

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 Wednesday, April 18, 1973

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 100 Grade 3 students of the Strathmillan School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Ternier, Mrs. Hickey, Miss Lezenby and Miss Dohan. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

We also have 33 students of Grades 5 and 6 standing of the Richer School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Lamoine. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

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

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.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Opposition)(River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. It relates to the problems of layoffs at CAE and the prospects for the future for the company. I wonder if he is in any position to indicate to the House whether there have been any new developments and any likelihood that new contracts will be given by the Federal Government to CAE.

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

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(Brandon East): Well, Mr. Speaker, I have had conversations with the Honourable Minister of National Defence, the Honourable James Richardson. More recently my staff have been in touch with the company and with federal officials. I am not in a position to make any statement on behalf of the Federal Government but the indications are that there will be new contracts forthcoming. We are at least hopeful that something will be forthcoming in the near future.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder if he can indicate whether anyone in the department or the government has in fact monitored the transfer of the overhaul base from Manitoba to Montreal and to Quebec to determine whether in fact the expansion plans of Air Canada in Montreal are according to the original plans projected when the decision to take the overhaul base from Winnipeg was made, or whether in fact there has been an increase in capacity beyond that which was anticipated, whether the department itself has monitored to determine whether it's living up to the obligations or whether in fact something more has in fact taken place.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): Well perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I would be in a position to answer that. I believe that the information my honourable friend is asking was ascertained as long as four years ago in the House of Commons Standing Committee on Transportation, at which time under questioning by a number of members of Parliament, it was admitted by Air Canada that they had proceeded with expansion at Dorval far beyond, shall I say at least beyond that which they had indicated to the Thompson Inquiry Commission. So the answer in short, to the Leader of the Opposition, is yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the First Minister's answer. It is not the answer to the question that I am directing and I'd like to redirect the question so that both he and possibly the Minister would understand it. I'm now referring to the projections that Air Canada had made with respect to the justification for the removal of the overhaul base in 1969, and those were based on projections of expansion at Dorval and efficiencies that would come as a result of the fusing of both the overhaul base here and Montreal together. I wonder whether the government has had any opportunity of monitoring to determine whether it has gone along the course suggested or whether in fact it is along another course which would not necessarily justify the removal of the overhaul base in the first place.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, the degree to which one can monitor expansion of Air Canada facilities of course depends on the co-operation of Air Canada. It depends on figures, if they are ready and willing to supply, to an outside agency or to the Manitoba Government to be more precise. I can only say this: that we have had continuing dialogue with Air Canada officials; the Honourable the Minister of Labour and myself were in Ottawa -- were, rather, in Montreal last year discussing in some detail the progress that Air Canada was making in Montreal, and indeed we covered the whole spectrum of Air Canada overhaul, maintenance activities, etc. I can advise the honourable member that this is a continuing dialogue; we had the Chairman of the Air Canada Corporation Industry Pratte here along with his senior officials, and we again attempted to impress upon him the need for a greater Air Canada presence. Mr. Speaker, I can also advise the House that a meeting is scheduled to be held within the next ten days with senior Air Canada officials and myself and my staff, to discuss ways and means of enhancing Air Canada's presence in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister, then, is in a position to confirm on behalf of the government, or deny, that Air Canada has in fact followed the procedures that it originally had proposed in taking the overhaul base to Montreal, and that in effect no additional expansion over and above that that was anticipated has in fact taken place. Can he confirm that that is the situation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, unless we are somehow not communicating, I have already indicated to the Leader of the Opposition that as long as four years ago, I believe it was March or April of 1969, it was admitted in the Standing Committee on Transportation in Ottawa that Air Canada had in fact departed from their earlier indication of expansion at Dorval and had exceeded it, and then of course my honourable friend is aware that in addition to that expansion at Dorval there has been great expansion at St. Scholastique which is north of Dorval, so there has been expansion by Air Canada in and around Montreal far beyond that which they indicated to the Thompson Inquiry Commission. Now I believe that to be relevant to what my honourable friend is asking.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder if he can indicate whether his department has any statistics or information that would indicate how many jobs would be lost in Manitoba if the Autopac arrangements were terminated and free trade in . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The question is hypothetical.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, let me frame it in another way. Has the Department determined how many jobs Manitoba has been able to provide as a result of the Autopac arrangement and the allowing of free trade in farm machinery products?

MR. EVANS: Obviously, if the agreement is altered in some substantial way to the detriment of Canada in general, it will have an impact on the Province of Manitoba. We have considered the impact on Flyer Industries which would be involved, and we have considered the impact on the agricultural implement industry and other related industries, but I cannot advise the honourable member of any specific calculation we've made in this matter.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary. Can the Minister indicate whether it is a substantial number of jobs provided in Manitoba as a result of the Autopac agreement and the free trade that exists as a result of that?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, it would be difficult to provide a precise estimate in this matter. One can make guesses at it but it would only be a guess because there are other factors involved in this industry here, not only the Autopac agreement.

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

MR. I.H.(Izzy) ASPER (Leader of the Liberal Party)(Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Highways responsible for the Manitoba Telephone System. In view of the Federal Government's approval of the licence to broadcast live T.V. to such northern communities as Lynn Lake, can the Minister indicate when those live broadcasts will begin?

ORAL QUESTIONS

HON. PETER BURTNIAK (Minister of Highways, Minister responsible for Manitoba Telephone System)(Dauphin): No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot at this time.

MR. ASPER: Well, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. In view of the fact that the licence has now been issued for several weeks, can the Minister explain the delay in the commencement of broadcast live from Winnipeg to the north?

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party knows that there are certain things that have to be done and it takes a little bit of time, and as soon as all arrangements are made that broadcast will commence.

MR. ASPER: A supplementary, final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the microwave tower complete required for the broadcasting, and if not when might it be completed?

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. JEAN ALLARD (Rupertsland): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Colleges and Universities. Would he care to explain to us or comment on the unusually high number of teachers at Red River College who have booked off today and also on the possibility of it being related to the scheduling of holidays?

HON. SAUL A MILLER (Minister of Colleges and Universities)(Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure the word "unusually high number" of instructors that have booked off is correct, I'm not sure how high the number is. I believe it's somewhere in the nature of about 12 or 15. It might be related to the summer scheduling, I'm not sure. I don't know what the reasons would be but apparently a number of teachers did book off sick today.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM: (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, I would ask the indulgence of the House to make a non-political statement.

STATEMENT

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the egg producers of the constituency of Birtle-Russell, I would urge the members of the House to make the maximum use of eggs during the Easter festive season and would urge everyone to follow that advice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: I just wanted to tell the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell that Ya mauyou valiki yaicha, Mr. Speaker (Ukrainian) I have a large egg (Laughter)

ORAL QUESTIONS cont'd

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and my question arises out of a report in the Brandon Sun Monday, April 16th, which indicates that the construction of the Patterson Dam has been delayed because of inadequate arrangements with the farmers in that area and that that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question please.

MR. WATT: . . . problem has now been solved. Is this correct, this report in the Brandon Sun?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I do believe the honourable member is aware that asking whether statements in the press are correct or not is against our procedure. But if the Minister wishes, he may answer.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management)(Inkster): Well, Mr. Speaker, I think I got the gist of the question relating to the Patterson Dam. I can only reiterate what I've told the honourable member previously in the House, that efforts are continuously being made by the province to obtain federal cost-sharing on the Patterson Dam, but that was denied in 1970. The Department has recently been advised that under PFRA there will be a program which possibly could include federal cost-sharing on the Patterson Dam, and as soon as we are given further details on that program we will be able to determine whether the program can proceed. It remains a Provincial Government priority program subject to us obtaining federal cost-sharing, and I don't know who would be responsible for suggesting that the delay has to do with no agreement being reached with the landowners. That is not my advice respecting this delay.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. WATT: A supplementary question then. My I ask the Minister then, there has been no problem so far as the landowners directly affected in that area?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether there has been difficulty with regard to landowners. My experience in this connection is that landowners usually want to get as much as they can and the government wants to pay as little as possible. And that probably is the same with regard to landowners in that area as it is with regard to landowners in the rest of the province, and I am not making a criticism in that connection. All I'm indicating is that the delay with regard to proceeding with the program has to do with obtaining federal cost-sharing.

MR. SPEAKER: The last supplementary by the Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Well I'd like to ask the Minister then. There have been no meetings or there have been requests for no meetings with the farmers from the farmers themselves in that particular area that would be directly affected by the construction of the Patterson Dam?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, that is not an aspect of the problem which has been drawn to my attention or would be drawn to my attention. If we were proceeding with the dam, there would certainly be the usual procedures in obtaining the land.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

POINT OF ORDER

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of order, and although my point of order deals with the Private Members' Hour I feel that if I don't raise it now it might cause some confusion when that hour comes up later on this afternoon. Sir, it has to do with the manner in which we are dealing with Private Members' resolutions and I draw to your attention on Page 13 of our Rule Book, Rule 22 subsection(2) and I quote: "Where a resolution of a private member is reached for the first time on the Order Paper during the Private Members' Hour and it is not disposed of within that hour, the resolution shall be placed on the Order Paper at the bottom of the list of resolutions of that type." I draw your attention particularly, Sir, to the words, "where the resolution of a private member is reached for the first time on the Order Paper", and in subsection (4) it again says: "where the resolution of a member is reached for the first time" - again that word is inherent in the resolution - "on the Order Paper during Private Members' Hours, if the member is not present or does not proceed with the resolution at that time, the resolution shall be placed at the bottom of the Order Paper."

Sir, my point of order is that I think that the manner in which we've been dealing with private members' resolutions is not in accordance with our rules. I noticed last night four resolutions that were on the Order Paper and I was unavoidably away from here last night, I had intended to deal with that particular one, but since it was two or three resolutions down I thought that I would make sure that I could be here. Now what is happening is that when a member chooses not to proceed with a resolution or just makes himself absent from the House when that resolution is called, we're dropping them down to the bottom of the Order Paper after they've been called the first time and, Sir, I contend that in circumstances like that, what happens is that either somebody else picks up the debate or a vote is called on that resolution, that there is no standing of any resolutions on the Order Paper after they have been called the first time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, we would have no objection in that connection in that the honourable member, if I understand him correctly, is saying that after a resolution has commenced to be debated, that when it arises on the Order Paper a second time if nobody picks up the debate it must be voted upon or it drops from the Order Paper. Perhaps that is the strict interpretation of the rule, I haven't gone into it, Mr. Speaker. I don't believe that that is the way we proceeded that way last year and all we are doing, I take it, is dropping the resolution down when it's arrived at the second time. Unless my honourable friend has serious objection, perhaps we could continue in that way and discuss the matter when Rules Committee next meets. Otherwise it will be Private Members' resolutions that are dropped from the Order Paper. Now it's not something that we would make a great deal of argument about but I don't believe we proceeded that way last year, and it would mean that if a resolution comes up and a member is not here, it would either have to be voted upon or, as my honourable friend says, somebody else would have to pick up the debate to keep it on the Order Paper. If that's the way the rule must be proceeded with, then we will have no objection. On the other hand we

POINT OF ORDER

(MR. GREEN cont'd). . . would have no objection to proceeding as we have done and to discussing the matter at Rules Committee when it meets again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: I raised the matter because one of the reasons that we brought in this change in the Private Members' resolutions was to ensure that members would have an opportunity of knowing what particular resolution was going to be dealt with and we could prepare to deal with that resolution. The way we're dealing with them now we're worse off than we were before, and there is no particular order in which the resolutions are being dealt with and we find ourselves in the position, although a member may be unavoidably absent at a particular time and knowing that his resolution is not going to appear that particular night and he would make sure he'd be here the night that the resolution was going to be dealt with. It was in order to achieve that kind of order and that kind of sequence, to enable members to plan debates on these resolutions that the change in the Order was made in the first place. And unless we follow that particular sequence, then the whole purpose of the change in the Private Members' resolutions has been lost.

However, the House Leader has suggested that since we have started on this session -- I'm not sure that that was the way we dealt with them last year. It seems to me that we did deal with them properly last year but I could be wrong. But this year has been particularly bad because there have been four or five standing at a time that throws the whole sequence out, and the planning of members who wish to participate in those debates has been thrown out because of the manner in which we've been dealing with them. Now perhaps we, as members, could get together and decide just exactly what we want done for the remainder of the session, but I draw it to your attention, Sir, because I think the wording of the resolution is pretty explicit in that they're supposed to be dealt with when they arrive on the Order Paper and only can be stood and dropped down to the bottom of the Order Paper when that resolution appears for the first time.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker my question is for the Attorney-General. It relates to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Before we proceed past the point of order, I am aware of both points of view, and I would concur that possibly the House Leaders and other interested people could possibly discuss this informally and arrive at a solution, and advise the Chair of that consensus, and then we could proceed in whatever manner has been decided. Is that agreeable? (Agreed) Thank you. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

ORAL QUESTIONS cont'd

MR. ASPER: My question is for the Attorney-General and it relates to the statement he made several weeks ago that he would be proceeding with criminal charges relative to the Churchill Forest Industries Complex. My question is, have warrants now been issued or other notification of the charges been issued?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. A.H. MACKLING (Attorney-General)(St. James): Mr. Speaker, I don't think it's in the interests of the administration of justice that I should be rising in my place to answer questions as to when specific charges are or not being laid. Undertakings have been given and the administration of justice is proceeding accordingly.

MR. ASPER: Is the Attorney-General suggesting or are we to take it from his answer that no warrants have been served on anyone? And if not, why not?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, honourable members can take nothing from my answer other than the fact that the administration of justice is in good hands and that proceedings are being taken on the best advice possible.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas. Sorry. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Has the Government of Manitoba given notice of or commenced extradition proceedings against any of the parties who are non-resident and who will be charged under the already laid informations?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I think the honourable member's questions are rather offensive. However, I will indicate to him that proceedings will be announced as and when they are ready.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the First Minister. Coming from a very industrial rural community, the First Minister speaking in Roblin. Is it true that the First Minister said that the Member of Swan River was one of the most frequent writers of letters asking for welfare assistance for various persons in his constituency?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: I did indicate, Mr. Speaker, that certain members who had risen in this House to condemn in a general way the phenomena of social assistance, were among those quite active in seeking by way of letter and otherwise, seeking the intervention and involvement of the Department of Health and Social Development, social workers in terms of caseload and case assistance.

MR. BILTON: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the First Minister would answer my question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I indicated in the affirmative. My honourable friend is among those.

MR. BILTON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, --(Interjection)--Will the First Minister accept the fact that he has received only two letters from me in the past twelve months in this direction simply because the bureaucracy failed me that he governs.

MR. SCHREYER: Well Mr. Speaker, it may be that I personally received only the two letters, and of course my honourable friend has every right to communicate or write those letters to me. I was merely observing the fact that even those who tend to decry social welfare from time to time do admit that it is necessary.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: I'll wait, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. The other day I asked him a question and he took it as notice. I wonder could he give me my answer, in connection with the Pembina Dam?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member's question related to surveys being done with regard to the Pembina Dam. The answer to my honourable friend's question is just as I indicated during my Estimates, that the Manitoba Water Commission is presently examining the previous cost benefit studies relative to the Pembilier Dam as to whether or not they have changed in a more advantageous position at the present time. So I think that possibly his use of the word, "surveys," was what caused me to take the question as notice. That assessment is now being made by the Water Commission.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Question for the Premier. Has the Premier received a letter from the Red River Valley Commission asking for an appointment with the government caucus in connection with dams in this area?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, in the sense of asking for a meeting with the caucus, I am not aware that such a letter has been received, but I will check.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health. I wonder if he could indicate whether he has discussed implementation of the White Paper on Corrections with his staff in the provincial jails and whether he is implementing some sections of it now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health, and Social Development) (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, staff from different sectors of my department have been implicated in the drawing and recommendation pertaining to the White Paper, including staff in correctional institutions. And Mr. Speaker, as far as the implementation of the recommendations within the White Paper, the White Paper was intended to be discussed and then to be implemented with all citizens of the province of Manitoba being implicated.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I don't think the Minister answered the last part. Is part of that White Paper now being implemented before it has been discussed in this House, as promised?

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, there are certain things within the White Paper that have been implemented even before we took office.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, could the Minister indicate whether he's having difficulty in a couple of the provincial institutions from the guards about the implementation of his White Paper at the present time?

MR. TOUPIN: There could be complications pertaining to different members of my staff. We've discussed some of them. The honourable member may be aware of certain difficulties with certain members of my staff that I am not aware of.

MR. BOROWSKI: Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has he received a letter from a group of guards that are indicating they will walk out of the prison because of the implementation of certain sections of the White Paper?

MR. TOUPIN: Not to this date, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Labour. Does the Minister intend to hold any negotiations with the teachers over the issue of holiday pay at the Red River Community College and perhaps other community colleges?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour)(Transcona): It's my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that that's all part of negotiations and certainly it would be presumptuous for me to interfere until such time as I was asked to provide arbitration if necessary.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. ALLARD: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister of Health and Welfare. When can we expect --(Interjection)-- I have a question for the First Minister. When can we expect to have a discussion of the aforementioned White Paper on Corrections, and in what manner?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, I would think, Mr. Speaker it would be during the Estimates of the Department for one, and then, Sir, knowing the ingenuity of my honourable friend, I'm sure he will find one or two other occasions when it can be discussed as well.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Public Works. I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works if a public washroom will be built either in the Power Building or next to the Power Building in considerable less cost than the one that is proposed on the Memorial Park.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

HON. RUSSELL DOERN (Minister of Public Works)(Elmwood): No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): Yes, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Colleges and Universities. --(Interjection)-- okay. I wonder if he could advise the House as to whether the regulations changing the holiday time for the civil servants involved at the Red River Community College come from him, his department, or is it a local kind of decision?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, insofar as holidays for the Red River Community College staff, they are part of the MGEA and the civil service holidays would pertain to them the same as to anybody else in the civil service.

MR. GIRARD: I wonder if he could advise the House as to why changes in the schedule on which they are taking those holidays or are to be taking those holidays, was made.

MR. MILLER: Well, the suggestion that changes have been made would indicate that somehow there's a set pattern that must be followed every year. It's my understanding that the employees at Red River are as civil servants on a twelve-month basis and holidays are arranged for, based, I suppose, on seniority and whatever the traditional manner, and they're entitled to whatever holidays they would have earned depending on the number of years in the service. As to the time of a holiday, that really depends on the college and when they need them and how they have to timetable them.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Honourable Minister could advise the House if, in fact, there are changes in the schedule of holidays for the teachers that now are

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. GIRARD cont'd). at the college.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I can't answer that question because I don't know the details. There may be changes this year, as there are every year, depending on the workload that is required. If there's a heavy summer enrollment, then of course more teachers are required. If there's a smaller summer enrollment less teachers would be required and more teachers could be on summer holidays.

MR. GIRARD: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask another question. Has the Minister information to indicate that there will be a heavier enrollment this summer than in past summers?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, in some sections there are continuous enrollments because of different intake dates. We attempt at the college to have that institution run on a twelve-month basis. To achieve that we have intake dates, could be in November, could be February, so there's always somebody taking courses at the college. In a certain branch there may be a need for staff right through the summer months.

MR. GIRARD: To the same Minister, I would like to ask more specifically then: Does he foresee a significant increase in enrollment in the Business section of the college?

MR. MILLER: Now we're getting down to specifics, Mr. Speaker. I'm glad the member has stopped fishing and asked the question he should have asked in the first place. In the Business and Distributive Education Section, Mr. Speaker, two members of the staff will be taking leave, maternity leave. There's a pilot project starting this summer. --(Interjection)-- The Member from Thompson wants to know are they both women? I don't know. We do not ask those questions at the college. There's a pilot project being started at the Community College in this particular section on modular programming, which will require staff, and the one I believe is going away on a training course. The other members of the staff are going to be required because of the intake, the procedures which I mentioned earlier, which will require staff to be present at the college so that those students who came in during the course of the year may successfully complete their year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister would undertake to advise the House soon, probably tomorrow, on why it is that in excess of 70 teachers have registered sick today.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the Member that, rather than my answering that question, he check back on his sources and determine whether in fact he isn't over-exaggerating by far the figure 70.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Attorney-General. I wonder if he would, in view of the public statements he's made and have been made by others in connection with the criminal charges arising out of this Churchill Forest Industries affair, I wonder if he would indicate to the House any reason why he refuses to answer the questions relative to the issuing and prosecuting of charges.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, outside of this House the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party launched a considerable attack on the administration of justice suggesting there was political motivation in respect to delaying of charges. Now I indicated to the member privately, and now I'll say publicly, that what he said could not have been said better in this forum or in this province than by the individual named Messrs. Kasser and Reiser, because it is in their interest that as much publicity be given to the fact that there are charges that have been under consideration against them in this province for some time. That has been a lengthy investigative procedure, and for the honourable member now to continually ask questions, "when are the charges going to be laid?" the charges have been laid, further charges are under consideration, and the totality of those charges is under consideration and applications to court are made without advanced publicity to anyone. That is the normal course and I'm not about to change that just to satisfy the interest of my honourable friend or if he is interested in the people involved.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege. The implication of the last answer by the Attorney-General being that I have some interest other than an interest in the people of Manitoba, the implication being, Mr. Speaker, that I have an interest in the people

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. ASPER cont'd). . . . who have been charged, a statement or an inference I categorically deny, and I ask the Attorney-General to withdraw it lest it provoke further questioning.

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

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Does Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party have a point of privilege or a point of order?

MR. ASPER: No, Mr. Speaker. I have a supplementary question.

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

MR. ASPER: Has the Government of Manitoba defended itself against the \$500 million lawsuit launched apparently in New Jersey, United States?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: The honourable member should be apprised of the fact that it isn't a \$500 million lawsuit, it's only a quarter of a million dollar lawsuit -- a quarter of a billion I'm sorry, a quarter of a billion dollar lawsuit, and it's directed not against the Province of Manitoba, it's directed against the Honourable the Attorney-General in person, and the Honourable Leonard Evans in person, and the Honourable Win Stoddart, etc. etc., and the advice of this lawsuit was conveyed through a public relations firm and we are taking whatever steps are deemed necessary to attend to that matter and it's in good hands.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question please.

MR. ASPER: In view of the fact that the people of Manitoba would be required to pay the judgments involved, Sir, will the Attorney-General indicate whether or not a defence has been entered?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is asking a lot of silly questions but, you know, if he would contact a public relations firm he'd probably find out that it is not a lawsuit that has been launched, it's an application that was launched to the court for leave to be able to bring a lawsuit, and that matter's in good hands.

MR. ASPER: Has the Attorney-General or any other member of the government in recent weeks made further statements other than those that have been made in the House to reporters for the Wall Street Journal?

MR. ASPER: (5 seconds recording failure.)

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I fail to see that this line of questioning has anything to do with the procedures of this House. I have been very lenient and allowed a lot of latitude, but I do believe that we are getting into details which are private and personal. From the answers I received to this House, it appears to me that this is a private suit against a number of individuals, not government. That was the information to me.

The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member made the remark, more of a statement than a question, and I want to indicate to him that I don't, as a matter of practice, tell anyone about matters that are before the courts, unless, you know, I have to respond to a question like that of my honourable friend.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, I have a very simple question. When the First Minister visits Swan River, will he tell the people the same story he is reported to have given in Roblin? And I want him to know, while I have the floor, Mr. Speaker, that I object to his inference in Roblin.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I don't know how helpful my honourable friend's objection is because I could simply file an objection to his objection. The fact is that I will continue to say that which I believe to be a fact, that my honourable friend has been among the more active members in terms of soliciting the involvement of the public purse for the assistance of certain families, for good reason perhaps, but then it does not square, it does not square with his statements with respect to the general philosophy of social assistance.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney-General. I wonder

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd). . . . if he could indicate, Mr. Speaker

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. BOROWSKI: I have a question for the Attorney-General. I wonder if he could indicate what criteria is used by the government in hiring people for the civil service with criminal records -- for serious crimes or petty crimes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that the question dealing with the employment of people in the civil service is properly directed to me, I think that my honourable colleague, the Minister of Labour, might be able to answer that. I'm not aware of the criteria he's fishing for.

MR. BOROWSKI: May I . . . an answer from the Minister of Labour, if he'd indicate to the House what criteria the government uses to hire people who have served their time in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: The only thing I could indicate, Mr. Speaker, that as far as we are concerned we're somewhat similar to the voter in Thompson, that elected an MLA. We do not recriminate against people simply because they have been in jail.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I asked a serious question. I didn't expect a smart alex answer.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

MR. BOROWSKI: I am asking if . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Let me indicate to the honourable member and to all honourable members, that this is the question period; it's time to ask questions not to express opinions or make statements before they ask questions, otherwise I shall have to rule the question out of order. The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Minister of Labour if they have a certain waiting period to hire a person who has served his time after he has been released, like six months or a year or two years. Does the government have any rule that he gives to his department about hiring people who have served time for any reason?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: No, Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, if anyone has paid their penalty to society for a violation of any of its laws, they then become free citizens.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Urban Affairs. Has the government offered to take over the responsibility of Assiniboine and Kildonan Parks in the City of Winnipeg?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Urban Affairs)(Burrows): Not both parks, Mr. Speaker, but Assiniboine.

MR. MOUG: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would this mean that there will be an admission fee charged such as there is in provincial parks?

MR. SPEAKER: That's anticipating.

MR. HANUSCHAK: One doesn't imply the other, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR (Virden): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to repeat a part of a question that was asked yesterday and the Minister of Agriculture was absent; what action is the Minister going to take to rectify the serious water shortage? We know the promotion of the livestock industry and agriculture generally is the real key to a strong economic province. This is greatly threatened right now. I know it's complicated. What is the Minister intending to do to encourage the promotion of rectifying this situation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agricultural)(Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, if it was within the privy of this House we would pass a resolution asking for some rain. That's where we would start. However, we cannot do that . . .

A MEMBER: Do it.

MR. USKIW: . . . but what we are doing, what we are doing, Mr. Speaker, is I have instructed the department to purchase six pumping units for the purpose of assisting our rural

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. USKIW cont'd). . . . residents in the pumping of water for the filling of dugouts and things of that nature. These will be available fairly soon and people who have problems with respect to water shortage should contact their local agricultural office to facilitate these pumps into their area. Further to that, we are endeavouring to prepare information that may be made available later on in the year to those farm people who have feed shortages, information that will at least try to relate what might be done by way of alternate feed supplies and so on.

MR. MCGREGOR: A supplementary then, Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. Also, what assistance will be given ones who have been relying on shallow wells, now are needing to go to quite deep well systems in order to try to alleviate this in a short . . .

MR. USKIW: Well, as the honourable member ought to know, Mr. Speaker, we have a very generous program with respect to water development wherein grants up to \$300.00 are available, 15 percent of the cost up to \$300.00. In addition to that, the Federal Government has recently announced assistance for the same purpose up to \$500.00 wherein it involves the well casing, so that between the two programs there is pretty adequate assistance for that particular purpose.

MR. MCGREGOR: Mr. Speaker, a last supplementary. That is so if you strike water, but it's not so if you have a dry well.

MR. SPEAKER: Question. . . The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, on the same point, I wonder if the Minister has been in touch with Ottawa to determine if they are going to come up with plans, proposals to deal with what could be a crisis situation on the prairies if there's no rain.

MR. USKIW: Well, of course, Mr. Speaker, I don't think we would want to imply that we are indeed in that situation at the present time. You know, obviously, if it does arise we will have to have some discussions as to what to do about it.

MR. JORGENSON: . . . would not want to get in touch with the Minister in Ottawa now to lay the plans that are necessary rather than waiting until the crisis arrives.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, because of the concern that is beginning to mount and given the continuing weather pattern, given the fact that there is increased concern not only with respect to ground water supply by wells and dropping water tables and aquifers, but the whole generality of this problem, I'm asking that the Departments of Agriculture, Mines and Resources and Municipal Affairs meet on this for the drawing up of contingency plans in as specific a manner as possible, and connected with this will be the getting in touch with federal authorities, again purely on a contingency basis. It is still far too early to assume the worst.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Is the government printing the City of Winnipeg tax forms at the Provincial Government's expense?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Selkirk): I think that the honourable member should realize that he's asking the question to the wrong Minister.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister inform the House if he wrote the City on March 5th saying that the Provincial Government would print the tax forms at the province's expense?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, that is insofar as all municipalities; I think the Minister of Urban Affairs would be closer in touch with that development, except to say that the forms have been made out, they are being printed, and I do not have the letter in front of me as to who is actually paying the cost of same. I could take that part as notice for the Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the province designing the format of the City of Winnipeg tax form?

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

MR. WATT: Well, I want to follow on a further question on our critical water situation right now, and I wonder if the Minister and the First Minister would not consider that we are now in a critical situation insofar as water is concerned, that is surface water supplies, in dugouts and pastures throughout the province of Manitoba, probably particularly in the west but I think in most parts of the Province of Manitoba, where farmers now are concerned about water

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. WATT cont'd). . . . supply eventually in dugouts for stock that they are putting out to pasture.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I don't remember whether the Member for Arthur was in his seat when I responded to the question from the Honourable Member for Virden, wherein I had indicated that whatever measures can be undertaken now are being undertaken and that the department is in the process of purchasing six pumping units for the purpose of filling dugouts, so that whatever possibilities there are within our administrative capability we are now undertaking. If the matter becomes more critical, however, we may have to involve other governments and other departments.

MR. WATT: A supplementary then. My question --I'll put it as a supplementary. Is the Minister prepared to proceed now with the pumping equipment and the general collection of water that is available now to collect into dugouts throughout the province before it dries up?

MR. USKIW: Well again let me repeat that is precisely what we are doing, and the decision was already made, and these pumps will be available for all of rural Manitoba wherever the water shortages are or occur, so that people that want to use of these pumps simply would have to contact the agricultural offices in their own regions.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Telephone System. Can he confirm that the Federal Government has in fact issued a license, I think during the latter part of March, to allow live broadcasting through the Manitoba Telephone System to northern Manitoba points?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. BURTONIAK: Mr. Speaker, I think that perhaps the Attorney-General is prepared to answer that question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Internal Services has made interventions with the CRTC. We have had assurances that second television broadcasting will become available in mid-central Manitoba late this year as a result of an agreement that has been reached now between the private TV broadcaster in Yorkton utilizing the Baldy Mountain transmitter, and I have that assurance that that additional broadcasting will be available.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker -- the Attorney-General. I wonder if we're not talking about two different efforts. The effort I'm referring to deals with a license application to the CRTC to allow, through the Manitoba Telephone System, live broadcasting into the eastern side of the province up north to Lynn Lake and further. Is that the broadcast system the Attorney-General is referring to?

MR. MACKLING: I'm not aware of the results of that application, not at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health. In view of the answer given by the Minister of Labour regarding the hiring of prisoners, could he indicate whether the two jail guards who were fired from Headingley for stealing clothes and other stuff, are they open to rehiring by his department as jail guards again?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, keeping in mind the comment made by my colleague the Minister of Labour, which I agree with, once a person has had an offence in the Province of Manitoba and paid for whatever offence he was accused and tried for, he should be available and we should accept any ex-inmates for positions that are available within the civil service if we, as a government, expect private enterprise to do the same.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure I understood the answer. Is he saying that they will rehire these two guards that he fired just last year for stealing?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, what I attempted to say is that they're eligible for rehiring.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I asked a question about the senior citizens' homes in Cartwright. Could he now give me an answer on that matter?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would hope to have the information tomorrow for the

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd). . . . honourable member.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. CY GONICK (Crescentwood): . . . to the Minister of Industry and Commerce, I think. It has to do with the pending application of the dairy companies to the Milk Control Board for an increase in their rates. Is the Government of Manitoba intending on allowing the dairy companies to once again raise the price of milk for the second time in twelve months?

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I believe that question should be directed to the Minister responsible for the Milk Control Board, namely the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. GONICK: To the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, as the member may not be aware, or may be aware it's really irrelevant, the Milk Control Board has sophistication now which it did not have in years gone by for the better ascertaining of the costs of production, distribution, and retailing, in that in their review of the applications they are in a better position at this point in time to determine in fact a real need with respect to an increase in price, so that I would hope that they do their job as efficiently as they can and whatever is recommended will be as accurate as is possible.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. GONICK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Mines and Resources. Is it correct that the Flyer Coach Industries intends to sell their Morris plant to an American operation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, there are before the board of directors various questions relating to various operations of the Fund's subsidiaries and companies to whom the Fund has advanced money. I believe that there has been a request by the Board to consider such a sale.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Urban Affairs. Is the province designing and paying for the Winnipeg - City of Winnipeg tax forms?

MR. SPEAKER: It's repetition of a previous question.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: It was to the other Minister, Mr. Speaker, the last time.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, it is our responsibility to approve the tax forms. Whether or not we offer assistance for the printing of them, I've taken that as notice, and when I have the answer I'll provide it to the honourable member and to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek have a supplementary?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. If the province does . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Hypothetical.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Let's just check . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. I wonder if he could tell the House whether it's correct that he is planning on a pre-election or fence-mending trip through northern Manitoba tomorrow and Friday?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I would call it neither fence-mending nor pre-election. I have on as regular a basis as I have been able to visit in a number of northern Manitoba communities and this - the frequency in 1970, 71, 72; 73 I hope will not be much different.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, a further question. Would the Premier not consider it perhaps offensive to many Manitobans to go on such a trip on Good Friday which is Christendom's most sacred day?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, this certainly was something which occurred to me and that is why I have not made any arrangements to attempt to conduct official business. However I do not see anything wrong in terms of visiting with people, just as I would be in any case on a Good Friday in any year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, it's to the Honourable the Minister of Urban Affairs. Is the tax bill printing service provided by the Province to the City of

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. MCGILL cont'd). . . . Winnipeg available to the City of Brandon on request?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I could deal with that question. I think as far as I am aware the printing of tax bills is in the hands of the province insofar as all municipalities in the province with the exception of the City of Winnipeg.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the printing of the tax bills for the City of Winnipeg as I have mentioned earlier, it is our responsibility to approve them and because of the changes recently announced to the benefit of the taxpayers, the City -- we have agreed to cover the cost of the printing and my information is that neither the City nor the people of Winnipeg will be all that much inconvenienced by any delay. But if it is a delay, we're prepared to pay for it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Urban Affairs. That being the case, the province printing and paying for it, will the form be tabled in this House before it goes to the city?

MR. HANUSCHAK: No, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I have one final question for the Attorney-General. I wonder if he could indicate whether it's a violation of The Elections Act for a Minister of the Crown to order election material before an election is announced?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that that is any more a violation of any Act than the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party having billboards throughout the province advertising his ability to lead his party.

continued on next page.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

POINT OF PERSONAL GRIEVANCE

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time, Mr. Speaker, to present a grievance. In doing so, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read into the record a letter that was sent to the First Minister on April 9th. My grievance comes as a result of a grievance against the government and an opportunity as well to deal with something that I believe is probably the most vital issue affecting the people of Manitoba today. A week ago, Mr. Speaker, I wrote the First Minister a letter that received very little publicity, although a copy of it was given to the news media, and I would like to read it into the record because it is the basis of my presentation today and because I believe as well, Mr. Speaker, that there is a response that is required from the government.

The letter is dated April 9th and it's addressed to the First Minister as Premier of this Province and it states, the body of the letter states as follows:

"The Progressive Conservative Party is deeply concerned about inflation in Manitoba. Rising living costs form an increasingly heavy burden on the people of this province. This cost of living burden is a regressive one. It is most unfair to those who can least afford it. It is our number one problem.

"The Progressive Conservative Party acknowledges that besides being a serious provincial problem, inflation is an national and international problem as well. Many of its roots lie outside Manitoba. This fact however must not be used as an excuse for inaction on the part of the provincial administration. Manitoba must soon determine whether provincial action will be effective in reversing the effects of inflation or in holding the line on cost of living increases. It is unfair to continue concentrating the blame for these increases on our farmers. Major anti-inflationary measures are being discussed at the national level. Manitoba's own cost of living problems must be analyzed and understood if we are to have a voice in these discussions.

"The sooner we understand inflation the sooner we can get down to the important business of curing it. A Manitoba cost of living policy must be developed if we are to fight inflation here or participate in national on national anti-inflation planning.

"The Progressive Conservative Party is convinced that the Provincial Legislature must take the lead in developing our province's cost of living policy. We therefore urge you to convene the Standing Committee on Economic Development as soon as possible for the purpose of investigating inflation in Manitoba.

"The Progressive Conservative Party recommends that the Standing Committee be given full powers to examine cost of living increases in Manitoba. It must summon witnesses from all interested groups, from agriculture, from manufacturing and the service industries, from labour groups, from retail and wholesale merchants, from consumer groups and from financial institutions.

The Committee must also have access to expert economic views both from within and outside the Provincial Government. Testimony must also be sought from members of the Economic Development Advisory Board, the chairman and staff" -- the letter refers to the chairman but it would indicate I believe as well the staff of the Economic Council of Canada.

"All possible contributing factors must be investigated: taxation, housing, transportation, interest rates, the cost of consumer goods, food, clothing and services.

The Standing Committee is the body best suited to examine the evidence on a non-partisan basis and to interview representatives from every sector of Manitoba's economy.

The Progressive Conservative Party hopes that you will consider our recommendations carefully. The cost of living problem must not be treated lightly; it is time for serious action."

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House Leader indicated that the Standing Committee on Economic Development will probably meet on or about May 1st. He also indicated that they

POINT OF PERSONAL GRIEVANCE

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) would be dealing with the matter that they primarily would be addressing themselves to and that is the representatives from the Manitoba Development Fund who would be present and who would be in a position to give information to the members on this side, and to the members on the other side as well, that has not been given in the House as the vehicle for which specific questions on Crown corporations and the Development Corporation's activities could be explained.

This proposal, Mr. Speaker, gives the Standing Committee, if it was given that responsibility now, Mr. Speaker, I'm aware that it is the -- in reality it is the Committee that makes the decision as to what procedure will be followed and as to what course of action will be followed. But I am also aware that the First Minister has a great deal of influence on that decision and it is my belief, Mr. Speaker, that there is a responsibility on the Premier's shoulder to give leadership in this respect. Without question this is the issue in Manitoba. People are having a difficult time, an extremely difficult time making ends meet. Notwithstanding the fact that there have been rises in incomes they do not in any way compensate or take care of the actual increase in the cost of living and in increase in prices.

And, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that what we see now is only the beginning of increased pricing that will take place as we approach the fall period and towards the end of the year. And there are many indicators of this. Supply and demand have indicated that in certain areas there will be without question increase in pricing because the demand has gone up, but in addition, Mr. Speaker, we face the reality that in the kind of inflation that exists in the western world, the kinds of checks and balances do not appear to be there to protect the consumer.

Now before I deal with it, Mr. Speaker, I want to make a couple of other observations. No one is suggesting that the Provincial Government can control this by themselves but it has to do with the responsibility that we as members of the Legislature have to our own constituencies. Are we simply to be here to represent them on only provincial issues or are we -- or do we have the responsibility to try and see whether we can influence and assist in those national decisions which in effect affect their lives. It would seem to me that the time has come for the members of the Legislature to address themselves to the problem which is paramount with most people, and to try and see as a result of their own investigation, and as a result of our study, whether there is not in fact some kind of policy that can be recommended to the Federal Government for action, and in turn to determine what provincial policy, if any provincial policy, can be implemented and that it can affect the cost of living in this province. But I recognize the national problem, and I recognize the national influence, and I recognize the necessity of national action. But in order for us to determine both provincial policy, and in order for us to be able to make a recommendation of federal policy, we have to understand it fully ourselves. And I think that the opportunity for a Standing Committee to be able to summon witnesses, an opportunity to be able to hear different presentations, an opportunity to be able to do the kind of examination and cross-examination on the information that would be furnished, would in fact give us the ability to be able to at least try and steer intelligently the direction that government must undertake at this particular time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, within the last day or two the consumer price index has indicated that there has been no rise in Winnipeg, and Winnipeg being one of the indicators, as being the only indicator for Manitoba, there would be an assumption that that would mean that conditions are rather stable in this area. But, Mr. Speaker, if we examine what really is taking place we realize that there have been in the past year increases almost every few months, that in certain respects Winnipeg has been ahead of other areas with the increases, and I'm going to mention that in a few moments. So that in effect while there may be a situation whereas today, or in the last month, we have not achieved an increase as in other areas, the over-all increase, Mr. Speaker, has been a five percent increase from last year to this year and that is serious because that is being paid for by people; that is causing additional demands for wage increases which in turn is raising the price of goods, which in turn, Mr. Speaker, simply pushes the inflation and feeds the inflation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in July and August of last year there was an increase of 3.6 percent above that a year ago. Mr. Speaker, in August and September the increase arrived at was a 4.2 percent increase, that is accumulative increase. In December, Mr. Speaker, it was a 4.5 increase, and last month it was a 5 percent increase in terms of a full year. It's

POINT OF PERSONAL GRIEVANCE

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) interesting because I want to make reference to it because I can anticipate looking at the Minister of Industry and Commerce that he's preparing the rebuttal, and I want to indicate to him that if in fact he's going to suggest that the price increase was not there for this last period that that means that everything is okay, that I should like to indicate to him what happened in October, 1972. Because in October, 1972, food costs rose across this country but Winnipeg was the highest. And the actual increase in five cities that did increase, Mr. Speaker, was in fact Winnipeg and we were ahead at that particular time.

Now Mr. Speaker, I believe that the situation is serious and I do not believe that any kind of statistical information in any way will take away from the hard facts of life for most people that they are having a difficult time making ends meet.

I'd like to if I may refer to, and I'm glad the Honourable Member from Crescentwood is in his seat, refer to his reply in the Budget Speech because I think it's rather appropriate to quote some of the clauses again, or some of the information from some of the statements that he made, because I think that relevant to the whole issue as to what really is happening--(Interjection)-- I'm sorry. Again unfortunately I could not hear the honourable member from his seat but I would hope that he, I hope that he would rise and confirm what I'm going to say now with respect to the cost of living, because, Mr. Speaker, the reality is, that notwithstanding that is happening, people are getting behind and not getting ahead in this province in terms of real income and real purchasing power. And the Honourable Member from Crescentwood is shaking his head and this is a problem, and this is a serious problem we have to face, and this is why as members of the Legislature we have a responsibility fully to deal with it, fully to investigate it, and not to pass it off as if it is something that is under control in Manitoba and is not capable of being analyzed by the members of the Legislature who I suggest have a responsibility to the constituents to deal with those problems that are important to them and to deal with those problems which in fact are the serious ones that they have to face every day.

On page 1438 of Hansard, quoting from the Honourable Member from Crescentwood, the following statement was made: "Now over the same period price increases would have eaten away something like \$400.00 of their income. In other words, in 1973 it would cost roughly \$2,400 to buy the same basket of goods and services that would cost \$2,000 to buy in 1969. And for a single person earning \$2,000 a year, the tax shift saves such a person something less than the loss of his purchasing power. Families earning \$4,000 a year would have lost about \$650.00 in price increases over the same period, so that the tax saving of 441" and I'm not at this point, I'm accepting the premises that the Honourable Member from Crescentwood has made, I'm not going to quarrel with that--so that the tax savings of 441 for such a family would cover roughly two-thirds of the accumulated loss over the four-year period and families earning \$6,000, Mr. Speaker, would have lost something like \$1,000 of purchasing power due to price increases over the period. So their tax saving which comes to 377 would cover about one-third of their loss."

And, Mr. Speaker, going on in his statements, the Honourable Member for Crescentwood says the following: "My purpose in drawing attention to these figures is again not to oppose the tax shifts. Given the surplus available to government, they certainly represent probably the most equitable way of dividing it; it's simply to point out the limitation of redistributing income by means of these kinds of adjustments, limitations which I understand members of the Executive Branch of Government realize because," and I think this must be emphasized, "price increases eat up most of the tax saving."

So the reality, Mr. Speaker, is that there is an acknowledgement on the part of the Member from Crescentwood, at least one member, that in effect the problem is serious and the problem warrants additional action. Now there may be and would be some disagreement probably between the Member from Crescentwood and myself and others on this side as to what course of action is to be undertaken; but leaving aside the question of disagreement, surely, leaving aside the question of disagreement, surely at this time it's necessary for us to be able to create the kind of vehicle that the public can in fact make presentations, and in fact can be given an opportunity for a contribution on their part to the legislative policy on a provincial and federal level that should be undertaken.

And, Mr. Speaker there are many people who believe that you can fight inflation with tax cuts. And I'd like if I may quote from an article entitled, "You Can Fight Inflation with Tax

POINT OF PERSONAL GRIEVANCE

(MR. SPIYAK cont'd) Cuts." The Canadian Business, in May of 1972, and I'd like to, if I may, quote three or four paragraphs before I continue on with my remarks. On Page 38 on the bottom of the page the article written by an economist with a private research organization by the name Edward Cape states the following: "In both early and late stages of recovery, an important aid to achieving price stability is for the industrial sector and the government sector to grow at nearly the same rate. In the early stages, both may grow rapidly; in the latter stages, both must slow down. But if in either stage the government sector grows a great deal faster than the industrial sector's capacity to finance increased government activity, the result must obviously include some increased tax rates or new forms of taxes, that is some tax push effect on prices and wages."

Further on, Mr. Speaker, on Page 40, he makes the following statements: "Over the six year period from 65 to 71," and he's talking about Canada, "the current dollar GNP growth again averaged about 9 percent annually. Over the same six year period the expansion in government spending averaged 14 percent annually."

Quoting again: "It is particularly interesting to note that over the past six years, while government purchases which represent about one-third of the economy showed an average price increase of 7 percent annually; the remainder of the economy showed an average price increase of only 2.7 percent annually."

Quoting further: "The most important of the economic issues arising from this discussion is the extent to which wages and salary earners will be able to retain their income gains in the form of real take - home pay rather than accepting government financed services as a substitute for take - home pay."

Now, Mr. Speaker, what Mr. Cape is suggesting is that if in fact government spending is ahead of private sector spending, then government is in fact contributing in feeding inflation, and in a very real sense is causing a rise to occur in prices, and is preventing real income gains to be made by people.

And Mr. Speaker, this is what has been happening and is happening today in Manitoba. And all one has to do is look at yesterday's DBS statistics of capital repair expenditure intentions to be in a position to make the assessment as to what is happening in this province by comparison to the other provinces, and to recognize that in a very direct way the Provincial Government by its action and by its course of conduct, has in fact contributed and is contributing to inflation.

For Manitoba if we examine the public sector involvement in utilities, which can be identified because it's all public sector, and institutional services in government departments, we find that approximately 668 million of 1 billion, 346 million forecast is being spent by the public sector, or almost 50 percent.

Now let's examine the other provinces. If we examine Saskatchewan, we find in the same grouping that 480 million of 1 billion, 213 million is being spent, and that's about 35 percent. If we move now to British Columbia and look at the other NDP province before we look at Alberta, we find that a billion, 750 million appears to be spent on utilities and institutional services in government departments of a forecast figure of 4 billion, 330 million, and that is 40 percent. And if we look at Alberta, we find that the total, Mr. Speaker, is close to a billion of 3 billion, 282 million, or 33 percent. So of the four prairie provinces, the four western provinces, three prairie and British Columbia, Manitoba at this point is spending 50 percent of the total estimates of capital and repair expenditures as government sector involvement, public sector involvement, whereas Saskatchewan is spending 35 percent, whereas British Columbia and the Yukon and Northwest Territories because they're grouped together are spending 40 percent; whereas 33 percent is being spent by Alberta. And Mr. Speaker, the conclusion one must draw from this is that as a result of this spending, there must be a push and a feeding of inflation because government purchasing is higher than private sector purchasing. Government efforts simply mean that, and I would like to quote back again what Mr. Cape has said. "Is that there will be in fact new tax push effects on prices and wages and in effect it means that the industrial sector cannot, and cannot provide the capacity to finance increased government spending."

Now I think we all recognize, Mr. Speaker, that we've gone through a period where there has been suggestions of a meat boycott, where the farmers of western Canada have been

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) blamed for high prices in meat and then verily have been put in a position of attempting to defend themselves when this is probably the first occasion in which they have been able to receive a just price for their efforts.

We know, Mr. Speaker, that prices have in fact increased but for the purpose of the record, and just to try and provide certain examples, I attempted to determine what costs were in '69, and what they are today, by looking at various ads, and trying to see whether I could find the identical items, Mr. Speaker, so that I could be in a position to see what the increased costs have been. And if I may, Mr. Speaker, I want to make reference to a few of them just to give you some idea of what prices increases have taken place. If we were to look at an Eaton's ad in 1969 for a freezer, a frig and freezer that has certain specifications, to be able to determine what in fact has been the increase, and I've tried to do this in two examples and I have them, just to indicate what actually the percentage increase has been. In 1969, a 1971 Viking with 122 pound freezer cost \$325.00, Mr. Speaker, it cost \$325 --(Interjection)-- well I'll come back to the policy in two seconds, Mr. Speaker, \$325.00; the price today is \$359.00. By the way, this ad is March 1st, 1971. In effect, Mr. Speaker, there has been a 10 percent increase since March of 1971 in two years on this article. In connection with a Viking stove with a rotisserie, the pricing increase has been from \$235.00 in March of '71 to \$284.00 today, and that's a 20 percent increase. Now I'm saying the obvious because I think everyone knows this. I have an ad here, Mr. Speaker, which shows an article sold by Simpsons-Sears, it's called a Craftsman 20 inch gas mower. It's the identical mower, it's the identical specification, Mr. Speaker, in '69 it cost 59.88; in 73 it cost 64.99, and one can argue, Mr. Speaker, that that is not a substantial increase in dollars but it does represent a 10 percent increase in actual cost to the consumers for a gas mower.

If we look at the price of food, and I don't want to bore the individuals opposite by reading off a list, because if they've done shopping in a supermarket or in a store they know what costs are. But there are certain examples that I would like to refer to that I think are interesting. With respect to meat prices, with respect to --(Interjection)-- I'm sorry? The documents will be tabled. With respect to meat prices, Mr. Speaker, comparing it to an ad on April 11th, 1973 from Dominion Stores, and comparing that to April of '69, a blade roast would cost in '69 - 79 cents a pound, now 98 cents a pound. That's an increase of 20 cents, and it's over a 20 percent increase, Mr. Speaker, it's close to 25 percent. A pork butt roast cost 59 cent a pound, now 79 cents a pound. That increase --(Interjection)-- I'm sorry. Well the honourable member opposite from Winnipeg Centre can determine the percentage increase himself, I did not work these out. --(Interjection)-- Well I would say, Mr. Speaker, for the honourable member opposite, it now at this point is -- I agree is a 33 percent increase in the case of pork butt roast. Mr. Speaker, Winnipeg Goldeye in 1969 cost 89 cents a pound, now it cost \$1.29 a pound, and that's close to --(Interjection)-- it's not but it's close to a 45 percent increase. A tulibee, because I wanted to make the comparison to see whether in fact any reasonable substitution could be offered by those who then could buy something for less quality - that was 39 cents a pound in 69, it's now 68 cents a pound, and that is close again to a 40 percent increase. Sliced bread exactly described the same in 69, was five for 89 cents, is now five for 95 cents, so there's only a six cent increase which would amount to about a seven or eight percent increase over all. --(Interjection)--

In cake mixes I couldn't in the cake I couldn't measure, but I want to indicate something about household items, and I tried to again relate them directly to those items that were sold from the ads that I have in front of me. Windex was sold in 1969 at 53 cents, is now 79 cents, so that increase is close to a 50 percent increase. Onions which were sold for 35 cents now sell for 59 cents, and that increase then represents about a 33 percent increase.

Well, the honourable members opposite are not going to be very impressed by my reading in those figures. As a matter of fact I want to tell you something, Mr. Speaker, I don't think the honourable members opposite are going to be impressed at all, and I'll tell you why. They seem to think that having brought a budget in, having in fact given back to the people some of the tax money that they've taken, that they are in the enviable position now that they do not have to answer one iota to the people of this province with respect to the questions of the cost of living. Well, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in a very real sense their

POINT OF PERSONAL GRIEVANCE

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) taxation policies have directly affected the cost of living for the people in this province. And, as I said, Mr. Speaker, before, the government has been the profiteer of inflation; they have in fact caused a redistribution, and in a regressive way, and the Honourable Member from Crescentwood can rise and suggest that it isn't so but if he does that, then he certainly is less of an economist than I thought he was. --(Interjection)-- Now, Mr. Speaker, the interesting thing here, and the Honourable Member from Crescentwood now suggests to me, what is our policy. Well. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SPIVAK: How are we going to deal with it? You then have to come down to a very basic position. Does the Provincial Government have any input in this at all? Now if the Honourable Member from Crescentwood would suggest that the Provincial Government has no input at all, --(Interjection)-- Well just a second, if he's going to suggest first, before we even deal with it, if he's going to say the Provincial Government has no input, then I suggest that there is no necessity for any discussion or debate to take place on this issue. But, Mr. Speaker, in fact, he will admit that the Provincial Government has a contribution to make in this area, but only in a limited way, nevertheless that means that there is something that can be done, and that there is something that should be reviewed.

As I've indicated, Mr. Speaker, the Consumer Price Index has risen steadily from February of '72 and February '73. Besides routine increases in the price of most goods and services, we can, and I forecast this, Mr. Speaker, expect significantly higher car and gasoline prices; all energy costs including hydro, and we know that from what the Honourable Minister, First Minister has indicated now, are likely to rise in the near future.

A MEMBER: And milk.

MR. SPIVAK: No relief from the cost of living pressures are in fact in sight. We require now, Mr. Speaker, a Manitoba cost of living policy, and the purpose of the letter sent to the First Minister was to allow the Standing Committee to hear and to determine whether a cost of living policy can in fact be determined. --(Interjection)-- Well the Honourable Member from Crescentwood says, public hearings. I am saying to you that someone, somewhere, is going to have to develop a cost of living policy. It is not being developed now and it is my belief that it can be developed if in fact we are given an opportunity for the members of the Legislature to hear from the so-called experts to understand the nature of inflation and to be able to deal with some of the specifics and one of which I without questioning can suggest is tax cuts, because tax cuts in itself will have its influence in decreasing the cost of living. --(Interjection)--

No, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I am talking about tax cuts. --(Interjection)-- Oh yes, I am talking tax cuts over and above what the honourable members opposite have offered. I am talking about reduced government spending in many areas of activity, and I am suggesting by doing that you'll put the public sector involvement in line with the private sector involvement, and out of this get an opportunity, at least some action to in fact stop blaming the - blaming inflation.

Mr. Speaker, the suggestion to the First Minister was made as a realistic suggestion and as a non-partisan suggestion. The suggestions were not made as criticism of the government; nor did we in any way suggest that the government was going to take action which they were incapable of providing. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, that they deserve more consideration than there has been received. To date I have received no letter from the First Minister, and I think in this respect there was an obligation on his part to inform me what his intentions would be. Mr. Speaker, inflation is both a national and an international problem as well as a provincial one, but the Provincial Government has an important role to play in the fight against the cost of living increases for three reasons.

MR. SCHREYER: Sir, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Let the First Minister state his point of order.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, letters are being read on the record; the letter of the Leader of the Opposition to me, now he's reading my reply to him, and I think that we could get someone else to read that letter. You know, the whole thing is a bunch of nonsense, but if we're going to have letters being read back and forth, I would like the privilege of reading my own letter since he's reading all afternoon.

POINT OF PERSONAL GRIEVANCE

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, to begin with, I have not received a letter from the First Minister; I am not reading from his letter. If he has a letter then I would be very happy after I complete my remarks for him to stand up and read it. I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that for the past week I have not received any acknowledgment or confirmation at all that the Standing Committee would be given that opportunity, and if the First Minister is prepared after my remarks to indicate that he would recommend that such a course of action be taken, I will give him a great deal of credit for it, but I am not in any way reading the letter of the First Minister. I haven't received it. It has not been delivered to my office.

I am now reading, Mr. Speaker, from some notes because I want to very clearly state what I consider is the problem. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Provincial Government has an important role to play for three reasons.

First, cost of living pressures which originate in Manitoba should be open to provincial counter measures.

Second, we must understand every dimension of Manitoba's cost of living problem if we are to have an effective voice in formulating national and anti-inflationary policies, and I believe that there is a responsibility on the part of the Provincial Governments to in fact try to influence national policy by making recommendations to the national government for action on their part.

Thirdly, governments themselves, Mr. Speaker, contribute significantly to rising living costs, and the way in which government can in fact contribute in a way so that there will be a decrease in costs becomes important.

The government is involved in the inflationary process in two ways. One, it receives increased sales and income tax revenues when price and incomes rise. Then tax increases have their regressive effects of reducing the real incomes of consumers, making governments the real beneficiary and profiteer of inflation. And, Mr. Speaker, in 1969 the combined income tax revenues were \$100 million; today they are expected to reach for the next fiscal year \$208 million in the coming year. Inflation, Mr. Speaker, is costing the average Manitoban, Manitoba family, between 400 to 1,000 dollars a year more to purchase the same goods and services it purchased only four years ago, and the Provincial Government, Mr. Speaker, gets its share of these increases.

The second reason, Mr. Speaker, is that the government actually contributes to persistent inflation, if government spending grows too much faster than the economic base which supports it. Government spending has doubled from 1969, and as I've indicated the only other statistic that has doubled has been unemployment. Spurts of government spending are necessary during slump but if these increased levels become permanent they add to the inflationary pressures. In recent years the price index of government purchased goods and services has risen significantly above the general consumer price index. This is a problem which the Provincial Government can tackle.

Mr. Speaker, there are three types of inflation, demand - pull inflation. When there are not enough goods and services to satisfy existing demand prices are soon bid up, and the higher prices serve as rational controls. As a bidder for goods and services the government contributes to this type of inflation. Cost-push inflation results when supply bottlenecks negotiated settlements, or international trade fluctuations occur. And tax-push inflation occurs when taxes are passed on to the consumer in the form of higher prices, and because of excessive government spending in taxation, this type of inflation is an increasingly significant factor in the cost of living increases. An effort must be made to solve all three types of inflation, and the Provincial Government must provide leadership and set its own house in order.

Three major programs are required for the Provincial Government. First, a clear picture of inflation in Manitoba must be developed, and if the existing government departments and the Statistics Bureau are incapable of gathering the information, a special cost of living committee should be established to monitor and analyze cost of living increases in the province. Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I asked the Minister of Industry and Commerce whether he had any forecasts of what would take place with respect to the costs of food and clothing, and, Mr. Speaker, he indicated that the Statistics Branch was gathering information at all times and obviously finds it difficult to make forecasts, and really at this point doesn't know what they're doing.

POINT OF PERSONAL GRIEVANCE

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd)

Now, Mr. Speaker, in reality there is an obligation on the part of government to present intelligently the forecasts that are likely to take place in the next little while. I suggest to you that the people of Manitoba do not know what is going to take place in a few months when the costs of certain goods are going to rise; one, because of demand in shortages of products; secondly, because just generally the taxation policies have not, for Canada and Manitoba, have not reduced the necessity for increased pricing; and thirdly, because of the essential demand that is now occurring with respect to certain products, a demand which is world demand as opposed to national demand, and our people should be in a position to know that and in effect there may very well be new national policies that may have to be designed to protect the people's interest.

Mr. Speaker, the second program is that the Provincial Government must stop feeding the fires of inflation. Taxes must be reduced over and above the surplus money that was given back to the people by the government, and government spending must be cut and tied to the growth of the provincial economy. Creation of jobs in the private sector must be emphasized. Even unemployment is inflationary since the tax money raised to finance welfare, unemployment relief, and the make-work projects contribute to the tax-push inflation. It is now time that wage and salary earners are permitted to retain their income gains in the form of real take-home pay rather than accepting more government financed services as a substitute for more take-home pay.

Finally, a Manitoba cost of living policy must be developed, and I believe, and the Honourable Member from Crescentwood may disagree, that the best way to do this is to use the Standing Committee of the Legislature as a committee which will sit during the Legislature, will sit this month and to give us the opportunity to have those people who have a particular interest to make their presentation, and also to be given an opportunity to ask, without necessarily summoning, people to come forward, and I'm sure that those from the Economic Council of Canada, those from our own Provincial Economic Advisory Board, those from the labour groups and the farm groups, will be prepared to come forward and to deal with the matter.

Mr. Speaker, we have had on the federal scene a review of food prices and a report, and one can be concerned about what has taken place there. First, one has to be concerned about the fact that in all of the discussions that took place there, the question of what taxation component point taxation was in the increased cost of food, was not dealt with, that somehow or other people were inclined to believe on that committee that they did not have to deal with the issue of taxation, and they did not have to deal with the problems of -- with taxation, or the way in which taxation has in fact increased the price of food. And I believe that there is an obligation on our part to determine that, and I believe the people in this province are not going to be satisfied with, you know, simple explanations that our problem isn't as great as the other areas, simple explanations that, you know, that we're reasonably steady because our people know that from their point of view the costs of goods are going up, and services are going up, and they are not in a position to meet it.

Mr. Speaker, if we could as a committee come to a consensus, or a reasonable consensus, as to what course of action should be taken by the Federal Government, we could pass that on as a committee recommendation and we would be making a contribution to the national scene.

And I come back to our responsibilities as Legislators. Do we have a responsibility to try to do this? Do we have a responsibility to try and become involved in an area that may to a larger extent be national policy but nevertheless affect our own people? We have the power, because we do have a Committee on Economic Development to deal with this matter; we have the power, Mr. Speaker, to be able to call witnesses and to be able to ask people to appear. Surely we have that responsibility, surely we cannot suggest that we should not be proceeding along the lines that I have suggested. And surely it would be possible, even between the Member from Crescentwood and myself, to arrive at least on a consensus on certain matters that should be undertaken, both on a national and a provincial level.

And, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the members opposite and the Premier, who has now left the arena, or the Assembly --(Interjection)-- Yeah. The Honourable Member for Thompson, he's already left for the north. --(Interjection)-- Save the two seats. I don't

POINT OF PERSONAL GRIEVANCE

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) think it will be favourable for him.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the First Minister and the government would allow the Standing Committee the opportunity to deal with this item. I would hope that we would have an opportunity for the kind of review that I suggested. And I would believe, Mr. Speaker, that after that committee hearing that there is need for an additional effort to be brought forward in Manitoba which is not a government effort but which government can initiate, and that would be the ability to try and deal with the voluntary sector of our community to see whether they themselves are going to be in a position to organize themselves into a prices and income committee to be able to, if necessary, hold public hearings if they so decide; to be able to have witnesses come before it, if they so decide; and to be able to try and deal with the increases in prices, labour income, and to be in a position to make recommendations on a voluntary basis. It seems to me that one of the great complaints that we on this side have had with the government is that they have not been prepared to -- Mr. Speaker, they have not been prepared to co-operate with the voluntary sector and private sector of our community; that in effect they have ignored them in those fundamental issues in which there can be first, some embarrassment to government, and secondly, in which government is not really interested in advice from others other than their planning groups or those within their own sphere of influence, their party's sphere of influence. It seemed to me that groups such as the consumer groups, groups such as the Chamber of Commerce, groups such as the farm organizations, and labour organizations, are capable given some initiative by government to form themselves into a prices and an income committee, and to be in a position to influence the price increases that are now taking place in this province, and will continue to take place in the next period of time. And I think that there is an opportunity for leadership to be given here in a way that it has not been given in the past. I think if such a committee, which would be a voluntary committee, not a government committee, a committee which would be answerable only to its own groups and to the people, that they can effect, do what has happened in the United States, which is essentially the jawbone, which really is simply to talk about those areas of concern that they have identified, to be able to try and hold prices down, and to be able to try and stabilize at this period of time when the cost of living is rising so rapidly and inflation is having such, you know, such significant effects on our people.

And so, Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me that this effort could come after we ourselves have had an opportunity for that review, and could come as a recommendation of the committee, if we so decide, but I would look for the Standing Committee after such hearings and discussions have taken place to be in a position realistically to make the kind of recommendations to the Federal Government that could be of assistance on the national level.

I'd like it if I may, Mr. Speaker, refer back to a meeting of the Standing Committee some time ago when we dealt with the problems of unemployment, when Dr. Weldon appeared there as head of Planning and Priorities. I think that those of us who were present at the committee were first of all impressed with his presentation, with his ability, and with the overview that he presented on the problems of inflation generally and on the problems of the economy of Manitoba, and with the statistical information that he dealt with in the sense that whatever questions were asked, we were able to get information. And that information I think has been valuable in us understanding essentially what has taken place with respect to the issues of unemployment in this province. And there's a difference of opinion between the members opposite and our side on courses of action, but at the same time, Mr. Speaker, we at least I think, can agree we have arrived at certain factors which we say are realistically the true situation in Manitoba and we're able to deal with it on a basis of at least a set of facts that we agree on, and at least a set of assumptions now that we can now discuss intelligently without having to quarrel on that.

Now I would think, Mr. Speaker, that it would be important, not that we have an agreement on those assumptions for the purpose of arguing the question of inflation and the cost of living, but I think it would be very important for this Legislature, and for the members of the government, and the members on this side, and the members of the caucus, to be able to have those experts who will present accurate information of what really is happening, so that we won't have it being passed to us by bits and pieces in the newspaper or on the radio or comments by this one or that one, but rather have it directly in front of us so that we're

POINT OF PERSONAL GRIEVANCE

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) in a position to understand it fully and be able to deal with it to our own people in our own constituencies, and be able to help shape policy. And I would think, Mr. Speaker, if we did that we would be making a contribution, in the course of it we would be indicating problem areas; we would relieve the farmer from part of the responsibility that has been placed on his shoulders, as being the cause of increased prices of meat particularly; we would relieve labour from part of the charges that have been made to them that they have been responsible for the increased cost of living, and they would in fact give us the opportunity, not for the attachment of where blame should be placed but rather for an evaluation in real terms of what is happening and for the development of the kinds of policy positions that would assist us.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say to you that in my opinion my grievance is a justified one. The Premier did not answer the letter. There is no obligation on his part to answer the letter but he does, and the members opposite do, have an obligation to the people of Manitoba in a very real and direct way to indicate that they are prepared to deal with an issue that is basic to most people, their major concern -- the cost of living and inflation, and to give members of the Legislature, who are the people's representatives, the opportunity to understand the matter fully, to make recommendations both to the Provincial Government and to the Federal Government in order to be able to assist in solving the problem and allow people the opportunity to make real gains as a result of rise in their incomes rather than have their gains eaten away by increased prices of goods and services.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY - GENERAL

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 17 (a) --passed. Resolution 17 -- The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, when we rose last evening, at least dealing with the Estimates of my Department, there were a number of contributions that had been made and I will endeavour in the few moments that are left to answer some of those observations, and hopefully I'll have an opportunity another day to -- providing we're not grieving all day over some lost cause -- to answer some further contributions.

Perhaps I can deal with the concerns of the Honourable Member from Rhineland first.

Well perhaps the briefest one might be the Member from Rupertsland who is not here. Really he was concerned to indicate first of all that there should be support for identification cards to assist industries that are affected by the age of majority with an easier administration of whatever program they have that's affected by age, and I certainly agree with the sentiments of the honourable member, and I think many of my colleagues who have from time to time made comment about it have indicated that sympathy. However we have not agreed with a compulsory identification system of people that is something which we feel we'd rather not pursue. It should be possible for the private sector to develop sufficient identification cards that would have the kind of information contained thereon that would be helpful. There are many institutions that already now use various types of identification card and I don't think it will take much ingenuity to come up with a suitable card.

Now dealing with some of the observations of the Honourable Member from Rhineland, and I won't have an opportunity to deal with all of his comments at this time. But he did deal with the broader aspects of reform and we got into such things as reform of the parliamentary system, and so on, and even the rules of this House, and I might, not quite in a half-bantering way, say to the honourable member that I would think that, I agree with him that some of the rules of this House could be changed, perhaps to tighten up the system so that we could perhaps be a bit more efficient in getting the work of the people done, because to me it's an exasperating process to have to listen to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition in a grievance mechanism that is redundant, repetitive, and we hear over and over again the same empty phrases, and meanwhile members are anxiously awaiting the response that should be made to their concerns about departmental spending. But be that as it may, I say that those remarks are in a half-bantering fashion because I'm not terribly upset about any member fully utilizing his rights. But where they seem to be a

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY - GENERAL

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) matter of overly repetitious dialogue, then that is a matter for some displeasure and some degree of annoyance, but not to any great extent. --(Interjection)-- No I really won't complain with any heat at all.

The honourable member also was concerned about the, well the measurement of liquor in shot glasses, and I know that that may have been an inconvenience to some licensed premises, but surely the individual consumer has a right to expect that the measurement is going to be in accordance with the proper standard and the Commission was rather surprised to find that the measurement in these glasses was quite inaccurate, inaccurate to the extent where there was a measurable inaccuracy, which over a long period of time could have a very substantial effect on the amount of the product actually being sold. And so there was a request for more accurate glasses, and I think that that is good consumer protection.

Now he was also concerned with the application of moneys from government in respect to alcoholic rehabilitation, and I think that I indicated something of my concern earlier when I was talking in introduction of my Estimates, and I happen to agree with the honourable member that society must spend more and more in the field of rehabilitation, and I think when the Honourable, my colleague, the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development reviews his Estimates with the House you will find that there has been increases provided for in the spending in his department in those areas.

He was also concerned with suspensions of licences and a concern as to whether or not suspensions were an adequate enough means of penalizing those licensees who had violated the rules and regulations of operations. And I can only say to the honourable member that it's my understanding that suspension of licence has a very salutary effect because it does involve considerable loss of revenue to an individual licensed premise and there has been an announced stiffening of policy in respect to that by the Commission. Now I see the Honourable Mr. Chairman is ready to . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour being 4:30, the last hour of every day being Private Members' Hour. We spent five minutes in Estimates today, and for the honourable members' information we have expended 48 hours 35 minutes of the Estimates. Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

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

IN SESSION

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

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Osborne, that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR - RESOLUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The first item on Wednesdays is Private Bills. Since we have none we move into resolutions. We are on Resolution 17. The Honourable Member for St. George. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the House Leader wanted to make a statement at this time in connection with the manner in which we were going to deal with these private members' resolutions so that we'd have it on the record.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I thank my honourable friend. I thought that he was going to make the point, that he had discussed it with me, and that we both concur that we should proceed in the form as originally contemplated, which is in the form that the Member for Morris discussed earlier this afternoon. That is that once a private member's resolution is introduced it has to be debated to its conclusion, and has to be debated every private members' hour that it comes up. If there is a member who has been speaking on the resolution and therefore it stands in his name, is not present, then either the debate continues or the motion is called to a vote, which is both our understanding of what the rule was supposed to mean and that any department from that ruling be ignored and that we proceed as the Honourable Member for Morris has suggested.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well, thank you. We are on Resolution 17. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

RESOLUTION 17

MR. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On the basis of the point just explained by the House Leader I wish to make a comment or two on this particular resolution and pick up the debate on it at this juncture. As pointed out by the Government House Leader, Sir, when we last were looking at this resolution we were listening to the comments of the Honourable Member for St. George and he was at that time explaining his objection to the direction of the resolution largely on the grounds that in many of the communities in which he has frequent experience, business and political, he finds that the \$2.00 restaurant meal is still a commonplace and as a consequence there is no particular need to consider raising of the sales tax exemption, an increase of the sales tax exemption where the price of restaurant meals is concerned.

I would challenge the member's contention in that respect, Mr. Speaker. He made specific reference to a number of communities, among them Arborg and others in the Inter-lake where he said if those of us on the opposition side of the House cared to investigate the situation we would no doubt find that the \$2.00 restaurant meal is still a frequent and common occurrence, common institution, and that no extension of the exemption is necessary. The fact of the matter is of course that regardless of where one is from, whether on this side of the Chamber or the government side of the Chamber or somewhere beyond the realm and reach and confines of this Chamber, anywhere in Manitoba, one is not as likely to encounter the kind of restaurant and the kind of community situation to which the Member for St. George referred, as one is likely to encounter the situation in Metropolitan Winnipeg. Half the population and certainly more than half the industry and commerce of the province are carried on within the metropolitan boundaries of Winnipeg, Sir, and most of the working people of this province come into contact with restaurant meals and restaurant prices in this metropolitan community. Not in Arborg, as pleasant as it might be to be in the Community of Arborg; not in some of the other small communities to which the Honourable Member for St. George referred, as pleasant as those small communities may be. This is where the commerce and the business of the province in large part is conducted; this is where the working man in majority makes his home and earns his living in Manitoba, so it's the restaurant meal in Winnipeg with which the majority of us have to contend. And the restaurant meal price in Winnipeg has suffered the same fate as the price of almost everything else in our society. The price of everything has gone up and nobody in this Chamber needs elucidation on that point, no less the price of a \$2.00 meal. What you could get for \$2.00 in a restaurant a year, two years, three years ago was substantially more on each of those occasions that what you can get for \$2.00 in a restaurant today. And it's because the price of the \$2.00 restaurant meal has gone up, that meal that once sold for \$2.00 now costs more, it's because of that that the resolution is before us and that the increase in exemption where restaurant meals are concerned should commend itself to members of this Chamber.

I support my colleague, the Member for Sturgeon Creek in advancing this resolution, putting it before the House, Mr. Speaker, and I find it difficult to understand why the Member for St. George and anybody on the government side would oppose it. In the first place it ties in very closely with what my Leader was saying a few moments ago this afternoon about the cost of living, about the difficulty for all of us in making a dollar stretch far enough nowadays. One has only to expose oneself to restaurant prices either in the capacity of a single working person or in the capacity of a family person, man or woman, wanting to take his or her family out for a meal, to have underscored all too clearly to himself the fact that restaurant meal entertainment is slipping beyond the capability of the average Manitoban very very quickly. The restaurants are no happier with that situation than we the patrons and consumers and working people are and I find it difficult to comprehend as I say, Mr. Speaker, the rationale for the government in taking a position in opposition to this resolution. The matter of the family restaurant outing I think is a consideration that shouldn't be dismissed lightly. The advantages in terms of family enjoyment to the occasional restaurant outing are obvious I should think to all of us here. The advantages to the restaurant operator are equally obvious. That is the advantages to having families think in terms of patronizing their premises for family outings and family entertainment. If the sales tax exemption were raised, as my colleague from Sturgeon Creek proposes in his resolution, from the point of the \$2.00 price to the level of the \$3.00 meal price, it would act as a stimulus and an encouragement, and I suggest to a greater family participation in the activity of restaurant eating. If on the surface

RESOLUTION 17

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) it appears that the government would be losing some sales tax revenue as a consequence of taking that kind of position, I suggest that that's a short-sighted perspective, Mr. Speaker. The reverse is more likely to be the case, because if the pricing conditions were such that there were greater patronage and greater participation, then in the long run the revenues, the profits and the taxes paid by restaurant owners and establishments of that kind would reflect the increased patronage, then in turn the returns to the government would reflect them equally. So it is not correct to say that the increase in the exemption being sought here would make for a reduction in the revenues available to the government. On the surface, at the time that the meal was purchased and the time that the bill was paid at the cash register, at the counter, that might be the case, but it is not the ultimate end of the exercise. The end of the exercise would be, as I have suggested, that there would be greater patronage and thus a greater return in the end to the restaurant and through it to the treasury.

The aspect of the philosophical justification for the resolution interests me too, Mr. Speaker, and the government's opposition to it intrigues me equally on those philosophical grounds. Here is a measure that in essence is a simple, uncomplicated, people's measure. Here is a government that at least poses as a people's government, a government that proclaims itself to be an administration for the people, an administration interested in making existence a little easier, a little less complicated, a little more equal, a little more comfortable for people, and yet we have, at least in the person of the Honourable Member for St. George, a government member opposing what is a simple, people's measure. So that represents a rather incongruous aspect of the situation as far as I'm concerned, Mr. Speaker, and I would be surprised if in general the members of the government benches, front and back, found themselves philosophically able to take the same position that the Member for St. George did. If they believe in the kinds of things they profess and proclaim to stand for, then it seems to me that they would have to be responsive to the measure proposed here.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would permit a question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I heard the Member for St. George speak and I know that he questioned some of the suppositions that were put forward in the opening address. I never heard him say that he was going to oppose the passing of the measure. I wonder if the honourable member can recall that being said.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: No. No. The question is well taken. The point is well taken, Mr. Speaker. I'm not certain that the Member for St. George has made the decision to oppose the resolution if and when it comes to a vote, but I certainly had the impression from his remarks that he was not in agreement with it. However, I defer to the question raised, to the point raised by the Government House Leader. The Member for St. George did not specifically say that he was going to oppose it and I have no way of knowing precisely how he'll vote. He had, as the Order Paper indicates, 12 minutes left to go and I expected that it might have been possible for us to hear the conclusion of his remarks on the resolution today, Mr. Speaker. So I may be leaping to conclusions, and if I am I stand to be corrected.

The conclusion that I leapt to, though, on the basis of the opening remarks of the Member for St. George, was that he was opposed to it and felt that it was not justified. If that's not his position then I accept the admonition of the Government House Leader fully and as gracefully as I can. I believe that the Member for St. George, in all conscience, will have to ask himself very carefully before he takes a voting position on the resolution, whether he could philosophically oppose it, and it will be interesting I suggest, Sir, to see what conclusion he does come to on the question. Nonetheless, as I've said, I had the impression that he's against it and in response to what he said the other evening I want to raise these aspects of the subject and say to him and to his colleagues that in philosophical terms I suggest it would be extremely difficult, if not unjustifiable, for them to oppose it.

This is a measure that would make things more pleasant and more comfortable for families, for people of modest and moderate and less than moderate incomes, for families and people who have to be careful about the kinds of expenditures they enter into when they're indulging in pleasant family entertainment and pastimes. This would be helpful to them; it would be helpful to the restaurant industry in terms of encouraging more patronage. There's no question that the tax that now exists on those meals over \$2.00 is a discouragement to

RESOLUTION 17

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) certain types of restaurant patronage. Certainly it's not a discouragement to the working man in a hurry who has to grab a dollar and fifty cent or dollar and seventy-five cent lunch on the run. He has to do that because of the time limit imposed on him by his working situation and he will patronize that particular eating place anyway. But there's no question that it's a discouragement to a greater and broader patronage of the restaurant. Any tax, really, is a discouragement to almost any kind of activity, and if it could be eased in the manner proposed by this resolution the result would be an encouragement for patronage of the restaurant industry, and that surely would have to reflect itself, Sir, through the entire economy, not only the economy of the family of the working man, but the economy of the province as a whole.

So I support my colleague from Sturgeon Creek and commend the resolution to the members of the Assembly, and hope that the members on the government side will find philosophically that they stand with us in support of it when it comes to a vote.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, the Member for Fort Garry has stated that he was of the opinion that my colleague, the Member for St. George, was speaking in opposition to this particular resolution of the Member for Sturgeon Creek. The fact is that he was planning to bring an amendment which would actually complement the whole resolution, and it should also be pointed out that the Budget has been brought down, that at this particular time it would not be feasible but that the government would certainly consider the idea of increasing the exemptions of meals up to \$3.00. But it's interesting, Mr. Speaker, to see that in comparing the type of exemptions province from province - I just have statistics here on the various provinces across Canada - Saskatchewan does have five percent tax in excess of \$2.50, meals costing over \$2.50; Manitoba is five percent presently on meals in excess of \$1.99; Ontario has recently increased - it's still ten percent, it used to be ten percent on meals in excess of \$2.50, they have recently, when they brought their budget, made it a ten percent sales tax on meals in excess of \$4.00; Quebec has eight percent tax on meals and this was increased from \$1.24 to \$1.49 in just recent months; New Brunswick has eight percent tax on meals in excess of \$1.00; Nova Scotia seven percent tax on meals in excess of \$1.00; Prince Edward Island eight percent on meals in excess of \$1.00; Newfoundland seven percent on meals in excess of .07 dollars or seven cents. So the seven cents really don't count but they have a seven percent -- (Interjection) -- quite a meal -- in excess of seven cents. Seven cents. I understand it is a Conservative Government in Newfoundland and they haven't done anything on this. They are still retaining this. But the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that since 1967, although we are in agreement with the whole idea, we're sympathetic to the resolution, we are not in any way opposed to the general principle that has been brought forth to this resolution; it is interesting to note that the restaurant industry has not been arguing that the exemption for restaurant meals should be increased. Rather, they have been of the opinion that the exemption for meals should be reduced to twenty-five cents, you know that there should be a reduction, and this particular resolution which, I don't know how the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek was motivated, whether he was in touch with the restaurant industry, he didn't indicate it, that this was something that the restaurant industry was pushing for, it has been his own particular opinion I gather and in that regard I don't think that we are very much in disagreement.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Fort Garry was stating that my colleague the Member for St. George seemed to be arguing against it. He was just merely pointing out that in his particular area people can get meals for less than \$2.00; and it is also a fact it's not a proven fact that the cost of meals have doubled in the last - say since 1967. Meals have gone up. Most communities, there are many areas you can still get a meal for less than \$2.00. If you go down to the Union Centre you can get a very good meal \$1.65, \$1.35. You can go to the Chamber of Commerce - I was told by the General Manager, Evan McCormick, that we can come down any time and get a good meal for \$1.95. The restaurant downstairs, the cafeteria, you can get a meal for less than a dollar. So this argument that the meals have doubled across the province in the various areas I don't think is really valid. However, we are not -- (Interjection) -- Went up? Well I think he indicated in some cases it has doubled. Well it might have doubled in -- (Interjection) -- Assiniboia? No, Sturgeon Creek. I don't believe it has, but it certainly hasn't doubled in most places that I eat except if you want to go to the

RESOLUTION 17

(MR. SHAFRANSKY cont'd) Winnipeg Inn, the Velvet Glove, or -- (Interjection) -- Well I don't eat at Joe's Place. I understand he had a greasy spoon at one time and he was involved with his pork chops all the time and since that time he has learned -- he's fasting because this is a particular period of time and so he's lost weight -- but I remember him a few years back and he certainly did not have that appearance. He has got a halo around himself now so that he feels that he is above any kind of criticism. Well, Mr. Speaker, the -- (Interjection) -- Tuxedo Inn? Where is that?

A MEMBER: Near the Youth Centre.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Is that near the Youth Centre? Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. George did have a resolution prepared, he was going to be introducing it the last day when he was speaking on it, however the time ran out so I'm going to introduce the resolution which was going to be proposed by him - an amendment to the resolution. And therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Flin Flon that the motion be amended by adding after the end of the fourth paragraph the following:

"AND WHEREAS reductions have been made since the imposition of this tax some six years ago so that the burden of taxation on the working man's income is now in aggregate lower in Manitoba than in most provinces; and

WHEREAS the tax on meals in Manitoba has a higher exemption than in many other provinces; and

WHEREAS the amount of the exemption is subject to change from time to time; "

And then the be it resolved reads: "THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of changing the legislation to only require the tax be paid on meals costing \$3.00 or more."

We're just adding the "whereases" . . .

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Just on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I believe that it should be clear that the member added three whereases, and then when he read out the last part of the amendment it is identical, it is not an amendment, he was just reading what subsequently followed his own amendment.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, that is correct. I stated, "and the Resolved is as is written in the resolution."

MR. SPEAKER: I concur with all the points of order that have been raised. If I had been allowed to continue I would have read the resolution as amended and then we would have been aware. Do the members still wish the resolution now to be read as amended or are they ready to proceed? I'll read it as amended.

WHEREAS the people of Manitoba have been paying five percent tax on all meals purchased over \$2.00 since 1967; and

WHEREAS the cost of food, labour, taxes, utilities and maintenance has caused the price of meals to have nearly doubled since 1967; and

WHEREAS the many Manitobans in the performance of their jobs, example, truckers, miners, construction workers, etc., are required to eat all or part of their meals in restaurants; and

WHEREAS the intent of this tax was not to impose a penalty on the ordinary working man's meals; and

WHEREAS reductions have been made since the imposition of this tax some six years ago so that the burden of taxation on the working man's income is now in aggregate lower in Manitoba than in most provinces; and

WHEREAS the tax on meals in Manitoba has a higher exemption than in many other provinces; and

WHEREAS the amount of the exemption is subject to change from time to time;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of changing the legislation to only require that tax be paid on meals costing \$3.00 or more.

The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): . . . point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside state his point of order.

RESOLUTION 17

MR. ENNS: I was listening very carefully to the Honourable Member from Radisson as he was moving the amendment but it distinctly is not what was just read. There was a "whereas" in there that I didn't hear you read, Sir: "Whereas the government is composed of such a group of fine fellows that . . ."

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. I do believe the honourable member is being facetious. I do think he should take our rules seriously and not raise points of order which aren't. The Honourable House Leader, on a point of order?

MR. GREEN: Yes, the Minister of Labour has brought to my attention a correct point, that you have read the motion as it would appear if it were amended.

MR. SPEAKER: That is correct, that's what I . . .

MR. GREEN: . . . with the amendment, and that that would have to be dealt with and passed before the motion would read as you have presently read it.

MR. SPEAKER: That's exactly what I indicated when I said, "will I read the motion out as amended." I didn't say that it had been adopted that way, just that I was going to read it out as it would sound amended.

MR. GREEN: Okay.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I rise to compliment the government for accepting the resolution that was proposed by the Member for Sturgeon Creek.

I do believe that the resolution certainly had merit and I listened to the Member for St. George and I was inclined to believe at that time that perhaps he was going to oppose it, and I just briefly looked in Hansard and he stated on Page 1607, "I've travelled across" - I'm quoting: "I've travelled across the country and across the province and in most instances where I stopped -- I didn't know where the honourable member eats, whether it is in the Charter House or places like that. I would say there are many restaurants in the province that have full course meals at \$2.00 or less." So just from that statement alone, one would be inclined to believe that he perhaps was not going to support it at that time. Maybe since that time the member and the government had caucused this resolution and then they have been prepared to accept it.

But, Mr. Speaker, I do feel that it certainly is good that the government has accepted it and I hope that the cabinet will give it consideration, because in my opinion, meals in a restaurant is food and I feel that food should not be taxed. Perhaps at a higher limit, maybe \$4.00 or \$5.00 it's different, but certainly it is my opinion that food should not be taxed. And perhaps we can say liquor is not food and I see no reason why liquor shouldn't be taxed and it is taxed. But **as far** as when we ever talk about food and accommodation or shelter, I think those two areas should not be taxed and I don't think, or I don't believe it is right because some other provinces tax building materials or tax food that it is right for us or for some other province to do the same. I think the quicker that the politicians and governments get away from taxing shelter and food the better it's going to be. So I do accept -- now that the government is prepared to accept it, and I could not agree with the Member who just spoke a little while ago, he said that it's taxed in the other provinces and in my opinion it doesn't make it right because it's taxed some other provinces it should be taxed here -- but I compliment the government for accepting the increase to \$3.00, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to take this opportunity to speak on the amendment of the resolution. "And whereas the reductions have been made since the imposition of this tax some six years ago so that the burden of taxation on the working man's income is now in aggregate lower in Manitoba than in most provinces." Well, Mr. Speaker, I am like the Member for Assiniboia, that I really don't believe that we have to worry about the other provinces and obviously the government does too because they go for the body or the final "whereas" of the amendment.

But getting back to the detailed Estimates, Mr. Speaker, we can also really take a look at whether the workingman in this province is paying less when in 1969, \$64 million was gathered by the Manitoba income tax, individual income tax, and \$166 million is now collected. This is less taxes on the working man? Isn't that really something! Mr. Speaker, when I sat down the last time and the Member from St. George got up I was disappointed that I wouldn't hear the bragging from the Member from Radisson as we usually get, but I am not

RESOLUTION 17

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) disappointed any more, it came from him at that side of the House.

And of course we've got the other taxes like the Motive Fuel Tax and they're saying that they're lowering it - it was \$5 million, it's now collecting 7 million - so again I guess the workingman's expenses haven't gone down from the point of view of running his automobile in this province.

The tobacco tax, those who enjoy smoking, Mr. Speaker, the tobacco tax as far as the workingman is concerned - of what used to collect \$8 million and now it's collecting \$13 million. So really is the workingman and people of Manitoba paying less taxes in this province at the present time?

Well now, Mr. Speaker, the resolution is very clear. It says that "some six years ago so that the burden of taxation on the workingman's income is now in aggregate lower in Manitoba." I'm speaking exactly to the amendment, Mr. Speaker.

Gasoline tax used to collect 35 million and now 43 million in 1973. Of course, Mr. Speaker, we have the other real problem areas where the workingman is involved in recreation, etc., all the charges for the recreation for the workingman are up considerably over what they used to be. -- (Interjection) -- Triple as a matter of fact as my colleague says. So the fact that the workingman is paying less And let's take the - not only the workingman who is in the province who has to eat meals as he's driving around in the country at different restaurants at noon. You know even in agriculture we have, for sundry services, we've got an increase from 144,000 to \$1,500,000. And this is causing the workingman to go down?

Mr. Speaker, you know this government has had a real little habit of the last while of when they amend our resolutions, you know, when they amend our resolutions we get this patting on the back business. No real closeness to the resolution but patting on the back business which is what is called the most childish stupid thing that can be done in this Legislature. You know we're not here to play games, we're here to talk about the benefits of the people of Manitoba, and yet all we do is get this game being played day in and day out by the members. They obviously must sit in the caucus room and say to one another, now, we'll toss a coin to who puts the usual stupid amendment in this time.

Mr. Speaker, we have again been talking about will the workingman be paying less in this province. We know and everybody knows that prices are all up in this province and there's hundreds of taxes that are hidden that we don't see in here. Mr. Speaker, this is the type of sham that we're getting from the government. This is the type of thing of, you know, they go for the resolution, for once in their lives they put their money where their mouth is, which hasn't happened too often with this government when we start talking about little things like this that will help people, but now all of a sudden when we got to have this complimentary silliness go on. If you want to have a budget debate which is what you really have as to whether the workingman is paying less in this province in this resolution, let's have it. Let's have it, sure. Oh yes, and we've now heard from the know-nothing over there in the corner. But, Mr. Speaker, let's take a look at some of these other ones.

Refunds: Public amusements it has here, used to collect 1 million 700 thousand dollars, now collects, 2 million, 100 thousand dollars. And he's paying less? My goodness! And now parks and recreation, I think I mentioned this before and I got a comment from somebody in the House that though the tourist business is up, is it up 100 percent? Because that's what it's up in here - \$605,490 - it collected and here we have it now estimated at \$1,177,000.00. And the workingman is paying less in this province?

And we had the comments from the other side of the House, you know, what's happening down at the business men's club, you know. The business men are the ones that eat a sandwich for lunch. They're the ones that don't spend that much for lunch, they usually have ulcers or something of that nature. But the workingman who needs a big meal, my God, he's the guy that spends money for meals and that's the man what we were talking about. So again I compliment the government for really going for the resolution. But to put in an amendment that says the people of this province are paying less taxes, when in 1969 - we now have an increase from 1969 of approximately \$317 million in the budget of the Province of Manitoba over '69. And those figures are changeable, some people add them up one way, it can get to 354 millions of dollars. And you're saying that nobody is paying less taxes. For heavens sakes, Mr. Speaker.

RESOLUTION 17

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd)

Let's talk about the increase of the civil service which is now a \$176 million cost in this province - up 94 percent. That's \$176 for every man, woman and child in this province. And you say the workingman is now better off in the Province of Manitoba? We always get the argument about the wealthy man, you know, the \$50,000 a year man and there are so few of them it isn't even funny. In fact the Member from Flin Flon the other night he really went from the ridiculous to the sublime. He started to talk about the \$70,000 and \$65,000 a year man in Manitoba, and I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, there are very very few of them. The guy that gets hit in this province is the - 8, 10, 12 thousand, 7 thousand, 13 thousand-dollar a year man, and he gets hit real hard with all the increases that have been put in by this government. And then they turn around and say we're giving you your money back. You know, they're paying less because we're giving it back. And you know, what's been taken off the top? An increase in the civil service of 94 percent, that comes off the top. The boards and commissions, that comes off the top. All of these things come off the top.

You know, Mr. Speaker, it's like the story of Sandy and Jock, and while Sandy was lying on his death bed, he said to Jock he said, "Jock will you do me one last favour. While I'm lying in my coffin will you please pour my favourite bottle of Scotch over me before they put me away." And Sandy says, I'd be glad to but he says I have one thing to say, he said, "it seems like quite a waste, do you mind if I strain it through my kidneys before I sprinkle it over you." And you know, that's what's happening to the people of Manitoba, they're getting wet on by this government. I could put it in nicer terms, Mr. Speaker, but you know, the nicer terms - I could put it in worsen, but let's just say the people of Manitoba are getting wet on by this Government. They strain all the people's money through the kidneys. And what else goes through the kidneys? The boards, commissions and everything else that goes with it. And he says, he comes up with a resolution of the government saying the people of Manitoba are paying less taxes. You know, how stupid - what do you class the people of Manitoba as - Nuts?

-- (Interjection) -- Oh, we've now heard from the bookworm again. I would say that he's much smarter than all of us because he's the one that says the Readers Digest is a rag, you know. Well I can only say it's only comments from very good writers. But you know, I can agree he'd think it would be, he's so far above the people who read ordinary things that I could agree that he'd think it would be.

But Mr. Speaker, let's, let's just wind it up, as far as I'm concerned, I would like to hear the comments, I'd like to hear the comments from the other side on the amendment. I hope you have several speakers on it. I would like to hear the comments from the fellows on our side on this amendment, of praising the government and saying that we have less taxes in Manitoba, when we've got double the taxes in Manitoba since 1969. We've got 94 percent increase in civil servants, we've got darn near double, you know, all these revenues are up where people are having to spend their working dollar. And you say they're not paying more taxes! You say you're giving them money back. I'll tell you, that money comes right out of their pockets. And again, you know, the man who pays the piper calls the tune, and that is the whole process of this government; to pay out money, drum the people to have more control over them, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (St. Johns): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also thank those honourable members who seem so pleased to want to hear from me.

I did enjoy listening to the Member from Sturgeon Creek. Of course it gets pretty tiresome hearing the same old record. I do wonder why he talked about the Honourable Member for St. Matthews about being a bookworm. I know that the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek has read a book, I know it, he's waved it at us often and he has said, -- there it is, there's his bible. Mr. Speaker, I must thank him for producing the one book that I know he read. I doubt very much if he's read anything else but I know he's read that book and it is his bible and he has just supported the fact that I was right.

Mr. Speaker, I've been accused of being righteous on occasion and I must tell you, Mr. Speaker, that we sink to some low levels around here. But some of the things, you know, we get lower and lower and the kind of a joke which amuses the honourable member across the way is not the kind of a joke that I would find pleasing to hear in this Chamber. Maybe there's another room in this building, on this floor, where I could listen to it a little more receptively. However, he's read a book, and he's got his standard of jokes, and that's his right to carry

RESOLUTION 17

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) forward in his manner. -- (Interjection) -- He offended me, yes. He says he's sorry he offended me. I don't know if he is; I don't know if he offended others present; there may be others in this room who were offended by his standard of humour, I admit I am one of those.

But that isn't really why I rose to speak, because the honourable member's comments in that respect were not deserving of recognition. I really rose to speak because of his leader's great big speech this afternoon, bit deal that he made, and supported as it was by the Member for Sturgeon Creek just recently, who talked about doubling taxes, and doubling civil service, and good old boards and commissions. He is the one member across the way who always remembers to refer to boards and commissions.

Mr. Speaker, it has been shown time and again that the civil service increase in Manitoba is no different in general from the way it is right across the board; there are more services being provided; honourable members and the citizens demand more services; they're getting more services, and they're paying for those services. I don't think it is any -- I doubt if the Member for Sturgeon Creek wants to suggest that the civil servants are not doing their work and earning their pay and if they are doing their work and earning their pay, then clearly they are providing a service which the people of this province want and are getting.

Mr. Speaker, what really brought me to my feet was his leader's suggestion and his own which dealt with the increases in expenditures, and the Member for Sturgeon Creek says, are the people of Manitoba stupid? And they're certainly not stupid. The people of Manitoba can well understand that when we have a budget which we presented as we did, that the expenditure items refer to substantial reductions of taxation. The Member for Sturgeon Creek must know it, even though he's only read the one book that I know of, he must have enough intelligence to understand that when you take over into your budget a medicare cost, a health premium cost, and you include it as an expenditure, as indeed it must be because it's paid to the Manitoba Health Services Commission, it's called an expenditure, but it replaces an item which was charged to every single person or head of a family in Manitoba, \$100.00 a year, and better than that; it's shown as an expenditure and there's no other way. Maybe the Member for Sturgeon Creek doesn't know that. Maybe he doesn't know that it has to be shown as an expenditure. And he says two and two makes three, so now we have another level of his knowledge and intelligence.

Mr. Speaker, he should know it, and I believe he does, you know. He and I can bandy these dirty cracks at each other; the fact is I do have a respect for his intelligence, and I do know he understands it, but I do believe that he's not prepared to say so to the people of Manitoba. He'd rather distort the facts, and he would rather say that our expenditures have gone up, rather than honestly recognize the fact that there are moneys involved there which are in turn reduction in taxation. Now which member on that side has expressed on opposition to this government's policy of rebating or cancelling out the entire health services' premium, something in excess of, or approximately \$200.00, since this government came into power. Which one of them is opposed to what we did; and which one of them is so dumb that he doesn't understand that that item of \$200.00 for every married couple in Manitoba is today an expenditure as shown in the estimates of expenditure? Which one of those members don't know that? They all know it; of course they know it, but they won't say it when they go out of here, and the Member for Sturgeon Creek will scream loudly, pound the table, wave his library at us, and will go out to the people and say, taxes have been increased. He won't admit the truth. He won't admit the truth at all, that over \$100 million, as I recall the figure, is a reduction in health premium costs, a complete cancellation, and never showed in the budget before, never showed up in 1968 because there it was premium collections that went to the Health Services Commission. Do you not know that gentlemen opposite? Or are you prepared to repeat what is a real untruth, which is it? Are you prepared to admit the truth.

Let's go to a little item; let's talk about increasing the per capita grants from, the municipal grant from \$8.00 to \$10.00. That's an increase in expenditure, isn't it? Isn't it, gentlemen? Is it not also a payment made to municipalities to aid them to keep down as much as they can the increasing costs at the municipal level? Are you prepared in all integrity to go out to your constituencies and say that that \$2 million is increased expenditure of this province; or are you prepared to admit the truth that that is a payment -- and I remember Walter Weir made great hay of it, when Walter Weir said, we are going to increase from \$3.00

RESOLUTION 17

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) to \$8.00. That was an expenditure. And he said, look what we're doing for the municipalities. I heard him say it. You heard him say it. You probably said it, gentlemen opposite. You didn't say the province is taking extra money from the people of Manitoba. You went out and said, see what Walter Weir did, he increased per capita grants from \$3.00 to \$8.00.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, is the honourable member prepared to admit that the increase in per capita grant does not cover the cost of the reduction in provincial road maintenance in municipalities as of the past two years?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, the increase is due to the fact that there is a recognition of increased costs, but the Provincial Government is still paying its proper share of provincial roads, and if it's not the same formula as it was before under the Conservative Government, it must be better, that's all I can say, because it can't be worse.

Mr. Speaker, when this government in this year increased the provincial share of foundation levy from 75 percent to 80 percent that shows as an expenditure under the estimates. Is there anybody opposite who is prepared to admit that indeed it is an additional contribution from provincial sources to the school taxpayer, the real property taxpayer, to assist in attempting to keep down the increasing cost of education? Are you prepared to admit it? Or are you prepared to go out to your constituencies and tell a distortion and not give that truth but withhold it? You know, Mr. Speaker, a partially told truth is much worse than a lie, and that is the kind of thing that we've been hearing, as we heard it from the Leader of the Opposition for an hour and a half or ad nauseum this afternoon, as we heard it from the Member for . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . and if these are the kinds of things that we are prepared to admit is true, which we proudly say is true, which the people opposite are prepared to cover up as not being the truth, then until we reach that stage we will continue to have these nonsensical comments made from the members opposite.

If we add -- (Interjection) -- Oh! -- I was going to mention the property tax credit which has gone up to \$200.00 now, a maximum of \$200.00. I hear the Member for Sturgeon Creek say, where will we get the money from? Mr. Speaker, in four years this government has more than honoured its commitments to the people of Manitoba and it's paid its way in every respect, and has been able to show a tax levy overall which is comparable to that of any other province. And members opposite know, that they have been shown charts, and they have not refuted them, which shows a reduction in taxes from 1939, but they won't admit it. -- (Interjection) -- '69, thank you for the correction.

Mr. Speaker, the members opposite must be burdened, as is Mr. Stanfield their national leader, by a 7 percent sales tax in Conservative Ontario. That must be something that must really burden them, because in a year in which we were able to rebate, to give back substantial taxes to people of Manitoba in the same budget year without an increase in taxation, Ontario, Conservative Ontario, has increased its sales tax by 2 percent -- (Interjection)-- plus an energy tax, plus a tax on corporation, and do you know, Mr. Speaker, according to Mr. . . . -- (Interjections) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, according to what I've been able to calculate and I'm not yet satisfied that I have all the figures to present, but it looks to me like Ontario is now charging corporations a provincial income tax in excess of Manitoba's. -- (Interjections) -- And I'm told there that's half the story. Well, Mr. Speaker, we should discuss these things and bring them out, but at least let's have the whole story from your side. When your leader opposite, when the Member for Sturgeon Creek talks about gross figures, global figures, tell the whole story, tell the truth, that's all I ask. Tell the truth. And if honourable members think that all they have to do is look at a total expenditure statement and say, that's the truth, then they don't know, or they know and they're not telling the truth. Because the truth is that in all these expenditures are very very substantial tax cuts, exactly what the members opposite were asking for -- tax cuts. The only difference is, across-the-board tax cuts is what Conservatives want; selective tax cuts is what the New Democrats want. And this is in essence -- (Applause) -- that is in essence the difference between the two Parties. Selectivity in order to attempt to bring a greater equality, across-the-board dealings in order to maintain

RESOLUTION 17

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) what is still an inequitable system, and nobody here will say that we've achieved the end by any means.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member will have seven minutes the next time. The hour being 5:30 the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning.

A MEMBER: 10 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning.