had to do to raise their incomes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the position that wage and salary earners are in, and that is the vast majority of the people of Canada. They're in that position for the simple reason that they do not own the tools and the equipment that they work with, and that is the one disadvantage that workers will always have in the kind of economic system that we now have in Canada, and I repeat, will not be changed by anything, any changes in the labour legislation which this Legislature can bring about. Every strike, Mr. Speaker, results initially from a decision by the employer not to grant increment increases to their work force; and were businesses in the same position where they had to strike in order to earn increased income then, Mr. Speaker, we would have the quality of collective bargaining that the Member from Wolseley was talking about during his presentation.

Mr. Speaker, these are the facts of economic power that exist in the Province of Manitoba according to my views, which the Member from Morris can certainly rock it and disagree with it, that is his privilege. Now, Mr. Speaker, all the Legislature can do - as the Member for Inkster said so well - and all that it has done in the history of Canada, and the history of this province to this day, is inhibit the collective strength of labour, to restrict it, and this is what the Department of Labour have been doing for a hundred years in this country and in this province. This is the purpose of government mediators, conciliation officers and all the rest. The right to strike has been taken away from large numbers of workers; striking between labour agreements is prohibited by law in this country, not in most other countries in the Western world. The idea the government as a neutral agent, a neutral party, a referee between labour and capital - which is again the liberal notion of the Member of Wolseley - is simply a distortion of history. And we know it, Mr. Speaker, from the history of this very province before the Member from Wolseley and I were born. In 1919 during the Winnipeg general strike, the state and its armed agents at that time, the police, were used to shoot down workers in the street because they went on strike. Mr. Speaker, it was no accident that just a few years earlier MacKenzie King who performed the role as the Deputy Minister of Labour for the Federal Government and imposed his unique system of compulsory mediation in this country - which no other country had until that point, and few countries have to this day - when he was forced out of that position temporarily, it was no accident that he was hired by none other than John D. Rockefeller in the United States to adjust the system which he imposed on the working force in Canada through law; to adjust it in the private market in the coal mines of Colorado, where there were militant strikes. And he adjusted it successfully, in breaking the militancy of a major strike in the mines of Colorado, and was used for many years by Mr. Rockefeller to break strikes through the private system in the same way that he did when he was Deputy Minister of Labour through the legal changes which he brought about.

Mr. Speaker, this is not ancient history. We can talk about the asbestos strike in Quebec, we can talk, most recently in these past twelve months, there have been major strikes in Ontario where the police - and I don't in effect blame them, they were required, they were



(MR. GONICK cont'd.) . . . . asked, they were instructed to act as strike breakers in various key strikes throughout the Province of Ontario, in Belleville, at the Tex . . . strike; and other major strikes, only in the past six months, municipal peace forces were required to help break strikes by interfering with picket lines, and even private citizens were arrested by the police for supporting in a perfectly peaceful way picket lines outside of plants in industrial Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, there is no such thing as neutrality between labour and capital, as the Member for Wolseley discussed it. There can be no neutrality. The struggle between labour and capital, and that's what it is, is a struggle for control over work, a struggle for control over income. And it is very clear that past governments in this country, past governments in provinces have used the law to help businesses preserve their control, to help them preserve their disproportionate share of the total income. Now, Mr. Speaker, as I understand Bill 81, what it is trying to do is to use the law, not to take power and control away from business because you can't do that by changing labour laws - simply to remove some of the legal encumbrances that have shackled labour in its attempt to win more control over their work conditions and a greater share of the income.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have heard much of the term industrial peace. This becomes all of a sudden a kind of universal goal - more important than seemingly the most important goal for some members opposite - imploring governments to continue to use the law to inhibit labour, not so that they can act differently than other parties, but so that they can act in the same way legally as other parties. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think the way members opposite are using the term industrial peace, and the way it is used in the press, is simply another term for union busting; just another excuse to conduct big business as usual with labour legislation which inhibits unions from acting, from exercising rights which all other members in our society have. Industrial peace, Mr. Speaker, is not the goal, the goal of our society, certainly it is not the goal above all others of this government. Mr. Speaker, in Germany, in the 1930s industrial peace became a goal, a major means to a goal, and they abolished not only the right to strike, but they abolished in effect the trade union movement. And in the USSR members of the labour force were forced to join unions, but unions were stripped of all power to protect their members from abuse, from exploitation on the part of the state, but they accomplished industrial peace, so to speak.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that it is the intention of this government to establish industrial peace at the cost of taking away rights from the labour movement which all other members and all other individuals and all other groups in this society have had, and in which they have been protected from having for many many years. The goal of this group is to maximize wages, to maximize working conditions and standards of living of working people, and if industrial peace happens to get in the way of these goals then, Mr. Speaker, industrial peace will have to be sacrificed, because it is not the major goal.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to speak briefly about one aspect of the new labour code as represented by the substantial amendments, namely the changes with respect to technology, a matter mentioned by almost every person who has spoken on this legislation to date. Mr. Speaker, only those persons who elevate economic growth efficiency and profit do God-like importance would suggest that technological change must go forward regardless of its effects on the working people. And that is precisely what the Member for Sturgeon Creek was saying, what the Member for Riel was saying, what most members opposite who have spoken have been saying, that everything must be sacrificed so that some innovations may go forward regardless of its impact on the working people and their families in the communities in which they reside. Mr. Speaker, nobody on this side accepts that equation. The Member for Riel talked about the unfair advantage. Mr. Speaker, the Member for Lakeside . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. I. H. (Izzy) ASPER (Leader of the Liberal Party) (Wolseley): The member suggests that the opposition spokesmen in a blanket way have universally said a certain thing. I challenge this statement because I am one of those who have spoken . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. That is not a matter . . . Order please. Order please. That is not a matter of privilege. That is not a matter of privilege. Each member is entitled to an opinion, may express it providing he does not charge anyone directly. The Honourable Member for Crescentwood has four minutes left to speak.

MR. GONICK: Mr. Speaker, I want to . . . there are many aspects of this section of

(MR. GONICK cont'd.) . . . . the legislation which I wanted to talk about, but I must summarize what I wanted to say, to talk in particular about the major shortcoming which I see in the total package, which I have spoken to the Minister of Labour about privately. What the legislation says is that when an enterprise intends to bring about technological change of a significant nature affecting a significant number of people, it must give ninety days notice, and then if it goes to that extent there can be an opening up of the labour contract and this matter can be negotiated with respect to how the technological change will affect the labour force who will be affected; how the people can be compensated; the speed with which the technological change can occur, perhaps even whether it should occur or not - I presume that is all possible once the labour contract is opened up again. Mr. Speaker, I have no quarrel whatever with that, I think that is a principle that is very very important to establish. The only shortcoming I see, Mr. Speaker, is the qualifications which are appended to the bill, to the section, namely that a significant number of workers must be affected, and they must be affected in a significant way. The term "significant" is not defined in the section, it would be up to the Arbitration Board to consider whether or not a change is significant.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour has very wisely, I think, removed third parties from most aspects of labour law in the Province of Manitoba, and this is the major accomplishment of this legislation. But here with respect to technological change, a third party is introduced which will have discretion as to whether or not the agreement can be opened up for re-negotiation with respect to technological change.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that as regards other aspects of the behaviour, performance of the labour force, that we should be able to allow for the - and assume a sense of responsibility on the part of the unions affected, that they will not in a frivolous way open up the labour contract for re-negotiation when changes are so insignificant that they do not regard them as being important for the life of the contract.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we should accept the responsibility of the unions in question that basically allow them to determine what is significant for them, because it is the work force that is being affected, that they are responsible to, and not some arbitration board; and if over a period of time, it appears that they are abusing this privilege, this clause, perhaps this matter as any other matter could be reconsidered. But I believe very strongly that as in other areas which this labour legislation touched upon, in this very important one regarding technological change and the ability of the unions who are responsible to the work force who will be affected by the changes in technology, that they should be the ones to decide on what is significant and what is a significant number and what is a significant change. And with only that that I consider important but nevertheless minor in terms of the total package, Mr. Speaker, I commend this legislation to members of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): I beg to move, seconded by the Leader of the Opposition, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, would you kindly call second reading on Bill 59.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed Motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance) (St. Johns) presented Bill No. 59 - the Mineral Acreage Tax Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, in forwarding that slip to you I note there's reference to Law Amendments Committee. I'd like to confirm with the Clerk that this bill will be reviewed in Committee of the Whole and will not go outside of the House, being a taxing measure. So that's one item that I bring to honourable members' attention.

Honourable members have been waiting for this bill for some time since it was forecast in the Budget Speech, at which time we reviewed some aspects of the proposal, the type of bill we propose to bring, proposals to insure that mineral rights which may be held for speculative purposes by corporations, cannot be retained without some reasonable return to the people of Manitoba. Companies which hold mineral rights often hold such rights in anticipation of future gain and we believe it's only reasonable that such corporations contribute to public revenues.

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) . . . . Holders of unproductive land, operators of mines, gravel pit operators, all of these, speculators in mines generally, all do contribute to public revenues, and the question is posed as far as presenting this bill, why not corporations holding mineral rights for gain? Those who wish to maintain mineral rights would be contributing to the public revenue just as I pointed out real estate taxpayers do. The rate of tax proposed is ten cents per acre on mineral rights with respect to parcels of forty acres and over, and tax would be on mineral rights held by corporations not by individuals. An internal study made by government has shown that about three-quarters of the mineral rights, some 9.1 million acres, are held by individuals and it is not proposed to tax those at all. The remaining one-quarter of mineral rights, some 2.9 million acres, are under corporate ownership and will be taxable under this bill.

The justification for acreage taxation of titles held by corporations would be that some corporations, such as the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Hudson's Bay Company, were subsidized by Canada for the construction of railways and for land rights, and it was probably not intended that such corporations should be able to retain mineral rights for speculation, which is indeed what they are doing. The individual does not generally have large holdings which are sufficiently large to have any influence on the development of minerals, whereas the corporations with large holdings, and frequently major control, have major control over a large part of the mineralized area which enables these corporations to influence the development of these minerals. I might say that ten cents may be considered only a nominal amount and not sufficient to help influence the decision-making process as to the exploitation of the resources. Corporations, of course, normally pass on the tax to the lessees of their mineral rights, but the corporations take no steps towards influencing the development - I'm talking now about the real property taxation, the corporations take no steps towards influencing development of their mineral holdings, and hold them back purely for speculative reasons, then this action can contribute to a deterrent to mineral development.

I should point out that there are certain railway rights-of-way which are exempt. The Saskatchewan legislation exempts rights-of-way, station grounds, yards or terminals, of any railway. If they are not exempt, the CPR could effectively argue that they could not be taxed under such an act because of the main line exemption clause in the old CPR agreement so that it might be difficult to support taxation and we thought we had better make it absolutely clear, and I might say that this feature of the bill has been tested by the Supreme Court dealing with the Saskatchewan Act and has been found *intra vires*, and therefore we tried to follow the Saskatchewan structure as much as possible.

We do point out that if any corporation feels that the taxation of the mineral rights is a burden in any way and that there really isn't any value in the holding of mineral rights, they can always surrender their mineral rights to the province and thus avoid paying taxation, and thus the province will have that asset for whatever it's worth for future development. The bill is designed to be effective January 1st, 1973. We have provided that it would be brought in by proclamation. We could then prepare our regulations before that.

The estimated revenues I've previously reported are some \$300,000 but that would be during the next fiscal year, 73/74. As I recall it we've only put in one dollar as revenue for this current year just to create a line in the budget.

Members will want to know that Saskatchewan for some years has applied an acreage tax with a basic rate of ten cents per acre for corporate holdings, and in this last session they doubled the rate to 20 cents per acre. In Alberta for many years they have applied a five cent per acre tax, but there they have applied it on holdings of both corporations and individuals. That is not our proposal.

Members may also be aware that Alberta has announced a proposal to tax oil reserves over and above the current royalty in acreage taxes. That of course is a very dramatic move on the part of Alberta where they say that even though you may not be producing oil, you got the reserve, we're going to tax it, and they estimate a very large income from that.

I thought it would be of assistance to honourable members if I would distribute to them copies of the notes that were prepared for me for Third Reading, indeed for committee. They are detailed and apply to each section and I think if they would be helpful to me, Mr. Speaker, then I would assume they would also be helpful to all members of the House, and therefore I would ask the Page to distribute copies - it's some six pages long, and it should be helpful when they review the bill and the sections with the notes that were prepared for me.

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.)

May I say that I did not pay too much preliminary attention to the drafting of the bill itself. It's a technical bill, a tax bill, but I have raised the question of one section - on Second Reading one does not refer to section numbers, so I will refer to the section which deals with the requirements on the district registrar, which struck me as being rather broad and too protective on behalf of both the district registrar and the company, and I have instructed the Legislative Counsel to look at that section and consider the possibility of some amendment if it thought by the Committee of the Whole that this section denies or defeats any efforts by the individual taxpayer to be fully protected from improper or inadequate proceedings by government.

So having drawn this section to the attention of honourable members, I am inviting them to look at it and in the committee stage to discuss whether or not it seems a little bit too protective of government agencies, and we will then, of course, be able to hear from the Legislative Counsel as to any comments. I suggest that he look at the provisions as they apply to tax sale in the normal course, a real property tax is not paid, and see whether there is more justification to relate that kind of protection to the one that exists under tax sale, to the proposed section in this bill.

Other than that, Mr. Speaker, I commend the bill to members of the House. I would think that with the notes I have given them they will be in as good a position as I to discuss the bill, because I assure honourable members as of now they know as much as I do about the bill itself and the purpose of it has already been discussed during the Budget Debate.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, without wishing to prevent anybody from speaking on the Bill at this time, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, that debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Leader of the Opposition wish to proceed?

MR. ASPER: Without exhausting my right to speak, I'd like to ask a question if the Minister will . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Yes. The Honourable Member.

MR. ASPER: I wonder if the Minister could include in his explanation tonight, or at a later date, the figures telling us what the fiscal effect, the tax revenue effect for the Province of Manitoba would be if the individual had been included? Would it be four times, three times as much? --(Interjection)-- I see. And your total revenue is 300,000 so the maximum you could gain on the ten cents per acre would be 900,000 or a million, two. Can I continue? --(Interjection)-- Go ahead.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Speaker, it is the practice when asked a question to reply, and then if the member has another question, then he's actually put two. Yes. This is based on a preliminary study. I should say that there's a great deal of detail involved in checking titles, and that was done during last summer with searching of titles and estimating the information we have. It's as good as we've got. Of course once we start collecting the tax we'll know a lot better exactly what it's worth. But the indication is correct, the honourable member is right, that since one-quarter of the total acreage appears to be corporately owned, and there's 300,000 there at the same rate; if individuals were taxed at ten cents then it would be three times three totaling 900,000, plus the three; is 1.2 million.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ASPER: If the Minister doesn't mind I'd like another question. In reading the bill I'm having some trouble with the language. My first question of a series is will you explain at some time in the debate why it was deemed advisable not to include individuals in the taxation? The second . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Just to save time, I think the honourable member is now asking detailed questions, the kind that would be best answered I believe in Committee of the Whole when we deal with it. Of course I will have an opportunity to close debate and any questions raised during the debate on second reading I could probably deal with them in closing the debate and certainly during Committee of the Whole stage we could deal with each particular.

But on the question, which I know I interrupted, I would just say that it's the government's thought that we want to direct this tax to corporate holdings, we don't want to direct it to individuals, farmers who own over forty acres of land. We don't feel that they are the ones who may be holding up the development of the mineral resources or holding, retaining title to them for

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) . . . . speculative reasons, and that is our thought that corporate holdings are more justified and that is the approach.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ASPER: Finally, will you provide the House with, or can you tonight, provide the House with data indicating on a national basis, whether or not we can look at this on a comparative basis with the other provinces, looking at options to increase the ten cents, or decrease it if competitive circumstances require? Do we have a competitive chart?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I have indicated that Saskatchewan is now charging twenty cents on corporate holdings of forty acres and over; Alberta charges five cents on all holdings, corporate and individual; none of the other provinces, to my knowledge, have any such tax. So if you want to speak in terms of competitiveness the fact is that there will be three provinces out of the ten that will be taxing in this manner.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, seconded by the Honourable Member, for -- I didn't get the -- the Leader of the Opposition, debate be adjourned, Agreed? So ordered.

The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Bill 106, Mr. Speaker, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed 10 -- which?

MR. PAULLEY: 106. The Honourable Minister of Transportation. Highway Traffic Act on page 2.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed Motion of the Honourable Minister of Transportation. The Honourable Minister.

HON. PETER BURTONIAK (Minister of Transportation)(Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Health, that Bill 106, An Act to Amend the Highways Traffic Act be now read a second time.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. BURTONIAK: Mr. Speaker, for the first part, the amendments in the bill to amend the Highway Traffic Act are basically of the housekeeping variety. A substantial number of amendments were required as a result of the enactment of the City of Winnipeg Act, deleting or replacing reference to the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg. Another group of amendments relate to the newly revised Criminal Code by deleting reference to old sections and substituting the new sections where reference is made to these in the Highway Traffic Act. There is no change in either the principle or substance in any of these amendments as such. There are, however, a number of amendments which introduce either a new principle or modify in some degree an existing principle, and I would like to just mention a few of the proposed amendments which I feel are noteworthy examples which I should like to bring to the attention of the honourable members of the House.

A change in the definition of school buses is proposed which would broaden the definition and permit such vehicles to be used in connection with activities not necessarily related to school curriculum, and also grant authority to school boards to approve such use.

A provision is included which will authorize the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to increase by regulation the maximum weight that may be carried on Trans Canada highways at the prescribed fees payable for the additional weight carried. Other provinces have increased their maximum weight and in order to facilitate the movement of intra provincial road traffic it is deemed desirable to bring our weight regulations into conformity with the neighbouring provinces.

A new provision is included which would permit the Motor Transport Board or the Taxicab Board to issue a temporary permit authorizing the transfer of existing registration to another vehicle when the original vehicle is damaged or otherwise disabled temporarily. Such permits would be valid for 15 days. Taxicab owners and motor carriers experience substantial loss of revenue when a vehicle is disabled and they are unable to effect a transfer of the registration to another vehicle during weekends or on holidays. The law relating to the suspension of motor vehicles is being amended by allowing a degree of latitude in the height of suspensions. The original provision was we feel too stringent and included conditions which were not intended to be covered by the enactment.

A new penalty section is included for persons who fail to stop at a weigh scale. Presently a person who fails to stop at a weigh scale or are ordered by an officer to stop, the person is

(MR. BURTNIAK cont'd) . . . . subject to the general penalty only with no minimum; whereas if he had stopped and his truck was overweight he would be subject to a more severe penalty.

The penalty provisions for offences relating to failure to remain at the scene, or exchange particulars with other persons, is being amended by providing discretion to the courts to suspend a person's licence for up to one year. Currently there is no authority to suspend for such offences and as some of them are quite serious it is deemed proper that the Court should have the authority to suspend the driver's licence in the appropriate cases.

Provisions related to the use of farm trucks for hire are also being amended. The amendment will permit in addition to the transportation of cereal grains and sugar beets, as was brought in last year or two years ago, the transportation of vegetables or fruit by farm trucks for hire as well will be included.

The provisions relating to the suspension of driver licences upon default of payment of fine imposed are also being amended. Some of the amendments are for clarification only.

A new provision is being added which will allow a person to serve out the indeterminate period of suspension at the rate of \$1.00 fine for each four days suspension served. This will eliminate the indeterminate suspension which now remains in force until the fine is paid.

The provisions which authorize boards to issue a temporary 30-day driver's licence to persons convicted of offences making them liable to automatic suspension under the Act is being amended by extending the duration of the temporary permit from 30 to 45 days. This will afford persons more time within which their appeals to the board can be heard and determined.

An amendment is proposed which will make persons in default of payment of deferred insurance premiums liable to suspension of their registration. Such a provision is necessary to ensure that persons in default of paying deferred insurance premiums will not continue to operate their motor vehicles indefinitely.

The authority to register commercial trucks is proposed to be transferred from the Traffic Board to the Registrar. This is merely to facilitate registration of commercial trucks which will be incorporated into the system to which all other types of trucks are registered. It will relieve the Transport Board of a considerable amount of work and the regulatory authority with respect to commercial trucks will remain vested in the Transport Board.

A provision is included in the amendments which will permit prescribing by regulation standards for motorcycles which may be registered under the act. There is a considerable amount of confusion as to what kinds of motorcycles may be registered, resulting in some persons incurring a cost in acquiring a motorcycle which they subsequently learn could not be registered for use on the highway.

These are just a few points, Mr. Speaker, that I wanted to bring to the attention of the members insofar as our bill is concerned -- at least these are some of the more important amendments that we propose and which I hope will be approved, and I commend them to the members of the House.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rock Lake, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering if perhaps you could call -- I'm just checking, Mr. Speaker, to see among those who have the adjournment who is in a position to speak. Bill 98. The Member for Rock Lake. Excuse me, Mr. Speaker. The Member for Emerson perhaps would be prepared to speak on Bill 93.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, I certainly don't wish to speak at length on the Clean Environment Act, but I wish to outline with some firmness that I have some concerns about especially one particular section of the bill.

I for one realize that in order to protect the environment from pollution -- the environment being air, water and soil -- we must have the kind of legislation which will permit government to sink their teeth into possible offences and recify it in the best way possible.

(MR. GIRARD cont'd) . . . . I do not, however, wish to agree with one particular principle of the bill, and that principle is outlined in such a way as to give the Cabinet, give the Executive Council almost absolute power with regard to controlling of the development of industries in Manitoba. As a matter of fact, the bill stipulates that the Executive Council may direct that in any locality there shall be no other industry or no other expansions of industry within that given locality.

Mr. Speaker, I feel very strongly that this kind of power ought not to be left in the hands of the Executive Council; and I feel strongly as well that the Executive Council does not need that kind of power in order to establish a Clean Environment Commission with still very far-reaching powers. I wish to voice my rejection of this kind of thinking, but otherwise I wish not to debate the bill, I'd like to see it go to second reading. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried. On division?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, would you call Bill No. 98, the Member for Rock Lake.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, we're dealing with Bill No. 98 which is An Act to amend the Natural Products Marketing Act, which to me, Mr. Speaker, I think is probably one of the most important bills that has come into this Legislature for a long time insofar as the agriculture industry is concerned.

I notice that the Minister in the explanation he gave to this bill was very brief and didn't go into any detail insofar as the bill was concerned. I think he was indicating that there were some amendments to the Natural Products Marketing Act which he had hoped would give some flexibility insofar as the bill was concerned as it applied to the Province of Manitoba; and also he indicated that he wanted some conformity as it relates to the Federal bill, namely Bill C-176, which was set up to establish national marketing boards for the whole country. And I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that insofar as Bill C-176 is concerned, I don't know of any piece of legislation federally that received more attention and had more discussion and more criticism than that particular bill. All across western Canada particularly. I know that my colleagues in the House of Commons fought against the ingredients that Bill C-176 contains because they were fully aware of the consequences of what this kind of legislation would do for the farmers of not only Manitoba but of the whole of western Canada. It is peculiar within the agricultural industry, Mr. Speaker, something we don't have in other industries, that is that our problems vary from province to province in this nation, and they are regional, and as a result it becomes very difficult to establish a policy that would be national in scope and at the same time be satisfactory to all farmers across this nation. And I know, Sir, that the Minister of Agriculture indicated one day last fall, and the Press were present, he said that had his Party been in office in the House of Commons, he didn't think there would be any difference insofar as the problems that he was facing and the kind of legislation that he was looking forward to.

Now, Sir, I am very very concerned about the amendments to this act. We have seen what this government has done today insofar as establishing marketing boards. I don't know whether he feels that he is not satisfied with just doing that. It indicates to me in this bill -- and the Minister didn't really go into any details on it -- but he wants to establish a plan where he can bring in regulatory measures to enforce a plan that I'm very much afraid, Mr. Speaker, that many farmers are going to be disappointed in and are going to be very fearful of. -- (Interjection) -- And as my colleague from Morris says, opposed to. Because what have we had, Mr. Speaker, in the past three years? -- and I want to say for myself, and my colleagues I think do agree with me on this particular philosophy -- we have a government that is bringing in the kind of agricultural policies through marketing boards whereby the government through the boards will decide and plan how the farmers are going to conduct and operate their business. And as I see some of the sections in this bill, Mr. Speaker, the farmer is going to be regulated right down to the single cattle beef that he might sell through a local butcher or what have you. In the many areas, Mr. Speaker, that the government is trying to enforce on the agricultural industry I can't help but feel the number of policemen that they are going to have to hire to control the Gestapo agents -- I'm sorry to say, Mr. Speaker, if I use this expression, I can't help but feel that it fits this kind of legislation that we are now faced with -- that they are going to have to enforce all these rules and regulations that they

(MR. EINARSON cont'd) . . . . are imposing upon the agricultural industry.

I can think of many areas where we have now got marketing boards, where we have seen within the Minister's department -- the Hog Marketing Board as one example, was imposed upon them without the wishes of the majority hog producers. We have the Dairy Commission -- mind you that was Federal -- but we now have a Dairy Board that is taking a much more active part, and I have asked questions of the Minister in the House insofar as our dairy policy is concerned, because I know he did go down to Ottawa to secure an increase in quota for the dairy producers of this province. That's all well and good, I think that's fine, but he asked for a three year period. The reason I asked how many dairy cows were producing in Manitoba he was not able to give me the answer, and I think it is relevant and important insofar as the dairy industry is concerned in the Province of Manitoba. For you know, Sir, that in order that we are going to increase and capitalize on this quota that he was able to get from the Minister in Ottawa, we have to find those extra number of cows who are going to produce that quota. And whether the Minister knows or not, I don't know, but I am given to understand that he has had some of his officials going into Ontario to try to find out whether there is a possibility of purchasing extra cows to be brought into Manitoba in order that he can capitalize on this increased quota that he is able to get. And if he doesn't, Sir, in three years time if we haven't capitalized on gaining that quota, we are going to lose it. You know, take from the time a female calf is born until it's in production it takes three years at least before it's going to produce. This is one area insofar as the problems are concerned within the marketing board of operating our dairy policies are concerned.

There is only one area in the agricultural industry that hasn't been touched so far, Mr. Speaker, and that is the cattle industry. It is one of the areas that has been flourishing the very best. And the cattlemen are saying to the government we hope that you will continue to keep your hands off; we are not interested in a marketing board to control that industry because we feel that what we are doing ourselves as an organized group through the voluntary association of farmers who are the producers of cattle, I think are doing an admirable job.

I want to say, Sir, that I did commend the Minister of Agriculture with the assistance of the Attorney-General when he was concerned about the egg situation for the egg producers of Manitoba, when he did challenge the Province of Quebec in the Courts insofar as the policies, the production and the prices that farmers were getting for eggs. So, Mr. Speaker, having done that, I'm amazed that the Minister should make an aboutface and go along with the kind of legislation we have here before us. I think, Mr. Speaker, that this is a regressive step, rather than trying to find a way of improving our economic standards for the agricultural industry and I, for one, am fully in agreement with the Minister that the farmer is not receiving his fair share of that dollar that is spent by the consumer in buying the food that they require for their daily living.

And so I say I don't agree with the philosophy that they use, with the controls that they are going to apply, because I can't see that this is going to answer the problems that farmers are faced with today, rather it's going to hinder them. And having spoken about the egg situation, the Minister has probably solved the poultry situation by the killing off of what it is a million hens. He has probably solved that all right. But there's one aspect of this bill, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister made no mention of, no mention of whatsoever, and that is something that was new to me -- when he spoke of an extra provincial board, and as I was given to understand this extra provincial board is not only establishing a provincial board in the province but an extra provincial board which gives him the authority outside the province. I don't know how many more boards they're going to try to establish, whether they're running out of jobs for their friends or what it is, but certainly I don't know what they are going to achieve on this because, Mr. Speaker, as I see the role that the Minister is playing right now insofar as the farmers in this Province are concerned, we're getting into a regulatory situation where these regulations are being established; where we're going to make an island out of ourselves here in the Province of Manitoba, and the outside are going to dictate as to what we are going to get for our produce in the Province of Manitoba.

The Minister has the idea that we here are going to be able to dictate the prices but, Mr. Speaker, it just does not work that way. We have to depend, as we are an exporting province, we have to depend on what the outside market is prepared to pay for what we produce as a surplus commodity that we have in this province. And speaking of the extra provincial board, Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest to the First Minister -- I know the circumstances that



(MR. EINARSON cont'd) . . . . the Minister of Agriculture is in, he's not here tonight -- but I want to say to the First Minister that I think under this act they are violating the British North American Act by trying to bring in these powers because I believe it does contravene the British North American Act, that I think that when this is made law there is nothing to stop someone from challenging the Minister in the Courts. And I say, Sir, because I think it's very important, and I want to quote Section 121 of the British North American Act. It states: "All articles of growth, produce or manufacturing of any one of the provinces shall from and after the union be admitted free into each of the other provinces." Now, Sir, I don't know how the Minister is going to find himself when he brings in this legislation, enacts it, makes it law in Manitoba, has that extra provincial board to operate his authority outside the province when we have a clause in the British North American Act, Section 121, which states as I have just quoted to you. This remains to be seen as to how they are going to handle this matter.

These are some of the comments that I have to make, Mr. Speaker, insofar as this bill is concerned, and as I said I think it is a very important one, and I am very concerned about the powers that are being stated here and the consequences it may have on the agricultural industry in this province, because I do feel that it is an industry that is very important and very vital to this province. I think the Minister could do well, rather than to bring about regulations and controls through his marketing board system if he would sit down and discuss with the industries that we have to work with, in trying to promote a better understanding and in turn would make better for the economic well-being of the farmers of this province. Having said this, Mr. Speaker, I await to have a much better explanation of many of the sections in this bill because I think they are very important and to me this is the most crucial legislation insofar as agriculture is concerned that has come before us in a long time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Well, Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry that debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable Member for Morris, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry that debate be adjourned. Agreed? So ordered.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: 103, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Health, the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, Bill 103 essentially adds up in our view to a mild disappointment, in that some of us have been awaiting some fairly bold new initiatives and definitions of direction for the medical profession and the whole health care field in Manitoba, and we had anticipated that perhaps during the lifetime of this session, some of those new directions would be outlined. The bill before us really does not contain any of the hope for provisions and initiatives, and as a consequence I suggest that in essence it is a disappointment to us, Mr. Speaker, and that it constitutes merely a case of much ado about nothing. On the other hand there are some housekeeping aspects to the bill which no doubt will make for a more efficient administration -- the Health Services Insurances Act and all that it implies in the province, and I recognize the need on the part of the Minister in the Department to have taken some of the housekeeping steps contained herein. My only major objection being as I have suggested that I had hoped for something more than this in the field of health services for Manitobans.

The part of the bill that gives us a cause for greatest concern is that having to do with the appeal that a medical practitioner can file against an order of the Medical Review Committee. And we are joined in our anxiety over that part of the legislation by the College of Physicians and Surgeons, whose spokesmen assure us that they share our concern with the fact that the decisions of this Medical Review Committee are going to be binding and there will be no appeal from them, Sir, and that the medical practitioners are possibly put in an extremely disadvantageous position from that point of view. It's true that the medical practitioner who is affected by an order of the Medical Review Committee really has a chance to go through two peer reviews, two reviews by juries of his peers, but he reaches a point at the end of the line under this legislation from which there is no appeal to the courts. There is no appeal to the instruments of law, and we don't believe that it's good legislation in the field of medicine in particular, that the decisions of a board of this nature should be so binding and unchallengeable. We believe that anyone should have the right to appeal through the mechanism of the

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) . . . . courts because there may be points of law that the Review Committee itself has either missed or is not familiar with. There may be aspects of the law with which it's not conversant and familiar. As a consequence there could be injury done to those medical practitioners who are affected by such orders and who ultimately have no recourse to the agencies and instruments of law that would be conversant with and familiar with those sophisticated points of law that the Review Committee overlooked. These greater powers of the Medical Review Committee are all right to a certain extent one admits, but they're only all right if they're used properly and responsibly, and when you consider that the committee can act under this legislation, Sir, without the authority of the commission itself, that is the Manitoba Health Services Commission, I think an area of possible injury and possible danger certainly is opened up. It's this facet of the legislation in particular that the College of Physicians and Surgeons is concerned with, and it's certainly this facet that exercises us most of all on this side.

I would be interested in the Minister's explanation as to why coverage in mental hospitals outside the province is being introduced in this form at this time, and just how broad an extension of coverage it contains in this measure. There are a number of institutions of a mental health, of a quasi mental health nature in parts of this country to which Manitoba residents sometimes go for treatment, there are some in the United States, There is certainly in British Columbia two or three in the nature of homes to which residents of Manitoba sometimes repair, and the question arises as to how the categorization of these institutions is achieved; whether or not the legislation applies to those mental health institutions which come very strictly and specifically into a particular definitive sphere, a particular sphere of clear definition, or whether the application is going to be so broad as to include as I say, some of the institutions -- and the Province of British Columbia is notable for a number that would fit less into a category of mental hospital and perhaps more into a category of a special type of rest home.

I would be interested in the Minister's explanation as to just how broad this provision in the legislation is and how far it goes, whether rest home or quasi rest homes are included, and why this particular section in the legislation is introduced in the manner that it is and at this time. It's obvious to me from the -- or let me put it this way, it would seem obvious to me from the way the legislation is framed, Sir, that we still suffer in this province from a lack of special psychiatric services and facilities for young people as well as for adults, and that there may be a tacit omission here in the legislation that the Province of Manitoba, the Government of Manitoba has to cover and protect its citizens elsewhere in other administrations, in other jurisdictions, and provide for same in legislation of this sort because the necessary facilities are lacking here. That question naturally arises when one considers the specific provisions contained in this bill, and I must mention for the Minister's consideration and comment that we are concerned that sufficient psychiatric facilities and mental care facilities be provided within the Province of Manitoba naturally for Manitoba citizens; and that be regarded as a major priority rather than that the emphasis go on the other side of the equation, and that coverage be provided for outside treatment. I think particularly in the field of children and young people, youthful patients, we have a severe shortage of the necessary treatment, psychiatric treatment facilities.

It would be interesting to know whether any parts of this bill are retroactive, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps the Minister can comment on that. Those are essentially the reactions that we have to the legislation. As I say, basically it's a question of being unhappy with the fact that orders of the Medical Review Committee reach a point where they are binding and where the medical practitioner has no recourse to appeal, or further judgment; and equally unhappy with the fact that the bill is narrow and restrictive in its vision, and that many of the new initiatives necessary in the health services field in Manitoba are not approached and not covered in this legislation whatsoever. What is necessary, in fact, is for the Minister and his department to review once again in a formal and full overview the needs of the health profession and the health services field in Manitoba, and that a whole new legislative approach be made available to clear up the confusion that exists in the field at this time, and permit those practitioners and those participants in certain health centers in Manitoba to proceed with the programs that they believe are necessary. Many of those programs have been interrupted by the lack of policy of the government, or by the indecisions of the government in the health services field, and none of those questions are answered in the legislation contained in Bill 103.

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

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Development)(Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I would only like to make a few comments at this stage. I believe that a lot of the questions that were posed in the House by the honourable members can be dealt with maybe more effectively and more in detail by an official that will be with me in committee when the bill is discussed and approved clause by clause.

I can understand to some extent the disappointment of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry when he talks of the bill itself. I don't believe that he is opposing very much of the -- not the intent anyway of the bill itself -- but maybe the lack of legislation that has been presented at this session pertaining to health itself. I tried, Mr. Speaker, to outline to members of the House one of the reasons why more legislation had not been presented at this session pertaining to health leaving aside social development, and one of the main reasons was the preparation and the hopeful tabling of the White Paper on health at this present session that will definitely engage a lot of professions, certainly the Department of Health and the Health Services Commission in very serious discussion on the existing services within the health fields in the Province of Manitoba, private and public institutions, and that it could certainly, in my mind, produce more effective legislation for the next session. And that is the main reason.

We can operate with existing statutes that we have within the Department of Health and Social Development. Some minor changes had to be made regarding the Manitoba Health Services Commission and they're before you. And they are housekeeping amendments I'll have to agree with the honourable member.

The honourable member was asking the reason why we presented the section dealing with mental hospitals and services outside of the Province of Manitoba. There are certain services that are not actually available in the Province of Manitoba that we can actually purchase elsewhere in Canada and this is one of the reasons why we wanted to have this section in the bill allowing the Manitoba Health Services Commission to pay for such services, and equally for emergency services that do happen now and again. And so far as the honourable member's question pertaining to the retroactive feature of that clause, there is a discretionary power left to the Commission pertaining to that possibility. So far as the health centres are concerned these will be dealt with like many other items in the White Paper on health and discussion will take place between sessions and hopefully that what has been announced and what has been started to date pertaining to health and social development centres will proceed.

The other aspects and possible effect of other clauses within the bill that were not dealt with by other members of the House could be dealt with effectively while we review the bill in committee.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if you would now kindly call the adjourned debate on third reading, Bill No. 12. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, in third reading of Bill 12 it's interesting to us to review the progress that it has made through the House and through Law Amendments Committee. In first and second reading there was placed before us a very simple piece of legislation which appeared to be innocuous and even ineffectual in achieving the stated aim of the government. Subsequently in Law Amendments Committee a number of amendments were brought in which completely changed the character of the legislation and in effect implemented many of the recommendations of the Klass Committee Report. Now in third reading we are considering an entirely changed bill.

Instead of simply legalizing unauthorized substitution of generic drugs for one which has been prescribed by a physician, the bill now makes it compulsory for the pharmacist to do this. The patient's right to know and to consent, in my opinion, are still not adequately recognized. Let's consider for a minute if this bill was applied to some other aspect of our living than drugs. Let's say that you went to a store -- let's say that the Attorney-General went to a store and he wanted to buy a hot pink shirt, a hot pink shirt -- pink shirt, hot pink shirt . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MRS. TRUEMAN: . . . and suppose he was told by the storekeeper, yes we have that shade of pink in a shirt but we have a green one that's considerably cheaper, the material's a

(MRS. TRUEMAN cont'd) . . . . little rough, it's not quite as fine a shirt but the government says that we must give you the lowest cost shirt in our inventory. -- (Interjection) -- Well, let's suppose instead that you went to buy some shoes and the shopkeeper was compelled to sell you his lowest priced shoes -- (Interjection) -- Ouch, how they would hurt. -- (Interjection) -- Wrong size, wrong colour. Or suppose that you went out to buy your favourite brand of breakfast coffee and you couldn't be sure that when you took the coffee home that you'd really gotten the kind that you always liked to have in the morning, there could be a lot of cranky people at breakfast time. Or maybe if you want to go out and buy some nice chops for dinner and you could be told by the grocer that, well he was sorry, he had chops but he couldn't sell those to you because he had some ground meat that was considerably cheaper; or maybe even some synthetic protein product which has been recently invented and suppose the government made it compulsory that we had to spend our money on the lowest cost product.

Well, these slightly ridiculous situations involve esthetics more than our health, and they might offend our tastes to a considerable extent. And I think that people would truly resent having government tell them how they were to spend their money, what they could buy when they went to the store. For here in a much more vital area we are dealing with drugs that are designed to affect the state of one's health and well-being, the state steps in and overrides those individual rights. Well, my first reaction to the compulsory aspect was to think that the government was going to move into central drug purchasing, bulk purchasing, and that they were simply insuring that they would have a market for their product. Now even the biggest corporation can't do that. They can only resort to advertising and persuasion and this is really quite benign compared to government compulsion.

Well, I must have been wrong in that assessment because in a subsequent statement the Chairman of the Cabinet Committee on Health and Social Policy in an interview stated that although the government intends eventually to introduce bulk purchasing it may not come about by establishing a new agency to do it. Well the more I thought about this the more intriguing it was and I thought that if the government wasn't going to do the buying and selling it seemed to me that a captive market was being provided for someone and that this was going to work to that person's financial advantage; in other words that someone was going to make a lot of money out of the results of this bill. We are told that under this legislation the lowest cost drug must be provided to the patient and the dispensing fee will be established in consultation between pharmacist and government. Well, of course that's price fixing at that level.

Representation was made to Law Amendments Committee by Sabra Pharmaceuticals, a firm which buys on Canadian and Foreign markets and then apparently packages and sells to the local market. Their spokesman was so vehement about the virtues of this bill on drug substitution and he proposed amendments that were much like those that were subsequently submitted by the government, that I couldn't help feeling that there must be some self interest concerned here and that perhaps the windfall would be possibly going in that direction. I'd been hearing about this company and I determined to try to get hold of an annual report and see just exactly what they were and what they did and so on. Well my attempts to get their annual report were frustrated because there apparently has been no report filed for 1971-72, and in fact the company is not in good standing and will lose its charter if a report is not filed by the end of the year. So I was unable to learn just what the company does, who the owners are, though there's talk around which I have not been able to verify. Once again I think the public's right to know has been frustrated.

The Member for Crescentwood has spoken of a large savings to the public. I'm surprised that a person so versed in economics it didn't occur to him that somewhere back there the person who was doing the bulk purchasing for a compulsory captive market was going to be reaping quite a harvest.

This is the very thing that outraged the government so, when we suggested that there should be competition in the auto insurance. They were horrified at the idea that auto insurance could be made compulsory and the people left in the hands of private enterprise, but that's exactly what is happening in this Bill 12. And I suspect that in this bill we were all just led a little bit down the garden path.

I think that I would like to make it clear that in the amendments that were proposed I was quoted in one of the newspapers to the effect that mine were the same, and I would divorce myself from the first four sections that were proposed by the government as amendments and would like it to be clear that my amendments simply provided that the lowest cost drug in the

(MRS. TRUEMAN cont'd) . . . . inventory had to be the one that was substituted, and my other amendments dealt with the labelling on the container and the information that was to be in the prescription.

Well it will be interesting to watch what happens next by way of implementing the Klass Report, and it looks to me as if the Minister has made quite a start from an inauspicious beginning and I am truly regretful that the compulsory aspect is introduced. If it hadn't been for that I think we would have been much happier with the Bill.

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

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Churchill, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Would you now call the adjourned debate on the Resolution of the Honourable the First Minister? I understand, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Member for Inkster has some time left in order to conclude his remarks.

A MEMBER: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. I would like to indicate that at adjournment hour I had indicated that the honourable member's time had elapsed and I asked the will of the House at that time whether debate would remain in his name and I was given the agreement, no one objected at that time, consequently the debate remained in his name. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

A MEMBER: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I'm a member of this House and I'm entitled to speak.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may on the point of privilege . . . he cannot now withhold . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. Order, please. The time to object was when I put the question to the House. There was no objection at that time. The Honourable Member for Inkster. The Honourable Member for Rhineland state his point of order?

MR. FROESE: Yes, I certainly didn't understand from your remarks that his time had expired and that you were asking for leave .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Let me indicate to all the honourable members, I try my best to enunciate and to speak clearly. If there's any difficulty in hearing me I wish they would tell me at the time when I am asking for whatever is going on at that particular moment. At the present time the Honourable Member for Inkster has the floor. The Honourable Member for Inkster. Order, please. -- (Interjection) -- Order, please. Shall the ruling of the Chair be concurred in? All those in favour please say aye. Against say nay. In my opinion the ayes have it, declare the motion carried.

. . . continued on next page.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN, Q. C. (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I thank the honourable members for their indulgence and I will try to not overstay my leave. I do have some remarks which I believe can be concluded rather quickly.

Mr. Speaker, I left off with the point of suggesting that I believed that it was dangerous to the rights of religious freedom and that it was dangerous to the concept of freedom of thought for the state to involve itself in financing any particular ideologies or beliefs. I also indicated, Mr. Speaker, that I thought it was more than Utopian, I thought that it was out of the question that the state would at some stage adopt a posture of allowing and treating all beliefs equally in terms of financing was concerned; therefore I said that the only way of treating beliefs equally in our society is to try to have an educational system which embraces all of those beliefs and does not direct the system towards the teaching of any one. And I've indicated that at times when I have used this argument some people have said that it was a hypothetical argument, that that is not the kind of thing that we would ever be faced with in our society.

Mr. Speaker, in response to that I started to read at the closing hour from an edition of the Western Jewish News dated Thursday, June 15, 1972, which is not long ago. The heading, Mr. Speaker, of the report is "School Protest" and the location is Johannesburg. And I am sure that the people in Johannesburg, Mr. Speaker, think that they are a very democratic country; they think that, Mr. Speaker, they have a value in the different racial groups that compose that country. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, many of them think honestly - and I don't agree with them - but many of them think that the policy of apartheid, whereby the races are kept separate for many many reasons, is one which is conducive to the growth of those particular groups and is not a disadvantage to them.

But, Mr. Speaker, the article reads as follows: "The Jewish community has expressed concern over the new regulation directing that religious instruction in state-run schools should be Christocentric to prepare that pupil, through his knowledge of the Bible, to accept Jesus Christ as his personal saviour." Mr. Speaker, I know that the majority of the people in Manitoba are Christians and I respect their belief in Christianity. I have suggested that it is dangerous for the state to be involved in the furtherance of religion through the school system. I believe that it is equally dangerous, Mr. Speaker, for them to be involved in the furtherance of five religions, or six religions, because that then becomes the institution of a state church.

Mr. Speaker, in Johannesburg where the state has seen fit to ask for religious instruction in the schools, it has now said exactly what I have said that it would say whenever it takes this type of position; that it is going to say what that religion shall say, and in the state-run schools in Johannesburg, in the state-run schools, it must now be taught that we are saved through Jesus Christ. Mr. Speaker, where does that leave a person who believes in Judaism? Oh, I'm sure that it will be said in a country of that kind, "Well, we will set up Jewish schools where you can go and therefore you won't have to go to the state-run schools."

Mr. Speaker, that takes me back to where my people came from, because my people came from Russia and I grew up all my life with the knowledge that they were prohibited from going to the public school. And the kind of thing that we are suggesting, Mr. Speaker, although it seems very innocent today -- and let me not present the Jews as being the martyrs in this case because the Jews are able to behave just as negatively as any other people in this connection, and I have had personal experience in that regard. Because, Mr. Speaker, the Jewish community of Winnipeg collects money and then finances its own school system, and in 1950 they used to finance roughly four schools; one of them which could be identified as the United Jewish Peoples Order School, which was identified by the rest of the community as a Communist school. And during their heyday of McCarthyism, Mr. Speaker, it got to the Jewish community that it would not be tolerated that they continue to support a Communist school. And the debate that I am taking place in right now, Mr. Speaker, I took part in 22 years ago when the Jewish community, which I considered to be a fairly progressive community, decided that they would cut off funds to this particular school because they considered them no longer entitled to be called Jews and therefore a part of the Jewish school system.

Mr. Speaker, this is not hypothetical - it happened. And I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that if we decided that we are going to subsidize religious schools today, in 20 years, 30 years, 40 years, in some period of time we are going to start telling those schools what they have to teach, and some group of cabinet ministers are going to look at the education budget, Mr. Speaker -- Mr. Speaker, some group of cabinet ministers is going to look at the education

(MR. GREEN cont'd) budget and they're going to say, Mr. Speaker, "That you know you have 20,000 Jewish people in the Province of Manitoba out of a million. They've got three schools; why do they have three schools for such a community?" And we should tell them that there should be one school regardless of the fact that there were differences in the Labour Zionist School and the Conservative School and the Orthodox School; we're going to tell them that we can't afford the luxury of three Jewish schools for a community of 20,000 people. And maybe then they will amalgamate them in one school and at that time the community will not be able to say anything. And then, Mr. Speaker, in another 10 years, or 15 years, I don't know the time, but I know that every time the state has gone into this it has meant a restriction of religious liberty; that somebody's going to come in and complain to the government, "You know what they're teaching in some of those schools? They're teaching that God inflicted 10 plagues on the Egyptians, boils and the killing of the first born and a whole bunch of things of that -- which amounts to hate, and there are people, there are people in our community who are objecting to it." And the Jewish people will be called in and said, "Now look. We don't like this part of what you are teaching." And it will not only happen to the Jewish community, it will happen, Mr. Speaker, in every community where the state decides that it is going to usurp the function of involving itself in the teaching of the beliefs of various parts of its citizens.

Mr. Speaker, these are not hypothetical questions. These things happened; they happened to me; and I vowed, Mr. Speaker, and I still vow, that I would not be a party to that kind of thing happening, because I know the results of it when it has happened. And if we are interested, Mr. Speaker, in maintaining a fair treatment for all the diverse elements in our community, the way of doing it is not providing them with separate schools; the way of doing it is making our school system so all-embracing that these people fit into the school system and are not directed by it to move in one direction, Mr. Speaker, or another.

And that is the fundamental issue, Mr. Speaker, that I am fighting. It has been introduced into this House because the principle is sought to be made less important. It's really introduced into this House, Mr. Speaker, as an administrative problem, that we have been giving money in different ways and that there are some schools who have been accepted into the school division and others that have not, and really we want to set up a committee to give us advice on this administrative problem.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you before the committee could give advice on the administrative problem, it would have to know; does the government wish to encourage the separation of schools and the facilitating of such separation by financial support on the basis of religious or racial differences, or does it not wish to encourage? Because if it does wish to encourage, it should extend relief on an equal basis to all these schools, and eventually it means a 100 percent basis. Because if the argument is sound that every parent has a right to designate the allocation of their school dollar, then it is sound, not 50 percent or 70 percent, it is sound 100 percent, Mr. Speaker, therefore that decision has to be made. And if the decision is that we don't wish to facilitate such separation, then the committee will say, well, your decision is easy. You cut back on those services that have gone beyond the spirit of the Shared Services Agreement, and you tell those school divisions that have been facilitating school differences on the basis of religion or race that they are no longer to do so. And that's the simple answer. The question that remains unanswered is what do you want to do? It's not a legal question, as has been submitted by the First Minister, as to whether the agreements are legal or not. Because if they were legal and 57 members said, "We don't want to do it," they would quickly say, "Don't do it." And if they were illegal, Mr. Speaker, and 57 members said "We want to do it," they would quickly make them legal. So all of this notion of a committee being able to solve the problem, really begs the question.

Mr. Speaker, what is going to be the make-up of this committee? Well, I will predict to you at this moment that if this resolution is passed it will be suggested that the make-up of the committee be composed of people who have not really taken firm positions on this issue; that it be composed of people who have been moderate, who have not firmed up their mind on this issue. Why, Mr. Speaker? Because if we accept the fact that we're seeking a way of giving money to the school, then the people to do it are not people who don't believe in that kind of program, and somehow it will be suggested that those people who have the least interest in the matter are the best ones to serve on the committee. Which is always suggested, Mr. Speaker, when you are seeking a compromise approach from moving in one direction on the principle or the other direction on the principle.

(MR. GREEN cont'd)

Mr. Speaker, I'm coming to the conclusion of my remarks, I want the House to know that. I want this House to accept the fact, Mr. Speaker, that what I have been discussing for the last 50 minutes or so has nothing to do with the issue that faces the members of this Legislature; that, Mr. Speaker, if this issue was what was being decided, it would never have come to the floor and it would be so overwhelmingly approved in the direction that I am referring to that it wouldn't be worth talking about.

Mr. Speaker, there doesn't have to be a single person in this House who needs convincing on the basis of the eloquence of either the First Minister or myself or anybody else. I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, if we all voted -- and this is what I ask you to do -- if we all voted on this issue the way we felt the day before the election took place, this issue would be overwhelmingly defeated. Because there isn't a single person -- well, maybe that's an exaggeration -- there are very few people who campaigned in the election on the basis of giving financial assistance to private schools. And as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it was never a promise of the government party, and it seems that an important issue of that kind should have been introduced to the electorate if it was intended to be proceeded with. But if every single person in this House ignored everything that I said, -- which I would ask them to do, ignore it; vote the way you would have voted the day before you were named an MLA -- Mr. Speaker, if the vote is taken in that form I am sure that the issue will be defeated.

Why is there, therefore, a complication about it? Well, Mr. Speaker, it's not a secret that this is a matter of internal party politics of the New Democratic Party. The Premier passionately -- and I use the word advisedly -- sincerely, and in every other respect, feels that a great injustice has been done and that he vowed, just as I vowed that I would resist this kind of thing, that he vowed that he would do everything possible, everything humanly possible, to see to it that this injustice was righted. And as a result of him taking that position, Mr. Speaker, many many loyal New Democrats, loyal people to him, loyal people to the Party, have felt that they must give the Premier every opportunity to make this thing possible. They consider, Mr. Speaker, that that is their duty to him and that is their duty to the Party. I would ask these people to follow the example set by the Premier, to pursue their views in as strong a manner as he has pursued his. And I say again, Mr. Speaker, if that is done, this resolution will not be passed.

My history in the Party, Mr. Speaker, is fairly recent. I joined the Party in 1962. But I watched the New Democratic Party for a long time. And two things, Mr. Speaker, amongst others, but two things, very important things, I gleaned from New Democrats, and I learnt my lesson from them. Most of them were in North Winnipeg; there was the present MP in Ottawa, Mr. Orlikow; Mr. Miller, who was well-known in the Party; Mr. Cherniack; Mr. Stinson was a former Leader of the Party; Mr. Knowles. One of the things, Mr. Speaker, that I gleaned from them, is that they were opposed to the state financing separate schools, schools outside of the public school system. The other thing, Mr. Speaker, that I learnt from them, and I learnt it at every single convention of the New Democratic Party that I ever attended, was that policy is the thing that we have to be loyal to; that nothing is more important, and no person is more important than the fact that this Party makes its decisions through a collective will. And my definition, Mr. Speaker, of being loyal is to indicate when I feel that something is being done contrary to the will of the Party. I feel that I'm loyal in that way for two reasons: I believe that that is the only loyalty. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, we are now moving into a situation which is going to be very interesting if this resolution is passed, because it really doesn't do anything. Similar to passing the resolution two years ago "considering the advisability", we had many people who were against the question who felt that it didn't say anything anyway so that it could be voted for. But if this resolution is passed it will not solve anything; and next year, Mr. Speaker, we will be in exactly the same position that we are in this year. And, Mr. Speaker, we will have sapped our strength, we will have sapped our energy, we will have spent our time thinking, "What is he going to say? What is the other person going to say?" We know that we have been doing that during the last six months, and I say that it has affected the efficacy of this Party to do those things which we sought election for, and it will do more of that next year. And in this, Mr. Speaker, lies a golden opportunity for the Opposition, which I am going to hope against hope, Mr. Speaker, that they will not cease to take advantage of; because the Opposition now can very easily take the position that let's keep this problem alive for them; we're not really voting for anything. If we vote for the resolution, Mr. Speaker, the



(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . resolution will pass; the New Democratic Party will have this committee, the committee will not change the views of any of its members, and the struggle will continue next year and we will wait to see what explosions take place next year.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that members of the Opposition who are opposed to the state providing financial assistance to encourage the separation of our school system, will join with me in not permitting that position to be taken, because whether you like it or not, or whether you know it or not, it will be a move in the direction of the state providing financial assistance to the school system, and I would think that you, just as I, consider that to be more important than creating a temporary embarrassment for the political party that happens to be in power.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what the members are going to do. I know that the situation that I have described is one which could well resolve; if that happens I will not, Mr. Speaker, feel that I have left out anything to try to prevent that kind of thing to happen. I hoped and I had reason to believe that the situation would be solved this year. Apparently some people felt that we could stave off the decision, or that there is some value in staving it off. I say that there is no value. I say that it has a negative value. And, Mr. Speaker, I make these remarks because I believe that I'm being loyal to the New Democratic Party, loyal to what I was taught within this party, and that loyalty, Mr. Speaker, really stems from being loyal to myself. Because Shakespeare said it best and it's interesting, Mr. Speaker, that he put it into the words of a character who is looked upon generally as a fool; Polonius is generally looked upon as being a bit of a fuddydud, but what Shakespeare put into his mouth was never fuddydud language, which should indicate, Mr. Speaker, that sometimes what is said is more important than the person who said it. Polonius said, Mr. Speaker, and I say: "But this above all to thine own self be true and it must follow as the night follows day thou canst not then be false to any man". I believe that I am being true to myself, and I believe that as the night follows day I cannot thus be false to the Premier of this Province. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I should indicate to the honourable member the question would have to be by unanimous consent since the honourable member went over his time. Agreed? Any objections? (Agreed)

The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Thompson): The Member for Inkster said that the Premier was somehow forcing his views against the will of the party in Brandon, and just to phrase my question properly, the party had decided in Brandon that it should come to a free vote and gave the Premier and all of us that permission, how can the Member for Inkster claim that the Premier somehow tried to force his views against the wishes of the party and against the wishes of the legislators? The elected legislature.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, since I did not make the remark which the Honourable Member for Thompson attributes to me I won't answer his question in the form in which it is put. The honourable member is wrong, there was no resolution for a free vote at the convention in November --(Interjection)-- but, yeah, the Minister is correct. The fact that the Premier is pursuing the resolution in the manner in which he has called this party to move in a certain direction - I think that I said that, and I don't think that I would change that.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member for Churchill wish to ask a question? The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Would the member in overstating the dire consequences of state aid to alternate schools, could he give us an example in Canada of those consequences happening within our Dominion?

MR. GREEN: Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada. I gave an example. It is not a state situation but the exact same considerations apply and I would suggest to you that the honourable member supplied me with that answer when I asked him - who says that he believes that a parent should have the right to control the education of the child in the way in which he believes that child will profit - and I asked the member, would you then give money to a communist's school, and your answer was, I don't believe in communism.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: Would the member then agree that there is a difference between a group of people withdrawing aid from a private school as adverse to government withdrawing or dictating policy to a school system?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the only difference is that a government is likely to be worse than a group of people.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Would the member permit another question? The member suggests that he feels the public is against this. Is he suggesting a referendum?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I never suggested a referendum on any question. I believe in responsible government, but I believe that a political party that wants to solve this question on the basis of giving further financial support to private and parochial schools should go to the people and say we want to do that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, at the outset let me make it clear that I will probably take up or account for some of the overtime used by the last speaker in making my remarks this evening relatively brief. I would like to, Mr. Speaker, at the outset restate my original support for aid to private and parochial schools. I'd like to state, Mr. Speaker, that I agree with what has been said in this Chamber before, that unlike other nations of the world, other jurisdictions, we are not attempting to create a homogeneous society. I believe in the kind of society that we are trying to create here in Canada and Manitoba. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that insofar as it is of some importance to refurbish, add to the fabric of that mosaic that we speak of in our province; that the private and parochial schools have something unique and in particular to add; to foster to this kind of a society that we on other occasions have agreed is desirable. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is possible by a reasonably commonsense approach to afford and to offer some maintenance to these endangered schools. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this can be done without jeopardizing and without endangering our public school system.

Mr. Speaker, that's about all I wish to speak or say about the question of aid to private and parochial schools. What I now wish to say is the problems that the First Minister has presented to many of us in this Chamber by the introduction of the specific resolution now under debate. . . Mr. Speaker, I am genuinely confused. I am genuinely bewildered as to what my proper course of action now should be having just now stated my very specific beliefs with respect to the greater question that this resolution deals with. Mr. Speaker, I say to you that I do not know that as a proponent for aid to private and parochial schools what I should do. Should I vote in favour of the resolution and merely put off the question to another day, another session, another year? Or should I vote against the resolution in the hopes that that would at least indicate the inacceptability of this, what I would only have to suggest to be a method, a route chosen by the First Minister of solving his particular problems, of solving the internal difficulties of a New Democratic Party on this particular question; and of course specifically the First Minister's problem insofar, Mr. Speaker - particularly the First Minister's problem, to the extent that he has put his credibility on the line as First Minister, as Premier of this Province, on this subject matter.

Mr. Speaker, you know it was my privilege some time ago, before the session, to have the privilege of introducing the Premier, I'm sure the Premier will remember the occasion - to speak to a group of persons - indeed it was the domain of the church that I attend, the First Mennonite Church on Notre Dame and Alverstone. And there was a fairly large gathering of people that was convened for the purposes of, among other things, raising funds for the private school that is supported by that particular church. And I recall with no doubt, Mr. Speaker, in my mind, the firm conviction with which the First Minister told the gathered assembly that aid would be forthcoming to private and parochial schools in a matter of months, Mr. Speaker, in a matter of months.

Mr. Speaker, I really do not know how the First Minister will resolve this particular problem. I would be extremely negligent of my responsibilities as a member of the opposition if I didn't point out in the strongest possible terms the lack of leadership that the First Minister has given us, the lack of firmness that the First Minister has given us, and the utter state of confusion that the First Minister has caused by choosing the path that he has chosen. --(Interjection)-- Well, Mr. Speaker, the First Minister said I may well have a chance; I might remind him I fluffed it by forty votes a few years ago, and that chance no doubt will never come back . . .

Mr. Speaker, the First Minister says I may well have a chance, that is not the question. I am speaking for a chance right now, and I thought that that chance was going to be provided

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . . to me as a member of the Legislature. I thought that I had sufficient reason to believe that the First Minister had gone around this province, had raised the level of expectation among those who have earnestly worked and sought for this kind of support for some time, that we now would have at least an opportunity to demonstrate and to vote in a manner that - a vote that would have some substance in deciding this question. Mr. Speaker, that is being denied to us. Mr. Speaker, I genuinely ask the First Minister to consider my difficulties. I do not know the make-up of the kind of a committee that the First Minister is talking about. As was pointed out by the previous speaker, Mr. Speaker, if that you know, we could hardly cast about into the outside community to look for objective non involved, non committed people in this respect. It's quite obvious that the committee that we're dealing with is the committee that is going to be comprised of those of us who are now sitting in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, the First Minister has not given me any indication as to the specific terms of reference, and I don't call him for this. I imagine that the First Minister may elaborate more so in closing his remarks on this resolution. But I, right now, don't know and I have to indicate to the First Minister that I right now don't know how to vote on this resolution; I know what I want to do on the principle of the matter. But you, Sir, that is the First Minister, has denied me the opportunity of exercising that vote in a meaningful way. Mr. Speaker, I suggest also he has frustrated many people in the province on both sides of the questions in the manner and the way in which he had approached it, firstly, by suggesting that it could be dealt with in a reasonably expeditious manner - as he did, and as he was suggesting a few years ago, a year ago, as he was suggesting at the outset of this session. Mr. Speaker, it was some time that we got into the session before we really knew as legislators whether or not we would be facing a bill or a resolution. And even now, Mr. Speaker, with respect to an honest attempt to vote on this resolution, aid to private and parochial schools means many different things to many different people. In many instances it is a question of degree. I don't buy the speech that the Honourable Member for Inkster gave us in its totality. I think many of his points, the points that he made in his speech were extremely valid fifty years ago, twenty years ago - but, Mr. Speaker, surely nobody is suggesting in this Chamber, that we haven't come a long way from even the days of McCarthyism which isn't that long ago in our memory.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister for Inkster shakes his head, yet just a few days ago on another matter the honourable member was portraying the innate goodness of man if left alone and uncensored, that there would be absolutely no difficulty in arriving at the best of all possible solutions. Today he shakes his head. Today he does not quite agree that we have not advanced from the situation as it was in Czarist Russia 65 years ago, the situation as it was here in Winnipeg 25, 30, 40, 50 years ago. Mr. Speaker, that is denying what is evident to all, a genuine, first of all economical feeling amongst the religious people; that is denying the genuine coming together between the Catholic and Protestant community that is taking place; that is denying, Mr. Speaker, the genuine coming together of races and ethnic groups that is taking place, and is so capably represented in this Chamber. Ask yourself was the representation in this Chamber thus 50 years ago, or 30, or 20, or 15 years ago as it is today. And somebody tells me that we have not come a long way with respect to tolerance for our fellow-man, tolerance for his race, for his religious beliefs. Mr. Speaker, and all this happened at the time that the private school and parochial schools were in existence. Surely, Mr. Speaker, if the dire consequences that the Member for Inkster portrayed for us a little while ago - then we should be at each others throats right about now. Because the schools have been functioning since day one in this province, the parochial schools. And I would suggest to you that today the relationship between the Catholic body of people in our society and the Protestant body of people is better than it ever was, and I don't think anybody denies that.

Surely if you take the reasoned arguments of the Member for Inkster then that shouldn't be and it can't be, Mr. Speaker, it's necessary sometimes to puncture the arguments of the Member for Inkster because he says it with so much obvious belief and feeling that one has a tendency to believe it simply because he said it. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe everything that the Member for Inkster says simply because he says it eloquently and he says it well.

Mr. Speaker, I'm being diverted from my main purpose of rising on this issue at this particular time, and that is to come back to the First Minister again who is responsible for the resolution on the order paper at this particular time; and again suggest to him that he has done a disservice in the manner and the way in which he has brought this matter forward. He has

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . . made it more difficult to have a clear attempt or an honest attempt made to resolve the question at this particular time and to suggest that the decision would be any easier a year from now, two years from now simply belies the long history of the question, Mr. Speaker, just two years ago, and I believe I made a suggestion at that time, two years ago when the government first accepted or three years ago when the government first accepted their responsibilities as the new government of this province, the Member for Rhineland introduced the resolution and we had a fairly wide-ranging debate on that question at that particular time, I suggested to the government and to the First Minister at that time being as they were in a minority position that it was politically feasible for the First Minister, for the government, to put forward a measure, a government measure and to look for the kind of support that the measure might receive from members opposite. I suggested, Mr. Speaker, that none of us is blind to the politics that's involved and has been involved in the question. I suggested at that time, Mr. Speaker, that it was a unique opportunity, at least from my point of view as one who wanted to see some resolution of the problem, in a favourable way to my point of view, that it could be done at that particular time without the onus necessarily of negative politics being placed on any particular party. The government of the day was in a minority position and obviously a combined attempt by the Opposition could have defeated that particular motion, not necessarily the government. Put it on a free vote.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that we would have had every opportunity of dealing with the question at that time. It may not have passed. But I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that we are no further ahead with the question now. We have seen this problem create divisiveness within the government benches, and Mr. Speaker, as a Manitoban I am not particularly happy with that. As a politician I may be, but as a Manitoban I'm not, because I get concerned when members of the cabinet, members of the government are noticeably spending a great deal of their time, their resources and their energy when they should be doing and looking after other things, worrying about this particular problem that is virtually splitting the party at its seams. I get my little satisfaction or political satisfaction when I find a capable Minister of the Cabinet, the Minister of the Crown has feelings that he has to resign his seat on this particular issue. But I don't really express any satisfaction that encourages me to have confidence in the manner and way in which this government is being operated and being run when these kind of things happen.

Mr. Speaker, as I stood up I said that I was genuinely confused as to how I can approach the resolution before us. I would hope that perhaps with the contribution of other members, both on this side of the House and on that side of the House, particularly a further contribution on the part of the First Minister, that there may well be other opportunities for other people to speak, whether there are amendments being put forward to the resolution as it now stands, that I will receive some further guidance in this particular matter. But I challenge the First Minister to tell me why I shouldn't be confused on this particular issue in the manner and the way he has presented it to me. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether or not any other honourable member in this present assembly has been more closely associated within the last two decades in considering this vital and important matter that has been of concern since Manitoba entered Confederation, than I. I have gone through a number of sessions that have given consideration to the proposition that we have before us tonight. I was one of those that had the privilege of being here I believe in 1958, 1957 when the Committee on Education under the late Dr. McFarlane was set up to consider the relationship between Catholic and non-Catholic in the educational system of Manitoba. I was here as a Member of this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, when that report was tabled. I well recall the composition of that Committee; I well recall the major recommendations of that Committee; and also, Sir, I recall that the then government of the day decided, insofar as the relationship between the various religious denominational schools would be set aside for consideration.

I was a member, if memory serves me correctly, Mr. Speaker, of the Committee of this Assembly that was established to consider the proposition of Shared Services under the leadership of the former Premier Dufferin Roblin. And we spent hour after hour hearing representations to try and arrive at some solution to what many have considered as the problem that has confronted Manitobans ever since it entered into Confederation. Certain recommendations were made, Mr. Speaker, at that time as to a proposition of Shared Services. I believe that

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . . in the assembly today that there may be only three or four that were involved at that particular time as Members of this Assembly. One, my Leader, the Premier of the Province of Manitoba, another the Honourable Larry Desjardins, the Minister of Tourism and Recreation; I believe also that there may have been one or two others, I'm not sure if the Member from Rhineland was here when votes were taken on the reception of the Committee established to consider Shared Services. I believe that he was. I believe also that the Member for Souris-Killarney was here at that particular time.

But I do well recall, Mr. Speaker, again if memory serves me correctly, that there was a few of us that voted against the proposition of Shared Services: the then Leader of the Liberal Party, D. L. Campbell, the present Premier of the Province of Manitoba, who then represented Brokenhead, the then Member for St. Boniface, Mr. Desjardins, and the present Minister of Labour. And we voted against Shared Services, the proposition of Shared Services. But we voted, Mr. Speaker, at that particular time against it for different reasons. I voted against it, as did D. L. Campbell, if memory serves me correctly, because we felt that in the Shared Services proposition we were opening the door for the provision of aid to private and parochial schools. I believe that I would be correct in saying that the then Member for Brokenhead and the Member for St. Boniface voted against the resolution because it wasn't going far enough. And we have had this problem with us, Mr. Speaker, ever since the Conservative administration of that day brought in the proposition in respect of Shared Services.

Tonight, Sir, we listened to the Member for Lakeside condemning and criticizing my Premier for showing lack of leadership in introducing this resolution to the House. I want to say without equivocation that as far as my personal inclination is concerned it's no different today than it was at the time we were considering the proposition of the then Premier Dufferin Roblin. Insofar . . . --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order.

MR. PAULLEY: I knew what I was voting on. And I had the intelligence then and I only wish to heaven that the Member for Lakeside had a similar amount of intelligence today, which he has exhibited tonight, Mr. Speaker, that he hasn't got. Because I didn't question at that time the leadership of Dufferin Roblin and his integrity and I suggest to the Member for Lakeside that he shouldn't do the same with my leader tonight. And I regret very much that an honourable member of this House would stoop so low as to indicate that the individual who proposed this resolution lacks leadership and I reject that completely. The Member for Lakeside and every member in this House can disagree with my leader insofar as proposition is concerned, but let's give him credit, Mr. Speaker, for having guts and fortitude and leadership to bring into this House the consideration of a resolution which he sincerely believes. --(Interjection)-- One who has nothing above his shoulders certainly is entitled to make a remark such as that. And that's the Honourable Member for Roblin. And it's so typical of him . . . --(Interjection)-- or Arthur, the Member for Arthur who is seated in the back row. I apologize, I apologize to the Honourable Member for Roblin, I ask the Honourable Member for Arthur to come down where he should be in his proper seat and say what he did say, if he's got enough intestinal fortitude so to do. So I do apologize my honourable friend from Roblin.

MR. SPEAKER: Order! Order!

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, my leader has been criticized for bringing in this resolution. I have stated in the past and I reaffirm tonight, that I do not agree with the proposition. --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. PAULLEY: Your problem is you haven't got the intellect to ascertain as to whether or not there is a proposition; and this is so typical of the Honourable Member for Lakeside. And by jiminy Christmas one of the difficulties, Mr. Speaker, that a member of this Assembly and Legislative Assemblies have is to attribute the definition "honourable" to members. Were it permissible for me to do otherwise --(Interjection)-- No, it would be unparliamentary if I were to describe you as you should be described. It would be unparliamentary. I can't even do it by leave, but I hope I can do it by inference. And I hope it penetrates the concrete head of my honourable friend.

My honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, worries about the make-up of the committee to consider the resolution as proposed by the First Minister. What difference really, Mr. Speaker, does it make as to the make-up of the committee? The only inference that one can take from the remarks of the Member for Lakeside is that someone will cook up a committee,

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . . someone will cook up the membership of this committee in order to give effect to the propositions that may be in the mind of the First Minister, or even in the mind of the Member for Lakeside. No faith --(Interjection)-- Oh, you sit in your seat. Of all the asinine guys that ever joined this House it's that guy from Rupertsland, and he hasn't enough guts to speak from his own seat. But the inference in the remarks of the Honourable Member for Lakeside indicate no faith whatsoever in the composition of the committee. As I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, I was a member of the committee that considered --(Interjection)-- Oh, you were a babe in arms and still wet behind the ears as you are now -- to consider the proposition -- and you are a drip -- to consider the proposition at that particular time of Shared Services.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that I can speak on this question insofar as religious context is concerned because all of my life I have attempted to be a member of a religious denomination and devoted to the principles of that religious fraternity. In my little community of Transcona --(Interjection)-- It surely has, Mr. Speaker, it's got bigger. The Anglican fraternity in Transcona has joined with the Roman Catholic fraternity in Transcona in the spirit of ecumenicalism to join their forces, in the same church. We have joined forces in Transcona; we have entered into a spirit of co-operation, not only insofar as our religious observances on Sunday with our Communion and our Masses, but also we have seen in Transcona a gradual assimilation between Catholic and Protestant into united force in our community. For good, not for evil, and yet when I listen to the enunciations of the Member for Lakeside he attempts to impute motives to the First Minister of our Province because he dares, to use the words of the Member for Lakeside to bring into this House a resolution for the consideration and the establishment to consider further the fact of Shared Services.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say I opposed a few years ago the resolution of Dufferin Roblin establishing Shared Services and I did it very vigorously. But, Mr. Speaker, I was wrong, I confess that I was wrong. I suggested at that particular time that the adoption of the Shared Services principle was the thin edge of the wedge to bring into effect aid to private and parochial schools, to the detriment of the public school system in Manitoba. And, Mr. Speaker, I was wrong. Because the years have unfolded that as a result of Shared Services it has brought together Protestants, Catholics, members of the Jewish fraternity together at least in the community of Transcona, so that instead of four or five separate schools as we had at that particular time I believe there are only two. And boy and girl in Transcona in the educational system today have gained as a result of that and are working together in the best interests of the community; and their parents too, Mr. Speaker, are working in the best interests of the community, in my parish, the Anglican parish and others as well, and this to me has been well.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say I don't agree with the basic philosophy of my Premier that there should be established separation. I am going to vote, Sir, for the recommendation of my Premier, for the establishment of a committee to further consider the basis of ecumenicalism, of association between the various factors and factions in Manitoba, not, Mr. Speaker, with the objective of bringing about further divisions which I abhor, but I trust and hope that whoever happens to be on this committee that they will eventually bring into this House for consideration further propositions for bringing all of the boys and the girls, our students in the Province of Manitoba together for the well-being of the province as a whole. So I say, Mr. Speaker, contrary to what the Honourable Member for Lakeside has said, I appreciate the fact that the First Minister of this province has the intestinal fortitude to make another proposition for the consideration of this House in respect of a proposition or a problem that we have had ever since we entered into Confederation.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside almost sentence after sentence attempted to bring in a political concept of this resolution. I reject it completely. I appeal to members of this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, to let's put politics aside. Let's have enough guts --(Interjection)-- Oh, I'm not kidding, but if my honourable friend from Arthur cannot consider this on a non-political basis then I feel sorry for him. I feel so sorry for my honourable friend --(Interjection)-- On a political basis? Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend asked me where I ever considered this on a non-political basis. I considered it on a non-political basis when I agreed to be a member of the committee established by a Conservative Premier of the Province of Manitoba; and it was on that basis that I entered into agreement to hear representations. And if my honourable friend from Lakeside or from Arthur has such a low concept of the political

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . . fact in Manitoba let them have that, but I appeal to other honourable members, Mr. Speaker, to not allow their political affiliations to guide their minds. Because I figure . . . --(Interjection)-- Yes, my honourable friend, the Member for River Heights -- gee maybe I shouldn't recall the methodology that he used to get into this House through Maitland Steinkopf. Maybe I hadn't better do that. But I want to say to the Leader of the Opposition, for once in your damn life put politics aside and look after the well-being and the forward thrust of all citizens in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Arthur, debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Health and Social Development that

WHEREAS it is deemed advisable to review the Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, adopted on April 5, 1972, in order to assess the effectiveness of the said Rules with respect to the conduct of the House and to consider other possible changes in the Rules;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that a Special Committee of the House, composed of the Hon. Mr. Speaker, Hon. Messrs. Hanuschak and Paulley, Messrs. Bilton, Green, Jenkins, Johnston (Portage), Jorgenson, Shafransky and Sherman, be appointed to consider the Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba and allied subjects, and to make such recommendations thereon as the Committee sees fit;

AND THAT the Committee have authority to sit during recess, after prorogation and to report at the next session of the Legislature.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion on the resolution as read. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, will you call the adjourned debate on the motion of the Honourable the Attorney-General regarding the Report of the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: It's getting late on in the evening and this particular motion is brought in to concur in the Report of the Standing Committee on Regulations and Orders and whilst the resolution on the order paper mentions the various meetings and the minutes of those meetings, we also have a report contained in the proceedings No. 42 of the date of Tuesday, May 9th which gives a much fuller account of what took place and of the various recommendations that were made by the committee to this House. And in turn which also lists recommendations that were made by Mr. Rutherford to the committee itself. The committee has considered many of the recommendations - well all of the recommendations that were given to them by Mr. Rutherford, who in my opinion did a very able job.

I thought the recommendations were very fitting and certainly very worthwhile. In general, the report as listed in Votes and Proceedings deals with shortcomings, in my opinion, in the regulations made under the various acts of the Legislature of the Statutes and in so many cases amendments are being asked for so that the regulations would be proper and where minor changes of the act were recommended because in certain cases the regulations are overstepping the legislation in the Statutes.

I note for instance in the Revenue Tax Act of 1964 there was reference made by Mr. Rutherford on the regulations under that particular act, and I may read just one portion, or one paragraph Page 5 of the report of that day, and it says, and I'm quoting, "Such provisions in effect authorize the amendment of the act by regulation and in my opinion they are and the provisions in the act on which they are based are ultra vires." And then he continues "it is recommended" and he makes various recommendations that should be made and I am interested to know how soon these changes in the act will be coming about, when will the changes be brought in, because I think in some cases this is urgent.

(MR. FROESE cont'd)

On the following page of that same report that was presented to the committee by Mr. Rutherford, we find in connection with The Revenue Tax Act R150 - and again I would like to read one paragraph. This is regarding The Revenue Tax Act 150, I'm quoting: "This regulation based on Manitoba Regulation 104/1969. It provides that no tax under the act is payable in respect of certain granaries. The Legislature in Section 4 of the act has set out a large number of exemptions. The Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council cannot it is submitted add to these by regulation. The act does not even purport to give such authority. It is recommended that the regulation be repealed and the substance thereof enacted by an amendment to the Act".

Mr. Chairman, apparently this was still in effect and this has been going on since 1969, when granaries were exempted from the sales tax, or the revenue tax as it is known. That was passed under the previous government, and which hasn't been changed. The Finance Minister was present at that particular meeting when this was discussed, with one of his officials, and the letter I think was very fully discussed so that we would have clear understanding of this. And it seems to me that there was a certain amount of - I don't know whether rejection is the proper word - but certainly it was felt that change at the very present time was not in order, and that they would like to have this left for the time being, until further study could be made.

This part is not in the report that is being submitted to the House, in the Votes and Proceedings, and therefore I make notice of it to the House at this time. And this was also the decision of the committee that wherever possible that the matters of extending a tax or imposing of a tax or altering it should be done under act, and not by regulation; and the exemptions under that act are listed under Section 4(1) and granaries and such are not mentioned in those exemptions, and yet the exemption was made under the regulation. So I feel that we should have action on these various recommendations at the earliest opportunity possible.

This is, Mr. Chairman, the first report that we now have had on concurrence of regulations since this government came to office. Under the previous administration we had an annual resolution, an annual concurrence motion covering the regulations, bringing it up to date of the time when the session started or so at a given date of the previous years' - those regulations were concurred in. I thought that that was a very good practice because this gave concurrence by the House to the actions that had been done by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, by Cabinet, to the --(Interjection)-- . . . yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): While, Mr. Speaker, I have no recollection, or direct knowledge of what happened here between 1965 and 1969, I do of the period 58 to 67, and is my honourable friend prepared to say now that in the period 1958 to 65, which I believe is in his direct knowledge as well, that every year without fail there was a meeting convened of the committee on Statutory Orders and Regulations and that a report was submitted, each year, without fail?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I came into the House in 1960, and as far as I can recollect we had a motion of concurrence every year, concurring in the regulations that had been effected by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council during the previous years, and this in my opinion ratified the action of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. I thought it was a very good practise because it also assured the Cabinet that the Assembly was in concurrence with their actions, and I still feel that this practise should be continued.

Now that we are going to have these regulations being brought up-to-date completely by Mr. Rutherford, and this is the first time this is going to happen, and we are going to have complete copies of the regulations, I certainly feel that this is of immense value, that this is something that is very much appreciated on my behalf that we are getting this. Just like we got the statutes revised, now we are getting the regulations revised, I really appreciate this; but I feel at the same time that we should effect the former practise of having regulations concurred in annually.

These are my main remarks that I wanted to make under this particular resolution that is before the House. I feel that they are valid. I feel that concurrence motions should be brought into other committee reports as well. We've had a number of committees sitting between sessions and they have been bringing in reports, the reports are tabled. Under the new rules that we have there is no way that we can discuss those reports unless a concurrence motion is brought in, and we find to date not one concurrence motion has been brought forward on any of



(MR. FROESE cont'd) . . . . the reports tabled except on this one on regulations, and therefore I feel also that in respect since we now have another resolution on the Order Paper setting up a committee to study the rules, that the rule changes be brought in so that we again would have the right to discuss the reports when they are being tabled in the House; especially so if no concurrence motions are brought in afterwards so that this can be done.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General shall be closing debate.

HON. A. H. MACKLING, Q. C. (Attorney-General)(St. James): Mr. Speaker, I do wish to briefly respond to the Honourable Member from Rhineland. He did indicate towards the conclusion of his remarks that he was appreciative of the efforts that had been assiduously pursued by this administration in establishing a revision of the regulations. He indicated some concern, legitimate concern, for continuity in respect to revision and approval of regulations. That is implicit in the establishment of the revised regulations. This, as I have indicated, Mr. Speaker, is the intention, to have the regulations that flow from individual statutes collectively revised and maintained so that what otherwise had been a seeming jungle would now become a meaningful responsible set of law based on the statutes that give them legal form.

Now, the honourable member alluded to some problems, some that had been pointed out by the revising officer, and I want to pay tribute to the excellence of the efforts of the revising officer. He pointed out some concern in respect to a regulation dealing with granaries. Mr. Speaker, there are times when regulations may cross the median and be offensive to the statute and we must guard against those things; but in the particular instance that the honourable member refers to, this was not a further obligation imposed by regulation, but rather a release of obligation, and in those instances if there is any error, and that is in doubt when that occurs, it certainly isn't the same kind as imposing obligations without the sanction of the statute itself. And the regulations which now will be prepared in a final form, will certainly be a great service in following the law, not only by the statute but through the regulations, and there will be a necessity to follow up on the further revisions that were recommended by the revising officer to certain statutes, and certain statutes that weren't even considered because the regulations under those statutes were in the process of being substantially altered. It's been a very substantial effort and we're grateful that it is now being concluded and the specific resolution is to formally approve of the report so that now we can get the definitive revised regulations in hand and printed.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Third Reading, Bill No. 47, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour. The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs,

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Selkirk) presented Bill No. 47, an Act to Amend the Municipal Act (3) for third reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): I would like to say a few words on it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Okay. Very well. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BARKMAN: Concerning Bill No. 47 as we discussed in the committee room this morning, I still have my objections as far as some of the principles involved, and I should perhaps not refer to sections at this stage, but I think the Minister knows and to you, Mr. Speaker, I'm referring to 17 and 18 where the principle of the municipalities are involved will not have an opportunity of opting out as they can at this time. I think this is going to cause some confusion amongst the municipalities and I'm very much afraid that I believe there is 22 municipalities involved that are opting out at this time, and I think we're going to see some confusion in it, and I will not be lengthy. I realize it is at third reading but I wanted to voice my objection, particularly to those two principles, and I realize that the Minister mentioned that we could perhaps expect some changes, or new regulations, or amendments, as soon as the Carter Report would be coming in, and it's only on that behalf that I can support this bill because as far as these two principles are concerned, particularly the sections I mentioned, I cannot go along with that and I wanted to mention that at this time.

MR. SPEAKER put the question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I too, rise on this one particular bill that we discussed this morning in committee, and to which we raised strong objections earlier on second reading, whereby the municipalities now will be compelled to have welfare by-laws, the terms are prescribed in the act as to the - I haven't got the act before me, but the needs and the necessities, and so on, and that will have to be met by the municipalities. In my opinion this more or less means that we will have almost standard welfare by-laws throughout the province unless, unless they go beyond what is required in the act because they will have to meet the requirements as laid down in the act, otherwise it will not be valid, they will have to meet it. So in that respect the welfare by-laws will almost have to be uniform. I think this will mean an added expense to the municipalities which are already heavily burdened. We find that some of the municipalities forming part of the Greater Winnipeg area are getting relief this year but this is not being given to the rural municipalities rather they're now being saddled with a further burden. I feel that the opposite should have been done, that we should have given them greater and increase the per capita grant so that they could provide a better service to the local communities instead of putting this onus on them, and therefore I take strong exception to this. I am sure that many of the municipalities would probably have been represented if it wasn't for this time of year when people are busy, at least as far as the farming communities are concerned, and therefore did not personally appear before the committee. So on that count I take strong exception and will not support the bill on third reading.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Development) (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, the only reason that I rise at this point is that the Honourable Minister responsible for this act cannot rise and answer some of the points that were made by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye and Rhineland.

I feel that specially the Honourable Member for Rhineland is making allegations that are completely false, and so far as the amendments to the Municipal Act were compelling, that is true, municipalities to have by-laws. We are not setting by this act or even by - we are not setting by the Municipal Act the standards that the municipality must adopt. There can be differences and the honourable member only has to read the act to find this out. There are like the honourable member mentions approximately 23 or 24 municipalities that are out, that have no by-laws, some never did have by-laws, others have opted out in the last few years. I think it's only fair that we ask municipalities that are responsible only for those who are unemployed but employable to be responsible for social allowance in their municipality. I think that the municipalities in question are in a better position than the Department of Health and Social Development to deal with the unemployed employables, especially when there is very close cooperation with different departments of government. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I ask every member of this House to support this bill in third reading.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.  
(On Division)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Education) (Burrows) presented Bill No. 49, Le Centre Culturel Franco-Manitobain Act, for third reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, before we give third and final reading to this bill I would like again to reiterate some of my sentiments in the debate and ask the First Minister if he is going now to provide all the cultural groups in this province with this type of assistance, and I hope that he will. There is a letter on my desk today from another cultural group that are seeking funds of this type that's expressed in this bill, and I hope this government will recognize all the cultural groups in this province and treat them equally.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I realize that the Member for Roblin spoke on an earlier stage of this bill and could not resist the temptation to say a word again at third and final reading stage. The only reason I rise is because the honourable member asked me a very specific and direct question, and I'm in a position to give him a very specific and direct and brief answer. The reason for the bill that is before us now being before us now is because a decision was taken which I concur with, some three years ago to proceed in our Centennial Year 1970 with the construction of a cultural centre in St. Boniface. The Honourable Member for Roblin if he were to check with his colleagues would know that sometime in late 1967 or early in 1968, I forget

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . exactly, that there was communication between the Government of Manitoba, and certain of its Ministers in any case, and the Government of Canada with respect to the possibility of obtaining from Ottawa a \$5 million federal grant to Manitoba in observance you might say, or towards the observance of our provincial centennial. The allocation of the \$5 million was pretty firmly decided having to do with the Concert Hall and other cultural facilities in the City of Winnipeg, having to do with the Art Centre, the Art Gallery, having to do with Le Centre Culturel, and having to do with the Brandon Keystone Centre and, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Lakeside has obviously a recollection of it, and that basically is as I have just outlined. The cultural centre having been proceeded with, it is only logical that once the physical facility is proceeded with that it requires a form of organizational structure responsible for its annual operation, and just as we have a certain organizational structure responsible for the Centennial Concert Hall and for the Brandon Keystone Centre, there is a particular form of organization provided for the cultural centre referred to as Le Centre Culturel, and that's what this bill is all about. Now the Member for Roblin says if you're doing this, and this has been a few years in the making really, but if you're doing this then what about all the other ethnic and cultural groups? I simply say to him that since, I forget exactly what month, but in our Centennial Year 1970 the Province of Manitoba has adopted a policy whereby for every cultural group that wishes to apply, if they can come forward with a project that is of a cultural or historic commemorative nature, then the Province of Manitoba will make grants available on the basis of one-third of the capital cost up to a maximum of \$50,000, and in fact I believe that at least one, possibly two, or even a third, cultural ethnic group have made application and have received same, if not actually received the advancement of the moneys yet certainly a firm commitment in principle so if the honourable member has this solicitude about the other cultural groups that make up our mosaic, which I'm sure he and I both share the view that this is desirable. We have made tangible provision for the recognition of it.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 50, The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK on behalf of the Minister of Tourism and Recreation and Cultural Affairs presented Bill No. 50, an Act to amend The Public Libraries Act for third reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, just a few comments. I don't intend to oppose the bill but I certainly question some of the contents of the bill, especially where you will recognize a petition with eight percent of the names, that when this goes forward that a municipal council will be asked to consider - I think in previous legislation, in connection with other legislation at least, the amounts required are substantially more, the percentage substantially higher, and I question that part of the bill that is being passed on.

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

Bills Nos. 69, 71, 73, 76, 78, 88, 46, 75, 85, 89, 90, 92, 99, 101 and 105 were each read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Gee that's tough. I can't find anything else to go ahead with this evening or this morning, Mr. Speaker, I want to remind honourable friends that the Committee on Industrial Relations will be meeting this morning at 10:00 o'clock. And now, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that the House do now adjourn until 2:30 this afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable Minister of Labour, seconded by the Honourable Attorney-General, that the House do now adjourn and stand adjourned --(Interjection)-- Order please. Order please. One thing at a time. I must place the motion first before I can have debate on it. --(Interjection)-- Will it keep till morning?

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